THE POLITICAL ATTITUDES OF PRISON INMATES

A DISSERTATION

SUBMITTED TO THE DEPARTMENT OF POLITICAL SCIENCE

AND THE COMMITTEE ON GRADUATE STUDIES

OF STANFORD UNIVERSITY

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS

FOR THE DEGREE OF

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

BY

STEPHEN BRIM WOOLPERT

OCTOBER 1976

☐ TELEPHONE CALL   X - Receipt of Doctoral Dissertation ☐ PERSONAL VISIT | DATE

Nov 3, 1976

NAME AND ORGANIZATION OF CALLER

Stanford University

SUBJECT Doctoral Dissertation for GRF Grant #75-NI-99-0034
by Stephen Woolpert

ACTION REQUIRED	ACTION TAKEN
See action taken	Distributed to NCJRS and noted in grant file

COMMENTS:

Received 3 copies of "The Political Attitudes of Prison Inmates", Oct. 1976, by Stephen Woolpert.

One copy sent to NCJRS

Coordinated with: GCMD

Information Copies to: NCJRS

Confirmation Copy to:

TITLE
Program Manager

SIGNATURE

ii

I certify that I have read this thesis and that in my opinion it is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

_____
(Principal Adviser)

I certify that I have read this thesis and that in my opinion it is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

_____

I certify that I have read this thesis and that in my opinion it is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

_____

Approved for the University Committee
on Graduate Studies:

_____
Dean of Graduate Studies

PREFACE

My interest in bridging the gap between the fields of corrections and political science stems largely from two recent events: the riot at Attica State Prison and the shoot-out at the Marin County Courthouse in which George Jackson and several others were slain. What surprised me was the strength of my reaction to these events. Beyond being troubled and saddened, I could not escape the feeling that there must be a contribution which I as a social scientist could make to our understanding of these and similar events. This project is the result of that belief.

As the study evolved through the initial stages, the complexities of the problem seemed to grow exponentially: the lack of prior theoretical or empirical work, the problems of gaining access to and the trust of inmates, and so on. Fortunately, I received assistance from many sources which helped greatly in overcoming such difficulties.

The Law Enforcement Assistance Administration provided two years of funding, which covered the costs of field work and data analysis. The Research Advisory Committee of the California Department of Corrections granted me permission to survey prisoners without interference. The prisoners themselves were on the whole even more cooperative than I had hoped. The decisions of these three groups provided the necessary opportunity to conduct the study, for which I am most grateful. I believe the results justify their decisions.

CONTENTS

CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

ix

THE POLITICAL ATTITUDES OF PRISON INMATES

Stephen Brim Woolpert, Ph.D.
Stanford University, 1977

This is a study of the willingness of prison inmates to express support for political militancy. It addresses the proposition that criminal deviance and political militancy have become interrelated among American convicts.

The major thesis is broken down into two hypotheses. The first concerns recruitment effects. The question is whether the processes which funnel certain men into prison, while filtering others out, lead to a convict population whose political attitudes are unusual even as they enter prison. The second hypothesis shifts the emphasis to the effects of incarceration on inmate political beliefs. It asserts an association between the deprivation, degradation, and subordination of inmate existence and willingness to endorse unconventional political acts.

The data used in the study come from two sources. The major source is original data gathered from a sample of adult male California prison inmates during 1974. Three hundred and forty incoming prisoners completed a self-administered, forced-choice questionnaire, containing measures of criminal and social background attributes, attitudes towards various aspects of prison life, and attitudes towards political militancy. The questionnaire was subsequently completed hy 267 of the same prisoners after three to seven months of cc finement in the California state prison system.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

This is a study of the political attitudes of California prison inmates.[1] It focuses on their degree of political militancy, that is, their willingness to engage in and support unconventional political activities. By comparing the attitudes of prisoners at the start of their sentences with those of the same men after several months of confinement and with the attitudes of non-inmates, the present study observes the relative degree of militancy among men currently entering prison as well as the effects which incarceration has on their political attitudes.

The American prison occupies an unusual position in the political order: that of a totalitarian institution in a democratic society. Most social institutions in this country succeed in converting force into authority. People conform not so much because they must as because they feel they should.

But this conversion does not typically occur in the penal environment. Criminals are sent to prison precisely because they have violated the norms which control social behavior. Coercive power rather than authority becomes the basis for social control of prisoners.

Prisons are further removed from other political institutions by the fact that the political status of the prison population is curtailed. Upon conviction of a felony the criminal loses, often permanently, many of the rights and privileges of membership in the political order.[2] Convicts and ex-convicts are denied by law in many states the right to vote, to hold office, and to engage in many forms of conventional political behavior.

In short, there are marked differences between the political and social context of contemporary American prisons and that of the larger society. It is therefore of interest to political scientists to consider the politically relevant effects of exposure to such institutions.

The prison experience can usefully be conceptualized as an unusual process of recruitment and socialization into a role which is unlike any other in the political hierarchy. Most recruitment and socialization processes are those associated with political "upward mobility:" the movement of children into citizenship or of adults into progressively more complex and more responsible roles within the political framework.

Imprisonment, on the other hand, represents a decline to the bottom rung on the political and social ladder. The socialization process which occurs in prison is therefore qualitatively different from what is typically meant by the term. It is the concommitant of a loss rather than a gain in political standing. Rejection, deprivation and subordination are the primary themes of incarceration. The prisoner is an outcast both politically and socially. He occupies a "sub-citizen" role in the political system.

This study demonstrates that the effects of imprisonment are significant for political scientists as much as for prison administrators and penologists. All but a very small number of convicts are sooner or later released once again into society. But they do not necessarily leave their sub-citizen status behind them

when they leave prison; ex-convicts often fail to regain fully
their standing in the community.

More importantly, they bring with them from prison whatever
lessons they learn in their dealings with the criminal justice
system both before and during confinement. Their political be-
havior and their possible criminal behavior after release are in-
fluenced, for good or ill, by those lessons. For example, a con-
vict may learn in prison that "going straight" is the best way to
solve his own problems and help others. This would lead him to
engage in conventional social and political behavior.

Alternatively, a convict may leave prison conviced that he
is justified in "ripping off the system" because it has oppressed
and exploited him. His reaction to imprisonment, in other words,
may become linked to a political orientation which legitimizes
militant behavior after release.

The California state prison system alone has a population of
over 28,000 convicted felons, the vast majority of whom will one
day be free.[3] The relationship between their punishment and
their political predispositions is therefore of considerable
import for the non-criminal community.

Until recently the likelihood that the prison population
would be of substantial political interest was not very great.
The question as taken on growing salience in recent years, how-
ever, due to the upsurge in violence committed by convicts and
ex-convicts, epitomized by the tragic riot at Attica State Prison
in New York, and the kidnapping of Patricia Hearst.

The nature and causes of the recent wave of prison violence
have been the subject of considerable public debate. A recurring
theme of the debate has been the growth of political militancy
among prisoners. Despite their opposing evaluations of the prob-
lem, spokespersons for both the correctional establishment and
the radical left have repeatedly interpreted recent violence by
convicts and ex-convicts as symptomatic of an increasing militancy
within the inmate community.

For example, a report filed by the Chairman of the California
State Board of Corrections in October, 1972, concluded that the
increase in prison violence in California was clear evidence of a
"revolutionary attack" on the system:

> "The killings and many of the assaults
> appear to be without specific personal mo-
> tive, except that they might fit into a
> general pattern of revolutionary violence."[4]

Warden Meier of the federal penitentiary at McNeil Island re-
fers to the problem of "well-organized distrubances brought on by
the resistors, draft-dodgers, professional agitators, communists,
hippies and revolutionaries."[5] Similar comments have been made
by the wardens of San Quentin and Attica State Prisons.[6]

From the radical side, the rhetoric is different but the
conclusions are much the same. Horowitz and Liebowitz state

> "The politicization of deviance is
> occurring, as groups like homosexuals
> and drug addicts pioneer the development
> of organizational responses to harrass-
> ment... The line between the social
> deviant and the political marginal is
> fading. It is rapidly becoming an
> obsolete distinction."[7]

In a similar vein, former prisoners such as George Jackson, Angela Davis, Sam Melville and William Coons frequently use the term "political prisoners" to denote the concept of convicts as an oppressed and exploited class.[8]

Thus, the consensus of opinion on both sides is that increasing numbers of prisoners are becoming politically mobilized, gaining an awareness of the importance of political processes in their lives, and endorsing unconventional means of exerting influence on those processes. Summarizing this consensus, Jessica Mitford asserts that

> "Convicts and their keepers alike agree that traditional prisoners' grievances are undergoing fundamental change. They ascribe various reasons for this: 1) Radical and revolutionary ideologies are seeping into prisons... 2) A new and more sophisticated type of offender is entering the prison system: the civil disobedient, the collegiate narcotics user, the black or brown militant... 3) Whereas formerly prisoners tended to regard themselves as unfortunates whose accident of birth at the bottom of the heap was largely responsible for their plight, today many are questioning the validity of the heap... 4) Increasing numbers of prisoners are beginning to look upon the whole criminal justice system, with the penitentiary at the end of it, as an instrument of class and race repression."[9]

The political attitudes of prisoners have become, therefore, a subject of both academic and topical interest. This interest centers on two concerns: 1) are inmates in fact politically militant, and 2) if so, how can their militancy be accounted for?

The intent of the present study is to provide empirical evidence on inmate political attitudes which can shed light on

these questions. It is not intended to provide unambiguous predictions about the future behavior of prisoners, nor is it a crucial test of the political explanation of prison riots. It does, however, put both issues in a clearer context and permits more informed judgements with regard to them.

Specifically this study presents data on two hypotheses concerning inmate militancy: the "recruitment effect" hypothesis and the "incarceration effect" hypothesis. The first focuses on the political attitudes of criminals currently entering prison. It is concerned with whether the processes which lead from crime to arrest, conviction and incarceration recruit people into prison who are more militant than the non-inmate population.

There are no data which permit conclusions regarding the extent of militancy among incoming prisoners today as compared to that of previous incoming prisoners. The data from the California inmate sample do permit, however, comparisons of the attitudes of inmates at the start of their sentence with the attitudes of non-inmate controls. This comparison indicates whether incoming prisoners are in fact militant by current standards.

The incarceration effect hypothesis shifts the focus of attention to what happens after the prisoner begins serving time. It is concerned with the relationship between men's responses to the degradation and deprivation of imprisonment and their political attitudes. The proposition that inmate reactions to imprisonment are tied to inmate militancy is examined in two ways: first by comparing the political attitudes of inmates at the beginning of their sentence with the attitudes of the same inmates after

several months of confinement, and second, by disaggregation of
the inmate sample to examine variations in attitudes among inmate
subgroups.

The dependent variable in this study, political militancy,
refers to an individual's degree of readiness to support unorthodox
or illegitimate political behavior as a means of social change.
Of course, what is of ultimate interest is not one's predisposi-
tions but what one actually does. A large inferential gap sepa-
rates observation of one's attitude and knowledge of how one will
behave. However, militant political behavior is by nature not
susceptible to direct, systematic observation, whereas attitudes
favoring or opposing such behavior can be more readily measured.

Militancy is measured by several complementary indices:
approval of political protests, both in the abstract and as a
means of social change; reported prior participation in political
demonstrations and protests; and self-identification along a
left-right ideological continuum.

By themselves, such measures tell nothing about the clustering
of social and psychological factors associated with the expression
of militant political beliefs. Thus, the present study helps to
explicate the nature of inmate political militancy by placing it
in the context of its attributional, attitudinal and contextual
correlates.

There is very little literature on the political attitudes of
prisoners.[10] However, there are large bodies of theoretical
and empirical material dealing with political militancy[11] on the
one hand, and the effects of incarceration[12] on the other.

These two streams of evidence yield a number of variables which are of interest to the study of inmate political attitudes.

One group of variables describes the socioeconomic attributes of the men in the inmate sample. Such factors as age, race, and education are examined not only because they affect the distribution of political attitudes but also because prisoners are an extremely marginal group in terms of such attributes.

A related set of variables assesses the distribution of criminal background characteristics. Information was gathered concerning the criminal records of men in the inmate sample and on the number of experiences they have had which involved personal violence. Hence, the relationship between criminal acculturation and both reactions to prison and attitudes towards politics is assessed, in light of the importance of non-criminal demographic variables.

In addition to the effects of antecedent factors, the present study also examines interrelationships between two major sets of attitudes: reactions to imprisonment and political beliefs. The nature of the prison environment is given close attention. The most important aspect of that environment has to do with inmates' attitudes towards the two major prison reference groups, i.e., prison authorities and fellow inmates. Feelings which inmates have towards these two opposing groups are used to define a typology of prison roles, or styles of doing time. The contrasts in these styles are documented by evidence concerning shifts in role preferences over time and by evidence of the dissensus among the four roles concerning various issues of prison life.

The inmate typology, in other words, measures prison social-
ization patterns in terms of both cross-sectional differences
among inmate cohorts and patterns of attitude change among the
same prisoners during incarceration. The typology provides the
central framework within which the linkages between imprisonment
and militancy are explored.

Three important dimensions of political belief also have a
bearing on inmates' degree of militancy. The first is political
alienation. Inmate evaluations of the responsiveness, honesty and
attractiveness of the political system are examined. Differences
in both prison styles and support for militancy are found to coin-
cide with differences among prisoners in their degree of political
estrangement.

Data are also presented on respondents' subjective feelings
of competence regarding such political actions as persuading others
how to vote, protecting their rights in court, and starting a new
political group or party. Compared to the other variables included
in this study, however, political efficacy proves not to be of much
utility in differentiating inmates' political styles.

The third attitudinal factor is locus of control, which deals
with inmates' perceptions of responsibility for personal success
or failure. Inmates are distinguished according to their relative
willingness to see their lives as determined by their own actions
or by forces beyond their control. Unlike efficacy, locus of
control is an important element of the prison political culture.

The framework, then, within which the inmate political cul-
ture is described consists of feelings of political alienation,

political efficacy, and internal versus external locus of control.
It is within this context that inmate prison styles are related
to inmate militancy. Such an approach reveals information not only
about the nature of inmate militancy but also about the linkages
between militancy and prison-related attitudes.

The analysis proceeds through four stages. In Chapter Two,
data are presented on recruitment effects, i.e., the contrasts
between incoming prisoners and non-prisoners. The focus is on in-
mates' relative degree of militancy and on the role which criminal
background characteristics play in distinguishing inmates with
contrasting political beliefs.

Chapter Three presents a detailed look at inmates' adaptations
to incarceration. Four prison roles are presented, operationalized,
and validated through the use of data on inmate attributes and
their attitudes towards prison life.

Chapters Four and Five contain the major findings of this
study regarding the cross-sectional and longitudinal patterns of
inmate political opinion. Chapter Four describes the inmate po-
litical culture and examines relationships between prison roles
and variations in inmate alienation, efficacy and locus of control.
The correspondence between prison styles and political styles is
further corroborated in Chapter Five by data on the correlates of
inmate militancy. The relationship between criminal and political
deviance is found to remain intact between observations and to
persist when controlling for social and criminal background
factors.

The current study is exploratory in nature, designed to bring
together two distinct areas of social science inquiry: theories
of political militancy and theories of prison socialization. By
providing empirical evidence of the complex and important asso-
ciation between the punishment of crime and inmate political opin-
ions, the findings presented here raise questions both for polit-
ical research and for criminal justice policy. In the concluding
chapter, attention is given to the implications for each of these
areas. Detailed information on the research design and analysis
of the data are found in the Methodological Appendix.

NOTES

1. Prepared under Grant Numbers 73NI 99 1006 and 75NI 99 0034
   from the National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal
   Justice, Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, U. S.
   Department of Justice. Points of view or opinions stated in
   this document are those of the author and do not necessarily
   represent the official position or policies of the U. S.
   Department of Justice.

2. See Sol Rubin, "Loss and Curtailment of Rights", and Richard
   Vogelman, "Prison Restrictions-Prisoner Rights", both in Leon
   Radzinowicz and Marvin Wolfgang (ed.) Crime and Justice, vol.
   III, New York, Basic Books, 1971, pp. 25-40 and 52-67.

3. Jessical Mitford, "Kind and Usual Punishment in California",
   Atlantic Monthly (227), Feb., 1971, p. 45. Nationally, the
   number of Americans incarcerated in 1975 reached a quarter
   million.

4. California State Board of Corrections, "Report to Governor
   Ronald Reagan on Violence in California Prisons", Sacramento,
   Ca., Human Relations Agency, October, 1971, p. 4.

5. R. W. Meier, "Violence and Unrest in Prisons", Proceedings of
   the 99th Annual Congress of Corrections, American Correctional
   Association, 1969, p. 62.

6. Louis Nelson, "Violence in the Prison", Ibid., pp. 65-68;
   Russell Oswald, Attica- My Story, Garden City, N. Y., Double-
   day, 1972, chs. 1-2.

7. Irving Horowitz and Martin Liebowitz, "Social Deviance and
   Political Marginality: Towards a Redefinition of the Relation
   Between Sociology and Politics", Social Problems (16), 1968,
   pp. 283-85.

8. George Jackson, Soledad Brother, New York, Coward-McCaan, 1970;
   Angela Davis, If They Come in the Morning: Voices of Re-
   sistance, New York, Third Press, 1971; Sam Melville, Letters
   From Attica, New York, William Morrow & Co., 1972; William
   Coons, Attica Diary, New York, Stein & Day, 1972.

9. Mitford, op. cit., p. 52.

10. The best-known is probably still William Morrow, "Criminality
    and Anti-Democratic Trends: A Study of Prison Inmates", in
    Adorno et al., The Authoritarian Personality, New York,
    Harper, 1950, pp. 817-90. More recently, see Jonathan Casper,
    American Criminal Justice: The Defendant's Perspective,
    Englewood Cliffs, N. J., Prentice-Hall, 1972; Erik Wright,
    The Politics of Punishment, New York, Harper & Row, 1973;
    Melvin Seeman, "Alienation and Social Learning in a

Reformatory", American Journal of Sociology (69), 1963, pp. 270-84; J. P. Clark, "Acceptance of Blame and Alienation Among Prisoners", American Journal of Orthopsychiatry (33), 1963, pp. 557-61; Herbert Lefcourt and Gordon Ladwig, "Alienation in Negro and White Reformatory Inmates", Journal of Social Psychology (68), 1966, pp. 153-157.

11.   The following writings are the most germane to this study: Thomas Crawford and Murray Naditch, "Relative Deprivation, Powerlessness, and Militancy: The Psychology of Social Protest", Psychiatry (33), 1970, pp. 208-222; T. M. Tomlinson, "Ideological Foundations for Negro Action: A Comparative Analysis of Militant and Non-Militant Views of the Los Angeles Riot", Journal of Social Issues (26), 1970, pp. 93-119; H. Edward Ransford, "Isolation, Powerlessness, and Violence: A Study of Attitudes and Participation in the Watts Riot", American Journal of Sociology (74), 1968, pp. 581-91; David Sears, "Racial Socialization, Comparison Levels, and the Watts Riot", Journal of Social Issues (26), 1970, pp. 121-140; William Gamson, "Political Trust and Its Ramifications", in Gilbert Abcarian and John Soule (ed.), Social Psychology and Political Behavior, Columbus, Ohio, Charles Merrill, 1971, pp. 40-55; John Forward and Jay Williams, "Internal-External Control and Black Militancy", Journal of Social Issues (26), 1970, pp. 75-91; J. Milton Yinger, "Anomie, Alienation and Political Behavior", in Jeanne Knutson (ed.), Handbook of Political Psychology, San Francisco, Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1973, pp. 171-202; James McEvoy, III, "Political Vengeance and Political Attitudes: A Study of Americans' Support for Political and Social Violence", in William Crotty (ed.), Assassinations and the Political Order, New York, Harper & Row, 1971, pp. 312-41; Ted Gurr, "Psychological Factors in Civil Violence", World Politics (20), Jan., 1968, pp. 245-75; Bernard Grofman and Edward Muller, "The Strange Case of Relative Gratification and Potential for Political Violence: The V-Curve Hypothesis", American Political Science Review (67), 1973, pp. 514-39; Edward Muller, "A Test of a Partial Theory of Potential for Political Violence", American Political Science Review (66), 1972, pp. 928-59; Leonard Berkowitz, Aggression: A Social Psychological Analysis, New York, McGraw-Hill, 1962; Albert Bandura, Aggression; A Social Learning Analysis, Englewood Cliffs, N. J., Prentice-Hall, 1973; Richard Walters, "Implications of Laboratory Studies of Aggression for the Control and Regulation of Violence", The Annals (364), March, 1966, pp. 60-72; A. Pepitone and G. Reichling, "Group Cohesiveness and the Expression of Hostility", Human Relations (8), 1955, pp. 327-37; John Kregerman and Philip Worchel, "Arbitrariness of Frustration and Aggression", Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology (63), July, 1961, pp. 183-87.

12. For a good introduction to this copious body of material, see
Donald Clemmer, The Prison Community, Boston, Christopher
Publishing Co., 1940; Bruno Bettleheim, "Individual and Mass
Behavior in Extreme Situations", Journal of Abnormal and
Social Psychology (38), 1943, pp. 417-52; Richard Cloward
et al., Theoretical Studies in Social Organization of the
Prison, New York, Social Science Research Council, 1960;
Gresham Sykes, The Society of Captives, Princeton, N. J.,
Princeton University Press, 1958; John Irwin, The Felon,
Englewood Cliffs, N. J., Prentice-Hall, 1970; Lloyd McCorkle
and Richard Korn, "Resocialization Within Walls", The Annals
(293), May, 1954, pp. 88-98; Donald Cressey (ed.), The
Prison: Studies in Institutional Organization and Change,
New York, Holt Rinehart & Winston, 1961; Thomas Mathiesen,
The Defenses of the Weak, London, Tavistok Publications,
1965; Peter Garabedian, "Social Roles and Processes of
Socialization in the Prison Community", Social Problems (11),
Fall, 1963, pp. 139-52; Stanton Wheeler, "Socialization in
Correctional Communities", American Sociological Review (26),
Oct., 1961, pp. 697-712; Charles Tittle, Society of Sub-
ordinates, Bloomington, Ind., Indiana University Press,
1972; James Jacobs, "Stratification and Conflict Among
Prison Inmates", Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology
(66), Dec., 1975, pp. 476-82.

CHAPTER II

THE RECRUITMENT OF PRISON INMATES

A.   Introduction

The first question to be addressed in this study concerns similarities and dissimilarities between the general adult population and men being punished by the criminal justice system. What is the effect of current recruitment processes, including patterns of criminal deviance, law enforcement, adjudication and sentencing, on the distribution of background attributes and political attitudes of the prison population?

Simple documentation of the atypical nature of the inmate population would not by itself be a finding of major theoretical or policy significance. However, the central question of this study is whether criminal deviance and political militancy share a common ground in contemporary America.

If this proposition is valid, two things should be true of prison inmates. First they should manifest an above-normal degree of participation in and support for unorthodox forms of political behavior. Second, their degree of militancy should be related in a meaningful way to their degree of criminal deviance.

Data from the present study of California prisoners and similar evidence from prior surveys of the general population permit comparisons of inmates at the start of their terms with non-inmate controls (see Appendix). These comparisons indicate whether incoming prisoners in California are in fact militant by current standards. Their degree of criminal acculturation is examined, and the contention that political extremism is tied to such acculturation is tested. In subsequent chapters, cross-

sectional and longitudinal data measuring inmate attitudes at two points in the r prison terms are presented.

B. Gatekeepi 」 Devices

A prison ;entence comes at the end of a long process which diverts most `pes of people, including most law-breakers, away from prison. Not even all convicted felons make it to "the big time" in California. Criminal justice policy during the period when this study was conducted has been directed towards the goal of filtering out all but the most recalcitrant and dangerous offenders prior to imprisonment. Wherever possible, reliance is placed on the growing array of alternatives to incarceration.

Many of these "alternatives" are in fact modified forms of incarceration: work release, detoxification programs and other forms of treatment which entail the involuntary commitment of the felon in an institution.[1] But while the differences between the prison and diversionary programs may be as much semantic as substantive, the utilization of these programs has had the effect of making the California prison population an increasingly select group of men.

To understand the processes which funnel certain types of men into prison and screen others out, a brief discussion of the criminal justice system's differential impact on different segments of society is necessary. How these "recruitment effects" influence the political culture of the prison will then be examined.

Few studies have attempted to measure the distribution of criminal behavior across the general population of this country. One such study, cited in the Report of the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice in 1968, produced startling results. Based on a random sample of 1,020 males, over 90% admitted committing one or more offenses for which they could be punished by incarceration.[2]

If this figure approximates the actual one, the vast majority of criminals are never apprehended for their crimes. This is the first and most effective gatekeeping device in terms of prison recruitment. Its effects are far from random. The bulk of the criminal justice system's resources are devoted to fighting robbery, homicide, burglary, and other "street crimes," those typically committed by the poor, the young, the uneducated and the ghetto dweller. Such crimes are normally given higher priority than "white collar crimes" such as embezzlement and fraud. Street crimes are also more visible than white collar crimes, and those committing them are more likely, due to demographic characteristics, to arouse suspicion among police.[3]

Traditional law enforcement policies, therefore, are less likely to result in the apprehension and arrest of wealthier offenders, because their crimes cause less public anxiety, receive less attention by the law enforcement agencies, and are harder to detect than street crimes. Thus, those arrested for alleged criminal offenses tend to be a considerably disadvantaged population on a host of socio-economic indicators than the general criminal population.

The determination of guilt or innocence, either by trial, dismissal, or the entering of a guilty plea, further skews the ranks of "eligible" prisoners. Here again the impact of this screening process varies according to the socio-economic attributes of the defendant. Disadvantaged persons are not only more likely to be brought into the criminal justice system, such individuals also have few of the resources available to middle or upper class defendants: money or property-owning friends to cover bail and retain private counsel, character witnesses, "community standing," or the verbal and social skills which can aid their own defense.

Consequently, lower class defendants more often remain in custody for the duration of the adjudication process, which may take several months. In most cases they eventually enter a plea of guilty on the advice of their public defender, in hopes of minimizing their punishment.

The likelihood of criminal conviction decreases if one is able to obtain pre-trial release and/or retain private counsel.[4] Hence, one consequence of the distribution of private versus public legal assistance and the differential likelihood of pre-trial detention is to further increase the proportion of potential prisoners who come from the lower range of the social spectrum.

The majority of those charged with serious offenses are ultimately found guilty of some crime, however. This stage of the screening process exerts a relatively small recruitment effect compared to sentencing procedures after conviction. Crimes

typically committed by the relatively successful are generally
not punished by confinement.[5] Such offenses are in fact not
always punished by criminal or even judicial sanctions at all.
According to Lawrence Zeitlin, the most common punishment for
embezzlement is simply being fired, and the most common sanction
for tax fraud is a fine levied by the Internal Revenue Service.[6]

Only rarely does the white-collar criminal go to prison for
his offense. Prison inmates in America tend, finally, to be over-
whelmingly poor and uneducated. Forty-one percent of the general
labor force hold white-collar jobs, compared to 14% of the na-
tion's prisoners. Forty-five percent of the general population
are high school graduates, as against 18% of the prison popula-
tion.[7]

Sentencing patterns are further influenced by such factors
as prior criminal record and weak community ties. The pre-
sentence probation report which is prepared for examination by
the sentencing magistrate will more often recommend a prison
sentence if there is a record of previous incarceration or other
indications of poor integration into the non-criminal community,
e.g., unstable job history, no fixed residence, broken mar-
riages.[8] Once having done time in prison, jail or Youth Author-
ity camps, a convict faces a far greater chance of being punished
by more incarceration for future crimes. Prisoners are an in-bred
population, which makes them unrepresentative even of the young,
single, low socio-economic subgroup of the general population.

Sentencing criteria, therefore, have two effects: rein-
forcing the biases of earlier stages in the recruitment process

and adding an additional one. The two characteristics which most glaringly distinguish prisoners from non-prisoners are their marginal socio-economic status and their records of prior confinement in penal institutions.

Technically, the only requirement which a man must meet to be sent to prison is that he be convicted of a felony. In practice the man who goes to prison tends to be a young, poor, inner-city dweller with limited educational and occupational skills, a history of personal instability and weak bonds to non-criminal institutions, and a prior criminal record which dates back to early youth. Consequently, his chances of being a minority group member are disproportionately large. Two questions arise regarding these recruitment effects. First, what is the effect on inmate political predispositions as contrasted with those of society generally, and second, what is the resulting nature of the inmate political culture, i.e., the distribution and central tendencies of inmate political beliefs?

Based on the expected differences between prisoners and the general population in terms of both demographic characteristics and criminal history, there ought to be considerable contrasts between the political predispositions of the two groups. In the next section we will examine the hypothesis that the criminal background attributes of prisoners are associated with militant political beliefs. But first, it must be established that California's prisoners are indeed a marginal socio-economic group. Evidence of their acculturation into criminal subculture is also presented.

Comparisons between the political beliefs of the inmate sample and those of a sample of non-inmates are then adduced to demonstrate the relevance of prison recruitment processes for the prison political culture. Finally, the association between indicators of inmate criminality and indicators of inmate political deviance is examined in order to assess the contribution of criminal deviance to inmate political alienation, efficacy and militancy.

We turn first to an examination of the degree to which the men in the current sample manifest symptoms of marginality which result from the processes of prison recruitment. Table 1 reports the differences between the inmate group and the non-inmates in terms of demographic attributes. As expected, there are striking differences between prisoners and controls in terms of age, racial membership, education, unemployment rates and marital status. Inmates are not unusual in their religious affiliations, however.

The effects of recruitment patterns on the socio-economic attributes of the prison population are firmly documented in the current inmate sample. No control group data on criminal history is available. However, a few descriptive statistics from the inmate sample will illustrate their extreme deviance in this regard. Of the 340 inmates sampled, 156 men, or 47%, report that they were first arrested before the age of fifteen, and nearly 80% had been arrested at least once before the age of 20. The mean number of arrests reported is seven, and more than half the men have already served at least one to two years in a correctional institution.

TABLE 1

SOCIAL BACKGROUND DIFFERENCES BETWEEN

PRISONERS AND NON-PRISONERS

	% Non-Prisoners[a] (N=963)	% Prisoners (N=340)
FORMAL EDUCATION:		
11th grade or less	23	52
12th grade - some college	54	47
Finished college	24	1
	$(X^2=53.77,\ d.f.=2, p=.001)$	
MARITAL STATUS:		
Unmarried	30	53
Married	70	47
	$(X^2=80.7, d.f.=1, p=.001)$	
RELIGION:		
Protestant	46	43
Catholic	29	29
Jewish	2	1
Other	5	11
None	17	17
	$(X^2=N.S.)$	
AGE:		
20 or Younger	4	12
21-25	11	40
26-35	22	33
Over 35	63	15
	$(X^2=268,\ d.f.=3, p=.001)$	
RACE:		
White	79[b]	51
Black	7[b]	30
Chicano	11[b]	14
UNEMPLOYMENT:	7 to 9[b]	40

(a) Source: Bay Area Survey 2, Survey Research Center, University of California, Berkeley, 1972.

(b) California Employment Division, Operations Report, Sacramento, for the period between January, 1973, and December, 1974.

But the clearest indication of the extreme contrasts between inmates and non-inmates is an index of personal experience with violence. As Table 2 indicates, the history of violence among men entering prison is truly phenomenal. Being both the perpetrator and the victim of acts of violence are, for most men sent to prison, pervasive facts of life.

Violence rates tend to be high among the marginal groups from which many prisoners are recruited: poor, young, non-whites. But personal violence is also a central feature of the criminal subculture.[9] The degree of contact with personal violence is therefore useful not simply as a reflection of the harsh world from which prisoners come, but as an index of their acculturation into a deviant life-style which sets them apart even from other social marginals. Underscoring this point is the correlation between the length of inmates' criminal records and a summated index of prior personal violence, derived from the items in Table 2 ($r=.42$, $n=270$, $p=.001$). This association remains essentially unaltered when controlling for the effects of demographic variables.

Having noted the atypical social and criminal backgrounds of the men entering California's prisons, we now focus our attention on the contrasts between their political attitudes and action preferences and those of non-inmates.

C. Political Alienation, Political Efficacy, and Political Militancy

Studies of American political culture have found, with some exceptions, that members of marginal social groups are less

TABLE 2

PERSONAL EXPERIENCE WITH VIOLENCE

	% NON-PRISONERS* (N=1230)	% PRISONERS (N=340)
When you were a child were you spanked?	93	95
	$(X^2$N.S.$)$	
Have you ever been slapped or kicked as an adult?	17	67
	$(X^2=332.48,$d.f.$=1,$p$=.001)$	
Have you ever been choked?	4	48
	$(X^2=444.44,$d.f.$=1,$p$=.001)$	
Have you ever been punched or beaten?	14	84
	$(X^2=626.9,$d.f.$=1,$p$=.001)$	
Have you ever been threatened or cut with a knife?	9	66
	$(X^2=512.98,$d.f.$=1,$p$=.001)$	
Have you ever been threatened or shot with a gun?	9	59
	$(X^2=419.71,$d.f.$=1,$p$=.001)$	
Have you ever spanked a child?	84	66
	$(X^2=54.71,$d.f.$=1,$p$=.001)$	
Have you ever slapped or kicked another person?	19	77
	$(X^2=415.69,$d.f.$=1,$p$=.001)$	
Have you ever punched or beaten another person?	9	77
	$(X^2=669.27,$d.f.$=1,$p$=.001)$	
Have you ever had to defend yourself with a gun or knife?	6	49
	$(X^2=383.07,$d.f.$=1,$p$=.001)$	

*Source: James McEvoy, III, "Political Vengeance and Political Attitudes" in Crotty, (ed) Assasinations and the Political Order, N. Y., Harper & Row, 1971, p. 312-42.

efficacious and less allegiant to regime norms than other indi-
viduals.[10] The politically trusting, competent sector of
society is the elite stratum, while those at the bottom of the
ladder are less allegiant citizens whose level of politicization
is comparatively low.

Similarly, criminologists have long worked with the assump-
tion that crime often stems from anomic social conditions.[11]
Those living in such conditions are seen as less likely to assim-
ilate regime norms and less likely to perceive legitimate means
of goal-attainment as accessible, thus enhancing the likelihood
of deviance. Studies of inmates have found them to be higher
than non-inmates on measures of powerlessness, social isolation
and normlessness.[12]

Table 3 compares inmates and non-inmates on five items
measuring political alienation. In every instance but one, non-
inmates are more than twice as likely to endorse trusting state-
ments as inmates are. Three of the five allegiant statements are
selected by a majority of non-inmates; the majority of inmates
reject all five. The California correctional system inherits a
population which enters prison already severely estranged from
the political system.

Taken alone, high alienation provides very little guidance
concerning the expected degree of political militancy among pris-
oners. As Merton and others have often pointed out, alienation
may lead to a variety of behaviors including innovation, ritual-
ism, withdrawal and rebellion.[13] The choice of response is
widely believed to depend in part on the individual's perceived

TABLE 3

POLITICAL ALIENATION AMONG INMATES AND NON-INMATES

Matched Pairs	% NON-INMATES[a] (N=141)	% INMATES (N=340)
1a. There is almost no way people like me can have an influence on the government	40	65
Undecided	9	14
b. People like me have a fair say in getting the government to do the things we care about	51	21

$(X^2=43.43, d.f.=2, p=.001)$

	% NON-INMATES	% INMATES
2a. I am proud of many things about our government	74	31
Undecided	14	12
b. I can't find much in our government to be proud of	12	57

$(X^2=89.91, d.f.=2, p=.001)$

	% NON-INMATES	% INMATES
3a. Our government leaders usually tell us the truth	44	13
Undecided	18	18
b. Most of what the government leaders say can't be believed	39	69

$(X^2=63.98, d.f.=2, p=.001)$

	% NON-INMATES	% INMATES
4a. The way this country is going I often feel that I really don't belong here	4	33
Undecided	5	18
b. Although our country may be facing difficult times, I still feel it's a good place and that I really belong here	91	49

$(X^2=73.77, d.f.=2, p=.001)$

	% NON-INMATES	% INMATES
5a. The way our government works almost every group has a say in running things	37	14
Undecided	19	12
b. This country is really run by a small handful of men at the top who only speak for a few special groups	45	74

$(X^2=39.49, d.f.=2, p=.001)$

(a) Source: Quality of Life Survey, Survey Research Center, University of California, Berkeley, 1974.

sense of political competence or efficacy. Recent studies of contemporary American protesters, for example, have found alienation and efficacy to interact in a way which greatly increases the likelihood of militant behavior.[14]

Table 4 displays the subjective political effectiveness of incoming prisoners and a control group. Surprisingly on only one of the four items do inmates differ reliably from the general population. In other words, despite the extremely disadvantaged character of prison-bound criminals, their perceived political competence is more similar to that of non-inmates than their degree of alienation. Prison recruits men who are far more alienated but only slightly less politically efficacious than the non-inmate population.

But the political efficacy questions in Table 4 do not tap the attitudes of inmates towards the part of the political system with which they have had the most extensive opportunities to test out their perceptions of competence, this is, the criminal justice system. Their criminal histories display numerous interactions with rule-enforcement and adjudicative political institutions. It is of special importance to know whether these contacts have had any influence on their level of efficacy. Learning theory suggests that the frequent and unsuccessful nature of their dealings with the legal system would have a deleterious effect on their expectations of satisfactory outcomes.

Prisoners in the current sample do indeed distinguish between their capabilities in two areas of behavior: political

TABLE 4

POLITICAL EFFECTIVENESS AMONG INMATES AND NON-INMATES

HOW GOOD ARE YOUR CHANCES TO:	% NON PRISONERS[b] (N=141)	% PRISONERS (N=340)
Persuade your friends to go to a political meeting:		
Good Chance	26	25
Fair Chance	39	30
Poor Chance	33	38
	$(X^2=N.S.)$	
Help start a new political group or party:		
Good Chance	10	13
Fair Chance	10	23
Poor Chance	59	54
	$(X^2=N.S.)$	
Find a way to report a public official who doesn't do his duty:		
Good Chance	35	27
Fair Chance	32	28
Poor Chance	24	34
	$(X^2=5.83, d.f.=2, p=.10)$	
Convince your family or friends to vote for a party or candidate:		
Good Chance	42	25
Fair Chance	36	36
Poor Chance	18	26
	$(X^2=11.52, d.f.=2, p=.01)$	

(a) Undecided responses omitted

(b) Source: Quality of Life Survey
Survey Research Center
University of California, Berkeley, 1974.

acts such as those described in Table 4, and the handling of legal problems. Table 5 compares prisoners and non-prisoners on four questions which concern respondents' perceived competence vis-a-vis legal problems.[15] The differences between the two groups are large and in the expected direction. Between 20% and 35% more prisoners feel that they have little chance of being effective in these situations.

The most straightforward explanation for the distinction between inmate efficacy in these two areas of endeavor is that unsuccessful experiences with criminal justice agents teach prisoners to be skeptical of receiving fair treatment in the future. Casper's research on the effects of prior unfavorable judicial outcomes on defendants' perceptions of lawyers and judges supports this interpretation.[16] Later in this report evidence pertaining to the relationship between criminal history and legal efficacy among the inmate sample is presented.

It is noteworthy that the low level of inmate efficacy in the area where their contacts with government are most salient does not greatly depress their relative degree of competence in the larger political sense. There is a modest correlation between efficacy scores in these two areas ($r=.24, n=238, p=.001$). But their efficacy relative to that of non-inmates suggests that incoming prisoners as a group do not generalize from their pessimism regarding the criminal justice system to a broader feeling of political incompetence.

Let us summarize what has been established thus far. Contemporary prisoners in California are a marginal, disadvantaged

TABLE 5

LEGAL EFFECTIVENESS AMONG INMATES AND NON-INMATES[a]

HOW GOOD ARE YOUR CHANCES TO:	% NON PRISONERS[b] (N=141)	% PRISONERS (N=340)
Cut through red tape to get a public official to take care of your problem:		
Good Chance	10	8
Fair Chance	28	11
Poor Chance	55	75
	$(x^2=24.22, d.f.=2, p=.001)$	
Find a lawyer to help you if you get into trouble:		
Good Chance	73	39
Fair Chance	19	26
Poor Chance	7	34
	$(x^2=49.77, d.f.=2, p=.001)$	
Protect your rights in court if you are accused of a crime:		
Good Chance	43	22
Fair Chance	37	24
Poor Chance	14	50
	$(x^2=53.32, d.f.=2, p=.001)$	
Protect your rights against unfair actions by the police:		
Good Chance	36	15
Fair Chance	33	16
Poor Chance	25	67
	$(x^2=69.06, d.f.=2, p=.001)$	

(a) Undecided responses omitted

(b) Source: Quality of Life Survey
             Survey Research Center
             University of California, Berkeley, 1974.

population by a variety of measures. They also differ from the general population, and presumably from non-inmates with similar demographic characteristics, in their degree of contact with police, courts, correctional institutions and personal violence.

Politically, prisoners are generally unsupportive of established institutions. They are prone to deny assertions of the government's virtues and to affirm its faults. Finally, they have serious doubts about their chances of securing legal help and protecting their legal rights. And yet their perceived capabilities in other forms of political involvement do not differ from those of the general California population.

We turn now to the question of how and to what extent prison inmates choose to relate to the political system. Both their political self-descriptions and their political action preferences are used as evidence.

There is disagreement about the political potential of marginal men in mass society. No one disputes the relatively anomic nature of their existence, and their degree of alienation comes as no surprise. But conservatives and radicals draw different conclusions about the political implications of lower-class alienation. In Merton's terms, the conservative views marginal men as withdrawn or ritualistic, while the radical sees him as at least potentially rebellious. Lewis Lipsitz' distinction between "Burkean" and "Marxist" interpretations of lower class political culture provides a good synopsis:

> "In the Marxist vision, ordinary
> people are capable not only of under-
> standing social conditions, but at the

> appropriate time, of participating in
> altering them decisively. If, for a
> time, most men are silent, this is be-
> cause they have grown numb to the pinch-
> ing of their shoes and cannot imagine
> any better fit....
>   Burke's analysis would lead us to
> believe that most men will lack broad
> political ideas except customary
> 'prejudices'...Their knowledge will
> be limited to their own little 'pla-
> toon' and their interest will be
> similarly limited."(17)

These divergent interpretations of "ordinary" men parallel
in close fashion the split between radical and conservative anal-
yses of the inmate political culture. According to the former
view, many prisoners are developing a new and higher level of
politicization. Systematic contradictions in the political
economy are awakening prisoners and other social marginals from
their past lethargy to their true political consciousness.

The opposing view sees the vast majority of the prison popu-
lation as still not politically involved in a genuine way. Rather,
the seemingly political expressions of contemporary prisoners are
regarded as a temporary aberration, an expressive release of non-
political "prejudices" which have been exploited by radicals,
largely outside prison walls.

The question, then, is not whether we should expect to find
high alienation among prisoners, but whether we should also ex-
pect evidence of political activism or political apathy. The
Marxist looks for revolutionaries, the Burkean seeks loyalists.
Neither view has yet been confirmed or denied here.

Neither side in this quarrel expects, given inmates' margin-
ality, criminal background and high alienation, that they will be

especially active in conventional political activities such as voting, lobbying and regular party work. But studies of radical protest have often described participants as being weakly tied to community norms and institutions.[18] Moreover, the violent subculture from which most prisoners come could make them less reluctant to resort to violence as a political tactic.

Conversely, however, prisoners may lack sufficient political interest and awareness to engender political participation. Their violent proclivities and poor social integration may, in short, be irrelevant to politics.

We begin our examination of the political predispositions of prisoners by comparing them with non-inmate controls on measures of political identification. Subsequently, we will examine their degree of past political participation and support for alternative political tactics. Two questions will be asked of the data: 1) Are prisoners more or less militant than the general population and, 2) Are prisoners as a group generally militant or generally acquiescent?

Inmates were asked to describe themselves in terms of party identification and to locate themselves on a left-right political continuum. It is to be expected that prisoners would identify less strongly than other people with legitimate social institutions such as the two major parties, especially the Republican party. This is based upon their marginal social position, subcultural involvement and lack of political trust. Two conflicting predictions exist regarding self-locations on the left-right continuum. Those who see prisoners as politicized will expect a high

proportion of radical responses, while proponents of inmate acquiescence would predict above average numbers of moderate and/ or undecided responses.

Table 6 presents the distribution of inmate and control-group responses on both political self-description measures. The expectation concerning party identification is clearly confirmed; fewer inmates than non-inmates label themselves as Republicans or Democrats, with most of the difference made up in the "undecided" category. Whatever inmate political preferences may be, they are not as likely to be tied to the established political parties as is the case generally.

The more interesting findings involve their ideological as opposed to partisan identifications. Here both Burke and Marx receive some support. On the one hand, prisoners are more apt than controls to describe themselves as radical, and less apt to place themselves in the moderate-to-conservative range, thus supporting the radical argument. On the other hand, inmates are nearly three times as likely to be unsure where they fall on the continuum, suggesting a relatively high degree of political a-pathy in prison.

In general, then, prisoners are less certain of their polit-ical identifications than most people, both in partisan and ideological terms. Furthermore, the majority of inmates describe themselves as politically conventional. Fifty-one percent think of themselves as belonging to one of the two major parties, and two out of three fall within the liberal-conservative ideological range. But among prisoners who are able to describe themselves

TABLE 6

POLITICAL SELF-IDENTIFICATION

DO YOU USUALLY THINK OF YOURSELF AS A REPUBLICAN, A DEMOCRAT, AN INDEPENDENT, OR WHAT?	% NON PRISONERS[a] (N=963)	% PRISONERS (N=340)
Republican	21	11
Democrat	52	40
Other	4	7
Independent	22	24
Undecided	1	18

$(x^2=154.59, d.f.=4, p=.001)$

IN POLITICS, DO YOU USUALLY THINK OF YOURSELF AS A RADICAL, A LIBERAL, A CONSERVATIVE, A STRONG CONSERVATIVE OR WOULD YOU CALL YOURSELF MIDDLE-OF-THE-ROAD?		
Radical	3	11
Liberal	24	23
Middle-of-the-Road	41	29
Conservative	20	12
Strong Conservative	2	4
Undecided	8	21

$(x^2=81.06, d.f.=4, p=.001)$ [b]

(a) Source: Bay Area Survey 2, University of California, Berkeley, 1972.

(b) Conservative and Strong Conservative categories combined.

in simple ideological terms, radicals constitute a significantly
higher proportion than is found on the outside.

So far we have still not been able to provide unambiguous
support for either the Burkean or the Marxist view of inmate po-
liticization. Relative to the general population prisoners emerge
as both more apathetic and more radical. In order to clarify the
nature of inmate political preferences we must turn to the evi-
dence concerning their reported patterns of prior political be-
havior. Lack of clear political identification does not neces-
sarily preclude activism, nor does a clear political self-concept
guarantee it.

Prisoners were asked to report the frequency with which they
had engaged in a variety of political acts, ranging from writing
letters to participation in violent protests. Tables 7a and 7b
compare their responses with those of a sample from the general
population. The results are striking. As expected in all areas
of conventional political involvement (7a), prisoners score lower
than the controls, although the differences are significant on
only two of the five items. With the exception of signing peti-
tions, none of these forms of political behavior have been engaged
in by most of the inmate sample.

In terms of militant political acts, however, the picture is
quite different (7b). Inmates report significantly higher rates
of participation in all such activities. Approximately 20% more
inmates than non-inmates have engaged in each form of militant
political activity.

TABLE 7a

PRIOR POLITICAL PARTICIPATION AMONG INMATES AND NON-INMATES

HAVE YOU EVER DONE ANY OF THE FOLLOWING THINGS:	% NON-INMATES[a] (N=141)	% INMATES (N=340)
Written a letter to a news-paper or magazine about some political issue:		
Never	74	80
Once or twice	23	17
Often	3	3

$$(X^2=N.S.)$$

Signed a petition about some political issue:		
Never	19	38
Once or twice	54	51
Often	27	11

$$(X^2=17.04, d.f.=2, p=.01)$$

Worked with others in your area to try to solve some local problem:		
Never	44	48
Once or twice	43	46
Often	12	16

$$(X^2=N.S.)$$

Gone to a meeting or your city or town council:		
Never	54	70
Once or twice	37	23
Often	9	7

$$(X^2=11.5, d.f.=2, p=.01)$$

Gone to see some government official in person about a problem:		
Never	71	79
Once or twice	25	20
Often	4	1

$$(X^2=N.S.)$$

(a) Source: Quality of Life Survey, Survey Research Center, University of California, Berkeley, 1973.

TABLE 7b

PRIOR POLITICAL PARTICIPATION AMONG INMATES AND NON-INMATES

HAVE YOU EVER DONE ANY OF THE FOLLOWING THINGS:	% NON-INMATES	% INMATES
Gone to a protest march:		
Never	82	58
Once or twice	12	32
Often	6	10

$$(X^2=25.71, d.f.=1, p=.001)$$

Gone to a sit-in:		
Never	96	72
Once or twice	4	21
Often	0	7

$$(X^2=35.1, d.f.=1, p=.001)^{(b)}$$

Gone to a peaceful rally or demonstration:		
Never	76	48
Once or twice	18	43
Often	6	9

$$(X^2=32.35, d.f.=1, p=.001)^{(b)}$$

Picketed or taken part in a boycott over some political issue:		
Never	83	71
Once or twice	16	23
Often	1	6

$$(X^2=6.55, d.f.=1, p=.02)^{(b)}$$

Gone to a protest that turned violent:		
Never	94	77
Once or twice	5	21
Often	1	3

$$(X^2=19.7, d.f.=1, p=.001)^{(b)}$$

(b) Due to small frequencies, "Often" and "Once or twice" categories were combined for Chi Square analysis.

Thus, with respect to the degree of politicization among inmates, the evidence supports the view that prisons recruit a disproportionate number of actively militant men. By the same token, however, it is clear that militants do not comprise the bulk of the prison population. Only in the case of peaceful demonstrations do a majority of prisoners (52%) report ever having taken part. For most inmates political participation of any sort is infrequent.

Additional support for the view that the prison population is unusually militant but predominantly acquiescent may be derived from their evaluations of alternative forms of political behavior. Given the nature of prior political activity among prisoners, we should find them more willing than non-inmates to approve militant behavior. We should also find, however, that the majority of inmates do not endorse such behavior.

Table 8 shows that when asked to approve or disapprove a series of unconventional political acts, inmates do not differ from the general population in their evaluations of peaceful demonstrations or boycotts and picketing, but are clearly more favorably disposed towards sit-ins, violent protests and especially civil disobedience. Given their manifest willingness to violate laws generally, it is no surprise that this last tactic would have a particularly strong appeal to members of the convict subculture.

Table 9 presents data on questions in which respondents were asked to choose between two alternative political solutions, one militant and one conventional. In every case, inmates are

TABLE 8

APPROVAL OF PROTEST POLITICS AMONG INMATES AND NON-INMATES

WHAT IS YOUR OPINION OF:	% NON-INMATES[a] (N=141)	% INMATES (N=340)
Peaceful demonstrations (marches, rallies, etc.):		
Often justified	45	45
Sometimes justified	47	42
Never justified	7	13
	$(x^2$=N.S.)	
Boycotts and picketing:		
Often justified	32	36
Sometimes justified	57	49
Never justified	11	16
	$(x^2$=N.S.)	
Illegal but peaceful protests (such as sit-ins):		
Often justified	16	23
Sometimes justified	37	46
Never justified	47	31
	$(x^2$=10.3,d.f.=2,p=.01)	
Violating laws which you feel are unjust:		
Often justified	4	19
Sometimes justified	37	46
Never justified	57	49
	$(x^2$=70.06,d.f.=2,p=.001)	
Violent protests:		
Often justified	3	8
Sometimes justified	12	19
Never justified	86	72
	$(x^2$=26.29,d.f.=1,p=.001)[b]	

(a) Source: Quality of Life Survey, Survey Research Center, University of California, Berkeley, 1973.

(b) Due to small frequencies, responses collapsed to "Justified/ Not justified."

TABLE 9

REJECTION OF NON-VIOLENT POLITICAL TACTICS
AMONG INMATES AND NON-INMATES

Matched Pairs	% NON PRISONERS[a] (N=141)	% PRISONERS (N=340)
The best way to bring about changes in society is by:		
Demonstrating in the streets	2	25
Undecided	15	22
The election process	83	53
	$(x^2=45.31,d.f.=2,p=.001)$	
The best way to bring about changes in society is to:		
Talk things over	85	51
Undecided	9	13
Shake up the system	6	36
	$(x^2=54.88,d.f.=2,p=.001)$	
The best way to solve America's problems is to:		
Overturn the whole society	3	21
Undecided	7	16
Work within the system	90	63
	$(x^2=37.21,d.f.=2,p=.001)$	
In trying to make improvements in America, the use of violence:		
Is probably necessary	4	26
Undecided	8	12
Does more harm than good	88	62
	$(x^2=35.32, d.f.=2,p=.001)$	

(a) Source: Quality of Life Survey, Survey Research Center, University of California, Berkeley, 1974.

much more likely than non-inmates to reject the conventional solution in favor of the militant one. But, while both tables confirm the relative militancy of the prison population, they are not totally consistent with regard to the question of the prevalence of militancy among prisoners.

A majority of inmates feel that militant acts are justified at least some of the time, with the exception of violent protests, which are disapproved by a three-to-one margin. The use of confrontation-style politics is therefore not totally unappealing to most inmates if it stops short of becoming violent. On the other hand, given a choice between two alternative tactics, most prisoners prefer the conventional approach. It should also be noted that the rate of undecided responses in Table 9 is higher among inmates than among controls, which again indicates that more prisoners than non-prisoners are apolitical.

D. Criminal Deviance and Political Attitudes

The data presented here support the proposition that the processes of recruitment direct only certain types of men into prison while diverting most types away. This leads to a prison population whose political culture is unique even as they enter prison.

The final issue concerning these recruitment effects is the importance of criminal deviance as an explanatory factor for inmate political beliefs. If it is true, as Horowitz and Liebowitz argue, that political and criminal deviance are becoming increasingly interrelated, then the political differences between

inmates and non-inmates should not be solely a function of dif-

ferences in socio-economic status. Rather the non-conformist

political beliefs of inmates should also be connected with their

degree of acculturation into the criminal world.

The most striking measures of inmate social marginality are

youth, low education, low marriage rates and the high proportion

of non-whites. None of these attributes, however, bears any

substantial relationship to the two measures of criminal accul-

turation: the length of one's criminal record and the amount of

personal violence one has experienced. Therefore, the relation-

ship between criminal acculturation and political beliefs among

prisoners can be approached directly without concern for the

possible confounding effects of social marginality.

Summary measures were formed for inmate alienation, political

and legal efficacy, prior protest participation, approval of po-

litical protests, and rejection of non-violent political tactics.

For each scale, an individual's score is the summed total of his

responses to the appropriate items listed in Tables 3 through 5,

and 7b through 9 (see Appendix). Correlations between these six

political predisposition scales and the two measures of criminal

acculturation are presented in Table 10.

Inmate political beliefs and the action preferences cannot

be viewed solely as a by-product of demographic characteristics.

With the exception of the two efficacy scales, there are notice-

able associations between each measure of criminal involvement

and the political indices. Men with the strongest ties to the

criminal world are more alienated and more militant than other

TABLE 10

RELATIONSHIP[a] BETWEEN CRIMINAL ACCULTURATION AND POLITICAL
ORIENTATION OF INCOMING PRISONERS

Political Attitudes

Measure of Involve-ment in the Criminal Subculture:	Political Alienation	Political Efficacy	Legal Efficacy	Prior Protest Activities	Approval of Political Protests	Rejection of Non-Violent Political Tactic
1. Criminal Record:	.20	-.06	-.10	.19	.30	.25
	(n=271, p=.001)	(n=212, p=N.S.)	(n=243, p=N.S.)	(n=242, p=.001)	(n=187, p=.001)	(n=267, p=.001)
2. Prior Experience with Personal Violence:	.24	.01	-.13	.16	.20	.29
	(n=328, p=.001)	(n=247, p=N.S.)	(n=292, p=.01)	(n=295, p=.003)	(n=230, p=.001)	(n=325, p=.001)

(a) Pearson's r.

prisoners. The causal ordering of these relationships is not crucial to the argument here. Their deviancy in the criminal sense may have engendered a deviant political outlook, or their unorthodox political stance may have helped get them in trouble with the law. In either case, the "politicization of deviance" hypothesis is supported.

These data also shed some light on inmate efficacy in handling legal problems. The working assumption was that the cause of inmates' relatively unfavorable opinions concerning their legal effectiveness was their repeated failures in prior contacts with law enforcement agents. If such were the case, however, criminal record would show a strong negative relationship with legal efficacy, which it does not. Whatever damage is done to inmate efficacy by exposure to the criminal justice system, it is neither cumulative over repeated exposures nor generalized to other political activities. Neither political nor legal efficacy declines as the length of one's criminal record grows.

We are still left, then, with the disparity between inmates' relative level of political efficacy and their level of legal efficacy. Perhaps it is the initial impact of one's first unsuccessful encounter with the law which depresses one's legal efficacy. This would account for both the low level of inmates' legal efficacy and the independence of their legal efficacy from repeated criminal failures. The number of men in the inmate sample who have had only one such encounter is insufficient to test this proposition, however.

E. Discussion

Recruitment effects on inmate political predispositions are not limited to those associated with the high proportion of the young, single, uneducated, poor and racial minorities in prison. Rather, prisoners are a unique subset of the marginal social stratum, as evidenced by their long criminal records and violent histories. These differences between inmates and other lower-class men correspond to political differences. The correlations between criminal acculturation, alienation, and militancy among prisoners indicate that they hold political beliefs which cannot be attributed to their marginality alone.

The truth regarding the extent of inmates' militancy appears to fall somewhere between the opposing positions taken by conservative and radical observers. Neither apathy nor militancy is the norm in prison. Rather there are unusually large minorities of each type. The degree of uncertainty about political matters as well as the rate of participation in and approval of political militancy are well above the corresponding figures for non-inmates.

The presence in prisons of these two disproportionately large factions--one militant, the other acquiescent--suggests that the political culture of the prison cannot be viewed as a reflection of the outside political culture. The degree of political consensus, i.e., the sharing of a more or less common set of political assumptions, is far less in prison than in the larger society. Inmate militancy cannot be dismissed as the action of a "small handful of dissidents" in a population of predominantly allegiant prisoners. Most prisoners lack trust in the political

system, doubt their ability to get a fair shake from the criminal justice system, and are willing to give at least limited support to non-violent forms of political protest and dissent.

On the other side of the coin, contemporary prisoners cannot be described as a politically aware class. Most prisoners prefer conventional politics to confrontation politics, and have avoided participation in nearly all forms of political activities. Leaving aside the question of whether inmates are united in opposition to correctional authorities, it is plainly not the case that inmates are united by their common plight into a solidary political class in which active opposition to the government is the norm. Inmates' militancy is not spread uniformly across the prison population; it is found more frequently among those who are most involved in the criminal culture.

Finally, it needs to be stressed that, while recruitment effects are clearly at work in the prison population, the distinction between the effects of recruitment processes and the effects of incarceration on those recruited is difficult to maintain. Most incoming prisoners in California have already been incarcerated for a considerable length of time. It is consequently impossible to separate totally the effect of recruitment from the effects of confinement among the current sample.

This problem is exacerbated by the policy of diverting all but the most "hard-core" criminals away from prisons. Given the high alienation and militancy found among prisoners in this study, prison authorities have good reason to wish to avoid "contaminating" naive offenders by confining them with career criminals. On

the other hand, by restricting the prison population to the most violent and deviant men, the number of militants in prison population increases in proportion to other political types.

NOTES

1. This argument is well-made in the American Friends Service
    Committee, _Struggle for Justice_, N. Y., Hill and Wang, 1971,
    p. 23.

2. _The Challenge of Crime in a Free Society_, Report of the Pres-
    ident's Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration
    of Justice, N. Y., Avon Books, 1968, pp. 142-148.

3. Jerome Skolnick, _Justice Without Trial_, N. Y., Wiley & Sons,
    1966, pp. 42-62.

4. See, _inter alia_, Stephen Bing and S. Stephen Rosenfeld, _The
    Quality of Justice in the Lower Criminal Courts of Metropoli-
    tan Boston_, Report of the Lawyers' Committee on Law Enforce-
    ment and the Administration of Justice, Boston, 1970; Jean
    Taylor et al., "An Analysis of Defense Counsel in the Pro-
    cessing of Felony Defendants in San Diego, California",
    Denver Law Journal, (49), 1972, pp. 233-275.

5. See Table 4 in Erik Wright, _The Politics of Punishment_, N. Y.,
    Harper & Row, 1973. p. 30, for evidence of sentencing dis-
    parities at the federal level. At the state level, so few
    "white collar crimes" are punished by imprisonment that the
    California Bureau of Criminal Statistics' _Annual Report on
    Crime and Delinquency in California_ does not provide specific
    data on their incarceration rates.

6. Lawrence Zeitlin, "A Little Larceny Can Do a Lot for Employee
    Morale", _Psychology Today_, (4) June, 1971, p. 24.

7. President's Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administra-
    tion of Justice, _Task Force Report on Corrections_, Wash.,
    D. C., U. S. Government Printing Office, 1967, pp. 2-3.

8. See Patricia Wald, "Poverty and Criminal Justice", in Leon
    Radzinowicz and Marvin Wolfgang, (eds.), _Crime and Justice_,
    Vol. 1, N. Y., Basic Books, 1971, pp. 503-514.

9. Marvin Wolfgang and Franco Ferracuti, _The Subculture of
    Violence_, London, Tavistok, 1967, esp. pp. 150-163.

10. Angus Campbell, Gerald Gurin and Warren Miller, _The Voter
    Decides_, Evanston, Ill., Row, Peterson, 1954; Esther Battle
    and J. B. Rotter, "Children's Feelings of Personal Control
    as related to Social Class and Ethnic Groups", _Journal of
    Personality_, (31), 1963, pp. 482-490; Robert Lane, _Political
    Ideology_, N. Y., The Free Press, 1962; Phillip Converse, "The
    Nature of Belief Systems of Mass Publics", in David Apter
    (ed.), _Ideology and Discontent_, N. Y., The Free Press, 1968,
    pp. 206-261; Herbert McCloskey, "Consensus and Ideology in

American Politics", <u>The American Political Science Review</u>,
(58) June, 1964, pp. 361-383; Robert Agger et al., "Political
Cynicism: Measurement and Meaning", <u>The Journal of Politics</u>,
(23) 1961, pp. 477-506; Donald Stokes, "Popular Evaluations
of Government: An Empirical Assessment", in Harlan Cleveland
and Harold Lasswell, (eds.), <u>Ethics and Bigness: Scientific,
Academic, Religious, Political and Military</u>, N. Y., Harper,
1962, pp. 61-73; Joel Aberbach and Jack Walker, "Political
Trust and Racial Ideology", <u>The American Political Science
Review</u>, (64) 1970, pp. 1199-1219; Edgar Litt, "Political
Cynicism and Political Futility", <u>The Journal of Politics</u>,
(25) 1963, pp. 312-323; David Easton and Jack Dennis, "The
Child's Acquisition of Regime Norms: Political Efficacy",
<u>The American Political Science Review</u>, (61) 1967, pp. 25-38;
Robert White, "Motivation Reconsidered: The Concept of
Competence", <u>Psychological Review</u>, (66) 1959, pp. 297-333.

11. Robert Merton, "Continuities in the Theory of Social Structure
and Anomie", in his <u>Social Theory and Social Structure</u>, Glen-
coe, Ill., The Free Press, 1953, pp. 161-194; Richard Cloward,
"Illegitimate Means, Anomie, and Deviant Behavior", <u>American
Sociological Review</u>, (24) 1959, pp. 164-176.

12. Melvin Seeman, "Alienation and Social Learning in a Reforma-
tory", <u>American Journal of Sociology</u>, (69) 1963, pp. 240-284;
H. M. Lefcourt and G. W. Ladwig, "Alienation in Negro and
White Reformatory Inmates", <u>Journal of Social Psychology</u>,
(68) 1966, pp. 153-157.

13. Robert Merton, <u>op</u>. <u>cit</u>.

14. Nathan Caplan, "The New Ghetto Man: A Review of Recent
Empirical Studies", <u>Journal of Social Issues</u>, (26) 1970,
pp. 75-91; John Forward and Jay Williams, "Internal-External
Control and Black Militancy", <u>Journal of Social Issues</u>, (26)
1970, pp. 75-91; Jeffery Paige, "Collective Violence and the
Subculture of Subordination", unpublished PhD. Dissertation,
University of Michigan, 1968; William Gamson, "Political
Trust and Its Ramifications", in Abcarian and Soule (eds.),
<u>Social Psychology and Political Behavior</u>, Columbus, Ohio,
Charles Merrill, 1971, pp. 40-55.

15. Factor analysis confirms that these items and the items in
Table 4 form two separate dimensions.

16. See Jonathan Casper's forthcoming study of defendants'
attitudes towards the courts.

17. Lewis Lipsitz, "The Grievances of the Poor", in Phillip Green
and Sanford Levinson, (ed.) <u>Power and Community; Dissenting
Essays in Political Science</u>, N. Y., Pantheon Books, 1970,
p. 148.

18. William Kornhauser, <u>The Politics of Mass Society</u>, Glencoe,
     Ill., The Free Press, 1959, pp. 183-223; Seymor Lipset,
     <u>Political Man: The Social Bases of Politics</u>, N. Y., Double-
     day, 1960, pp. 94-130.

CHAPTER III

THE NATURE OF PRISON LIFE

A. Introduction

The political dissimilarities found in the previous chapter between inmates and non-inmates, coupled with inmates' extensive records of recidivism, raise the questions of whether and how confinement and inmate political beliefs are related. But in order to appreciate the politically relevant effects of incarceration, one must first understand the immediate nature of imprisonment from the viewpoint of those who experience it.

This chapter establishes a framework within which the connection between imprisonment and inmate political beliefs may be understood. First the literature on inmate social-zation is reviewed, and two major axes of prison life are examined in the context of data from the inmate sample. A typology of "prison styles" is then operationalized and validated as an index of inmate responses to the hardships of confinement.

I argue that such a typology is a valuable mechanism for explicating the relationship between imprisonment and inmate political culture because it enhances both longitudinal and cross-sectional analyses of the varied effects of incarceration. The typology also helps counteract the analytical difficulties stemming from the paucity of first-timers in the inmate sample, for it reveals the nature of inmate acculturation into the convict world better than does absolute length of confinement.

B. The Inmate Society.

Prior to 1940, no systematic scholarly analysis of prison life had yet been made. Since then, however, a considerable body

of theoretical and empirical material has appeared. Beginning

with The Prison Community, by Donald Clemmer,[1] this literature

has been consistent in its emphasis on the informal social

organization among inmates.

Most discussions of inmate society begin with a treatment

of the hardships of incarceration. At least three general cate-

gories of deprivations have been posited as influencing inmate

attitudes and behavior: physical, psychological, and sociological.

Physical deprivations include those resulting from confinement,

the scarcity of material goods, and the danger of violence. The

prisoner is constantly made aware of his lack of freedom:

> "Freedom is the only meaningful
> thing to a human. Without freedom,
> things lose meaning... The indeter-
> minate sentence gives the authorities
> tremendous control over a man's free-
> dom: you are at their mercy and are
> really impotent to do anything about
> it."[2]

The second category of deprivations encompasses "psychic

distresses associated with the absence of any means of establishing

or maintaining a positive self-image."[3] Goffman's[4] discussion

of the effects of institutional mortification on inmate behavior

graphically portrays the deterioration of self-esteem. A con-

vict at San Quentin expresses it thus:

> "I think that there is a need for
> punishment in society, but not this, not
> years and years behind bars. And not
> being treated like dirt. A man is
> still a man, whatever he done to get
> locked up. This place is righteously
> unjust. After a while it doesn't
> matter what you did; this is unjust."[5]

Finally, there are deprivations associated with inmates'
prolonged status as subordinates in a severely hierarchical social
structure. Interactions between custodians and inmates are domi-
nated by the caste-like role system and patterns of authority.
Confinement implies constant dependence upon others and constant
awareness of inferior status.

> "The worst thing here is the way your
> life is regulated, always regulated, day
> in and day out. They tell you what to do
> almost every moment of the day. You be-
> come a robot just following instructions."[6]

Beyond cataloging the deprivations, degradations, and sub-
ordination of inmate existence, most analyses of the prison also
share a concern with the nature of the social environment inside
prison walls. Despite the number and diversity of prison set-
tings, observers find a remarkable similarity among inmate social
systems at different prisons.

There is disagreement over whether the roots of the inmate
society are indigenous to the prison,[7] or grow from the outside
criminal subculture.[8] Most analysts agree, however, on the
normative tension existing within the inmate society. Every in-
mate faces enormous cross-pressures in prison. On the one hand,
he is under the strong expectation from his peers that he support
the interests and values of their sub-culture. Sykes and
Messinger classify the chief tenets of the "inmate code" into
five categories:

> "1) Do not interfere with inmate interests...
> 2) Refrain from quarrels or arguments with
>   fellow prisoners...
> 3) Do not exploit or betray fellow prisoners...

> 4) Do not weaken in the face of threats
>   or frustrations...
> 5) Do not accord prestige or respect to
>   the prison staff or the world for
>   which they stand."(9)

Within the inmate society, the social pressure to conform to these norms is strong. Sanctions for violations of the code range from ostracism to "catching cold" (getting killed).

On the other hand, the inmate is under a potentially greater pressure to accept the definitions and expectations placed on him by the correctional authorities. These have been summarized by Johan Galtung[10] as follows:

> "1) You shall recognize that you are
>   guilty!
> 2) You shall recognize that it was
>   correct to take you out of your
>   social context and imprison you!
> 3) You shall perceive your status as
>   a criminal as undesirable!
> 4) You shall do your best to 'pull
>   yourself together'!
> 5) You shall perceive your stay in
>   prison and the services offered as
>   a means to rehabilitation, and
>   utilize the possibilities maximally!
> 6) You shall obey the prison regulations!"

The obvious incompatibility of staff norms with those of the inmate code has fostered interest in the socialization processes affecting prison inmates. The most common measure of inmate socialization is "prisonization", which is defined by Clemmer as "the taking on, in greater or lesser degree, of the folkways, mores, customs and general culture of the penitentiary."[11]

Prisonization is a term used to sum up the consequences of exposure to prison. It is ordinarily treated as a unidimensional concept, i.e., inmates who adhere strongly to the inmate code are

viewed as strongest in their opposition to staff norms, and vice versa.

If there is a relationship between inmate adjustments to prison and their political beliefs, prisonization suggests itself as a useful concept. To the extent that prisonization reflects inmates' degree of acculturation into a world where opposition to conventional values and solidarity with other convicts are paramount, one might posit an association between prisonization and political militancy.

Our first task, however, is to examine the prisonization concept as it applies to the California inmate sample. Once an adequate index of prison socialization has been derived, the interplay of prison-related attitudes and political attitudes can be explored.

The inmates in the current sample were asked a variety of questions about prison life. Included were questions which tap feelings of mutual solidarity (i.e., one's respect for and identification with other prisoners). Another group of questions measures inmate hostility towards correctional officials (including distrust of guards and the Adult Authority, and negative attitudes towards prison programs). In other words, these two attitude clusters represent inmates' affective orientations towards the two reference points of the prisonization dimension, as it is usually conceptualized: fellow prisoners on the one hand, and prison authorities on the other.

According to prior studies,[12] prisonization tends to increase during the initial phase of confinement. We expect to

find within the inmate sample, therefore, an increase between observations in both inmate solidarity and opposition to correctional authorities. Table 1 compares the mean scores of inmates before and during their prison sentences on two summated scales, one comprising responses to the inmate solidarity items, and the other comprising responses to items dealing with hostility towards prison officials (see Appendix).

During the period which elapses between observations, there occurs a mixed pattern of change in the affective orientations of the entire inmate sample. As expected, there is a net increase in hostility towards prison programs and officials. The difference between the mean levels of resentment before and after their transfer demonstrates that more prisoners come to view their captors with a jaundiced eye as time in prison passes. Almost half of the most resentful incoming prisoners remain so during the succeeding months. Among more deferent inmates only 28% are unaffected by imprisonment.

Respect for one's fellow inmates also shows a net rise samplewide, but fluctuates less than feelings about prison administrators and programs. The increase in inmate solidarity does not attain the .05 confidence level. In other words, for the sample as a whole, the predicted change in inmate prisonization is confirmed in terms of growing resentment of prison officials, but not with regard to increased inmate solidarity. Different inmate subgroups, however, are more susceptible to prison socialization than others. These subgroup differences are summarized in Table 2.

TABLE 1

CHANGE IN INMATE SOLIDARITY AND RESENTMENT OF CORRECTIONAL AUTHORITIES DURING INCARCERATION

MEAN CHANGE

	$\bar{X}_1$	$\bar{X}_2$	T Value	D.F.	Significance
Resentment of Correctional Authorities	2.57	2.82	3.15	234	.002
Inmate Solidarity	1.91	1.99	1.32	235	.19

TURNOVER TABLES

First Observation

		%Low	2	3	High	Total%
	Second Observation % Low	8	15	6	1	7
Resentment of Correctional Authorities	2	49	40	35	10	32
	3	27	21	38	41	32
	High	15	25	21	48	29
	Collumn %	100	100	100	100	N=235
	Total %	25	23	22	30	100

First Observation

		%Low	2	High	Total%
	Second Observation % Low	49	29	17	33
Inmate Solidarity	2	40	37	27	35
	High	11	34	56	32
	Collumn %	100	100	100	N=236
	Total %	36	37	27	100

The clearest differences are those between blacks and other inmates. Among whites and chicanos there is no growth in hostility towards prison officials or in solidarity with other prisoners. Black prisoners manifest an increase in both of these areas.

There is little doubt, therefore, that racial membership exerts an important influence on the changing attitudes of prisoners. The growing hostility and solidarity of blacks is consistent with claims that the granting of privileges and the handling of disciplinary proceedings are contaminated by racial prejudice among prison officials. A white prisoner interviewed by Erik Wright attests to the unequal treatment of black and white rule violators at San Quentin:

> "The black prisoners are definitely
> hit harder than the white prisoners for
> the same offense. A guard will give a
> white prisoner a warning for something
> but will send a black prisoner to the
> hole for the same offense. It happens
> all the time."(13)

If inmates believe there is racial variation in the official rewards and punishments accorded them, it could account for the contrasts in attitude change among blacks and non-blacks. Blacks in the California sample appear to perceive fewer justifications than other inmates for orienting their behavior in accordance with staff expectations, and greater incentives for developing solidarity with their peers.

In addition to racial effects, age and prison climate also modify the impact of confinement on inmate attitudes. Resentment of officials grows most rapidly among men under the age of 21, and among men first arrested before the age of 15. It appears

TABLE 2

TURNOVER IN RESENTMENT OF OFFICIALS AND RESPECT
FOR INMATES BY SOCIAL AND CRIMINAL
BACKGROUND CHARACTERISTICS

			$\bar{X}_1$	$\bar{X}_2$	T	D.F.	Prob.
RACE							
	Whites	Resentment	5.75	5.79	.35	125	NS
		Respect	6.99	6.87	-.36	130	NS
	Blacks	Resentment	5.49	5.99	3.01	65	.004
		Respect	6.61	6.86	1.69	61	.05
	Chicanos	Resentment	5.94	5.94	0	31	NS
		Respect	6.52	6.52	0	32	NS
AGE							
	20 or younger	Resentment	5.63	6.19	2.07	26	.025
		Respect	6.43	6.71	1.35	27	NS
	21 to 25	Resentment	5.93	5.98	.33	90	NS
		Respect	6.71	6.78	.53	90	NS
	26 to 35	Resentment	5.65	5.76	.72	73	NS
		Respect	6.93	6.89	-.35	73	NS
	Over 35	Resentment	5.19	5.49	1.45	36	NS
		Respect	6.84	6.95	.60	37	NS
AGE AT FIRST ARREST							
	Under 15	Resentment	5.88	6.09	1.74	109	.05
		Respect	6.83	6.84	.08	106	NS
	15 to 20	Resentment	5.62	5.75	.80	67	NS
		Respect	6.76	6.81	.32	71	NS
	Over 20	Resentment	5.32	5.49	.89	46	NS
		Respect	6.69	6.90	1.15	47	NS
PERCEIVED DEPRIVATIONAL LEVEL OF PRISON							
	Above Average	Resentment	5.49	5.68	1.48	96	NS
		Respect	6.71	6.94	2.05	101	.04
	Average	Resentment	6.02	5.98	-.22	46	NS
		Respect	6.85	6.93	.44	45	NS
	Below Average	Resentment	5.71	5.95	1.60	90	NS
		Respect	6.78	6.61	1.38	87	NS

that not simply one's current age but also maturity at the beginning of one's criminal career serve to insulate men from the effects of confinement. Older men and men whose troubles with the law began later in life do not show the volatile reaction to incarceration which typifies less mature prisoners. As with the sample as a whole, however, inmate solidarity does not increase among any age group.

Surprisingly, men who feel they have been assigned to the most deprivational prisons do not undergo noticeable change on either attitude scale. Quite to the contrary, it is the men who rate their prison as better than other California prisons who experience the most marked increase in their positive feelings towards other prisoners. Moreover, prisoners with favorable prison ratings are stronger in their absolute level of identification with other inmates than men doing harder time.

The importance of these findings is that conservation centers and minimum-security prisons are consistently viewed more favorably by their inhabitants than objectively more deprivational prisons.[14] Hence, this finding runs counter to much prior research which has found stronger inmate solidarity in the most deprivational prisons.[15] The present data indicate convincingly that in the California system inmate solidarity increases among the men who are assigned to less deprivational prisons.

In terms of resentment of prison officials, we again find a contrasting picture. Although inmates bound for above-average and below-average prisons do not differ significantly in hostility

at the first observation, after transfer the men sent to close-security prisons are more resentful than their counterparts else-where.[16] The most plausible reading of these data is that the pervasive interpersonal violence which typifies the harsher California prisons[17] mitigates against the solidarity of prisoners. In less predatory surroundings inmates are better able to develop feelings of positive identification and mutual respect.

Hostility towards correctional officials, then, behaves differently from inmate solidarity vis-a-vis prison deprivation levels. Whether inmate solidarity would grow faster in harsher prisons than in easier ones if violence rates were comparable cannot be determined from the available evidence.

The above findings demonstrate several key points about inmate socialization. First, not all offenders are equally affected by incarceration. The men most likely to become more hostile towards the policies of prison authorities are young, black offenders with early records of legal problems. Solidarity with other inmates grows most rapidly among blacks as well, but also increases among men in prisons where inmate violence is relatively uncommon.

Second, both the measure of inmate solidarity and the measure of resentment of authorities reveal useful information about inmate socialization. The former captures the effects of prison climate while the latter is more sensitive to age-related changes. Both underscore inter-racial differences.

But this brings up the third point, which is that inmates' affective orientations towards prison officials and fellow inmates

do not represent opposing poles of a single dimension. Except for
racial differences, a change in one scale is not isomorphic with
change in the other. This observation is confirmed by the lack
of a statistically significant correlation between the two measures
at either observation. Knowledge of a prisoner's degree of re-
sentment towards one major prison reference group is not a valid
indicator of his degree of identification with the other.

Prisonization, therefore, cannot be adequately described by
a single continuum of conformity with or opposition to conven-
tional norms. There are instead two dimensions which must be
considered in determining how a man reacts to confinement. Feel-
ings of solidarity with other inmates and hostility towards cor-
rectional authorities are not redundant or even related measures.
Faced with two competing normative systems, an inmate may embrace
either or both sets of expectations, or reject both.

While this argument runs counter to much of the empirical
work on prisonization, it does not represent a complete departure
from prior work on the inmate society. Indeed, it is entirely
congruent with studies of the prison subculture's role structure.
Research on role constellations among inmates utilizes inmate-
recognized behavior patterns as criteria for designation of in-
mate "types". This approach follows the conceptual framework of
Strong and Wirth, which holds that:

> "social types stand for what the members
> who live in these various social worlds
> believe to be critical and important...
> (social types) are constructs which the
> group arrives at by selecting or abstract-
> ing accentuated forms of conduct displayed

by some of its members and having specific
connotations in terms of the interests,
concerns and dispositions of the group."(18)

There is variation among inmate typologies in both labels and

exhaustiveness; some, for example, deal with a particular area of

behavior (sex, distribution of material goods, and the like).

Others look for roles which cut across several issue areas.

The best known of the major typologies is Clarence Schrag's

fourfold classification scheme of "right guys", "politicians",

"square Johns" and "outlaws".(19)   Schrag states,

> "Briefly, inmates who fall within the
> 'square John' configuration consistently
> define role requirements in terms of the
> prison's official social system. By con-
> trast, 'right guys' just as regularly
> perceive requirements according to the
> norms of prisoner society. 'Con polit-
> icians' shift their frame of reference
> from staff norms to inmate norms with
> great alacrity. 'Outlaws', deficient
> in aptitude for identification, are in
> perpetual anarchistic rebellion against
> both normative systems and against
> affective involvement in general."(20)

A residual category, "dings," consists of a heterogeneous

assortment of misfits and eccentrics who do not fall into any of

the four major categories. Schrag's typology emphasizes not a

unitary, collective inmate culture, but a system of diverse, inter-

acting roles:

> The unofficial system, contrary to
> administrative rules and regulations,
> does not demand uniformity of behavior.
> Rather, it recognizes alternative roles
> that inmates play with respect to each
> of the focal issues."(21)

Furthermore, his typology stresses the importance of the

cross-pressures stemming from competing prison reference groups.

In the restricted environment of the prison, the dominant themes

of inmate life involve answers to the inevitable question, "How

shall I do my time?" Schrag's typology explicitly states that

men's responses to the opposing expectations of staff and inmates

are the major determinants of their answer to that question.

C. The Inmate Typology

The lack of association between inmate solidarity and resent-

ment of officials which has been observed among California pris-

oners is consistent with Schrag's description of four unique

prison roles, or styles of doing time. In what follows I demon-

strate that a composite index of inmate solidarity and resentment

of officials provides a valid operational definition of Schrag's

right guys, outlaws, politicians and square Johns.

It is not the intention of this study to further imprison

the convict sample in a rigid set of analytical calls. Schrag's

typology is applied to the survey data because of its convenience

as a means of organizing the distributions of inmate attitudes in

a coherent and theoretically meaningful fashion.

It cannot be determined from the available data what propor-

tion of the inmates would be assigned to each of the four roles

on the basis of their actual behavior or the ratings of guards

and inmates. The men are assigned to roles in accordance with

their relative position along the two component attitude scales.

Each scale was dichotomized in order to obtain calls of comparable

size.[22] The resulting distribution of inmates at the first

observation is given in Table 3:

TABLE 3

RESENTMENT OF CORRECTIONAL AUTHORITIES

		High	Low	
Inmate Solidarity	High	Right Guy (32%)	Politician (32%)	64%
	Low	Outlaw (19%)	Square John (17%)	36%
		51%	49%	

In order to substantiate the validity of defining the four
roles in terms of these two measures, attributional data and in-
mate attitudes towards several facets of prison life are broken
down by the inmate typology in Tables 4 through 12. In the dis-
cussion to follow, the results of these inter-role comparisons
are presented in light of existing knowledge about each role. The
tables are found at the end of this section.

No graduations within each sub-group have been made regarding
their degree of hostility towards authorities or solidarity with
inmates, so that men who bear varying degrees of resemblance to
an ideal type are accorded the same analytical status. For an
exploratory study, however, it is desirable to include all sub-
jects in the typology. The purpose is to reveal basic trends
within the entire prison population without an elaborate classifi-
cation scheme.

It is inevitable that the contrasts among the four types are
suppressed by the selection of cut-points designed to equalize
cell size rather than to maximize the homogeneity of each cell.
The advantage of this approach is that the responses of the entire
sample can be explored, rather than just those of the most ex-
treme subjects.

The suppressive effect of marginal role adherents is partial-
ly offset, however, by examining data on men whose relative posi-
tion in the inmate society remains firm between observation. Such
men are termed "stable role incumbents" in the tables. The data
show that such men generally manifest more clearly the contrasts
in prison styles than men who waver between roles.[23]

1. <u>The Square John</u>. Some men sent to prison conceive of them-
selves as conventional, non-criminal people. Their life-style,
background and values are more conformist than deviant. Typi-
cally such men commit crimes of passion or "naive" crimes re-
sulting from great personal or social pressure.[24] Prisoners
refer to such men as "weak sisters" or "square Johns". Irwin
states that the square John "finds life in prison repugnant and
tries to isolate himself as much as possible from the convict
world."[25] Schrag terms this particular orientation "pro-
social."[26]

Square Johns feel an affinity for what they feel to be the
conventional values of society. They are generally supportive
of strong social controls, cooperate with the prison administra-
tion and submit peacefully to criminal punishment. Schrag
suggests an underlying conservatism in the square John orienta-
tion:

> "Generally, prosocial offenders are
> cultural conservators for whom the
> stability of even a somewhat repressive
> order is preferable to the uncertainties
> of social revision or experimentation."[27]

In the California inmate sample, the men who best fit this
picture are those combining low esteem for prisoners with low
resentment of prison authorities. Their criminal records are
relatively brief. They are more often married than more re-
sentful prisoners. They are also more likely to say that what
this country needs are tighter controls on people rather than
greater freedom. They are fearful that without strong laws,
most people would not behave decently, but would act like animals.

Square Johns are shunned by most prisoners. "I can't enjoy a square John's company," says one veteran convict. "A thief thinks square Johns are crazy."[28] Consequently square Johns seek out a few close friends as a buffer against the alien and unpleasant society which they encounter in prison. Prior research has found that the weaker one's acculturation into the folkways of the prison community, the stronger one's primary group attachments.[29] Square Johns in the California sample are apt to describe their friends as a close-knit group.

Conversely, they avoid involvement in the collective activities of the prison culture. According to Irwin, they keep busy with hobbies or prison programs such as drama groups.[30] They ignore much of what goes on around them. When asked about events taking place elsewhere in the correctional system, square Johns in the California sample show below-average interest. They are the only inmate group which is not predominantly unsympathetic to prison line staff. Their feeling tends to be that prison guards are only following orders, and therefore should not be the target of inmate hostility. They do not strongly approve of riots as a means of expressing inmate grievances.

Square Johns see themselves as better off than most prisoners. This again reflects their detachment from the convict identity. Men in the inmate sample were asked to evaluate their status according to several standards of reference: how their prison compares with others, how the lot of prisoners in America is changing, and how they feel they have fared relative to other prisoners and people they grew up with.[31] Square Johns

generally display less overall status inferiority in these matters than most prisoners.

The square John role is, by its very nature, not a common one among prisoners. Particularly in California, where diversionary programs are available for many naive offenders, the classic square John does not often make it to state prison. As we shall see, it is also the least adaptive of the four prison styles.

There are men in the California prison sample at both observations, however, whose relatively prosocial orientation sets them apart from the bulk of the inmate community. While few of these men are truly one-time losers, they endeavor to adapt to prison cross-pressures in a fashion typified by isolation from the inmate society, strong primary group loyalties, and a low level of status inferiority.

2. The Con Politician. Schrag contrasts the prosocial style of the square John with what he terms the "pseudosocial" perspective of the con politician.[32] Such men are not as removed from the inmate culture as square Johns; but neither are they as openly hostile towards prison authorities as many prisoners. Rather, they attempt to establish a delicate equilibrium between membership in the opposing worlds of captives and captors.

According to prior studies, their criminal careers begin relatively late in life, often after success in a "straight" job. Their crimes are more sophisticated than those of square Johns: embezzlement, fraud, and forgery are the modal offenses.[33] Men in the present sample whose attitudes towards both prison

officials and other inmates are relatively positive did not begin their criminal activities until after most prisoners. They are the oldest inmate group (mean age=31) and have below-average criminal records. As evidence of their weak social bonds, they have the highest divorce rate of the four inmate groups.

The lack of permanent reference groups is the dominant theme of their prison style. The politician is described as "a chameleon who can conform to the rules of any group but does so only as long as it is in his own best interests."[34] Compared to square Johns, they do not establish strong personal ties with other inmates. They are viewed by other convicts as unreliable. Irwin, for example, states that

> "The politician is often involved in a
> direct conspiracy where lip service is
> paid to the convict code while the
> convicts are secretly betrayed for the
> politician's personal gain."[35]

In the California sample, the politicians' degree of involvement in the collective affairs of the prison is reflected by their desire to find out about events in prisons other than their own. They express a greater interest than square Johns or outlaws, men with less favorable attitudes towards inmates. They are also more unsympathetic towards prison guards than square Johns, despite having the same low overall level of resentment towards the prison administration. This is consistent with the politicians' reputation for engaging in sub rosa activities and "working the angles" to their own advantage in prison.

Politicians in the California sample share with square Johns a relatively positive comparison level. A low level of hostility

towards authorities coincides with a low level of status inferiority among prisoners. Variations in the mean level of self-esteem across the inmate typology are significant in three of the four comparisons. Politicians have the most positive opinions of themselves in all three instances.

Moreover, there is evidence that politicians are more optimistic than all other inmate types concerning success or failure after release from prison. When asked about the kind of reaction they anticipate from people on the outside, most politicians believe that an ex-convict who stays out of trouble will be accepted by most people.

Politicians may feel that the role-playing skills which they use to present different images to different prison reference groups will also enable them to adjust successfully to the expectations of the non-inmate society.

The final indicator of the politicians' desire to get along with as many people as possible, and to avoid antagonizing any potentially useful group, is their relatively low level of ethnocentrism. Various questions were put to prisoners about Jews, foreigners, and relations between minority groups and whites. These questions do not deal directly with the kind of racial tensions which exist inside prison. However, four of these items proved upon factor analysis to fall along a single dimension of ethnocentrism, and were consequently combined into a Likert-type scale (see Appendix).

Because of the operational difficulty in posing closed-ended questions which tap the racial intolerance of blacks,

chicanos and white equally, the assumption is made that men who score higher on the general ethnocentrism scale are more likely than other men to hold antagonistic views of opposing racial groups in prison. Both before and after men in the current sample were assigned to their ultimate destination, politicians express the fewest ethnocentric beliefs of the four inmate groups.

Politicians appear to follow the advice which Sam Rayburn gave to freshman Congressmen: "If you want to get along, go along." An ex-convict echoes that advice:

> "I am capable of realizing that you
> can't win in these institutions by
> fighting them. I often marvel at some
> of the criminals who seem so intelligent
> and have such high I.Q.'s and who fight
> them all the time. They continually
> fight them from the day they enter the
> institution until the day they leave...
> I just wait and see which way the ball's
> going to bounce, here."[36]

3. The Outlaw. Outlaws are defined as inmates whose response to prison cross-pressures is to reject both sets of expectations. Like the politicians, they have attachments neither to the conventional society nor to the inmate society. But unlike the politicians, they resort to what Schrag terms an "asocial" prison style.

The outlaw has a reputation as the chief trouble-maker in prison. Other terms for such prisoners are "lowriders," "toughs," and "ball-busters." Assaults and abortive escapes abound in their records.[37] Irwin describes the outlaw role as a popular one among "state-raised youth", delinquent boys who spend much of

their lives in juvenile halls and work camps, thereby becoming

eligible for prison at an early age:

> "Many state-raised youths... do not
> tolerate the slow ascent in the prison
> social system and become 'lowriders.'
> They form small cliques and rob cells,
> hijack other convicts, carry on feuds
> with other cliques and engage in various
> rackets. Though these 'outlaws' are
> feared and hated by all other convicts,
> their orientation is towards the
> criminal world."(38)

This description appears to fit men in the California sample

whose affective orientation towards prison reference groups is

consistently negative. They are young (mean age=26), usually

single, with extensive criminal backgrounds. Their low regard for

prisoners generally leads to a greater affinity for strong primary

group affiliations than found among other highly resentful pris-

oners. They describe their friends as a closely-know group more

often than right guys do. This comports with prior findings of an

inverse relationship between primary and collective affiliations.

Their primary group ties probably differ from those of

square Johns, however. The latter reportedly use such groups to

insulate themselves from contact with the inmate society; the

former join gangs or cliques through which they attempt to exploit

other inmates. Data on inmate ethnocentrism show the outlaw as

the inmate type most intolerant of outgroups. It is reasonable

to believe, therefore, that they are more actively involved in

inter-racial disputes than other inmates, particularly politicians.

This finding is not contaminated by racial differences in

role membership or ethnocentrism. Without denying that many

salient aspects of an inmate's world are racially bounded, prison
style preferences are not affected by racial membership either
before or after transfer. Nor is any racial group substantially
more ethnocentric than the others.

Further evidence of the outlaw's low degree of involvement
in the collective affairs of the California inmate society is
their lack of interest in prison events outside their own insti-
tution. Regardless of their opinions of prison authorities, men
with a low regard for other inmates appear to have less concern
about affairs at other prisons than men who respect their peers.

A generalized sense of rejection and failure is a central
theme of the outlaw style. Their level of self-esteem is consis-
tently the lowest of the four inmate roles. Their comparison
level vis-a-vis other inmates, other prison assignments and former
acquaintences is also the most inferior. Theirs may be the anar-
chism of despair rather than of defiance, reflecting an inability
to piece together a comprehensible social world in either the
conventional or the criminal culture. The following inmate's
sense of futility is illustrative:

> "Man, it don't matter how good things
> are goin' for me. You know, I may have
> a nice little job and everything running
> along smooth and I'll fuck it up. I'll
> fuck it up somehow. I always do. Like
> some cat can come along with a nice
> little caper and take me along. We'll
> get busted. It seems like I've been
> fucking up so long that it's always
> going to be like that."(39)

4. The Right Guy. The fourth modal response to prison is that
of the "real man" or "right guy." "The right guy is the hero of

the inmate social system," Sykes and Messinger claim. "The right

guy is the base line, however idealized or infrequent in reality,

from which the inmate society takes its bearings."[40] Schrag

depicts their prison style as antisocial.[41] Here is one expres-

sion of it:

> "Frankly, I haven't got a hell of a
> lot of use for society, not when I been
> taking care of those members of your
> society- district attorneys and judges.
> I just don't dig this society, that's
> all. I can't help it, but I can't see
> it."[42]

Among California prisoners, this antisocial style is accom-

panied by the greatest opposition to strong social controls, in

sharp contrast to the authoritarian tendencies of the square

Johns. Right guys reject the notion that strong laws are needed

to regulate human behavior. They endorse the belief that the

country would be better off with a liberalization of social

control.

Like the outlaws, right guys come to prison with a long

history of crimes and punishments which begin in their early

youth. But in their response to the prison environment they are

more dependable in their dealings with other prisoners. Right

guys in the California sample are very strongly opposed to cliques

and other close primary affiliations. They get along with their

prison mates by keeping their distance. As one inmate put it,

> "If a new guy comes here and just
> settles down and minds his own business,
> nobody'll fuck with him. Everybody sees
> a guy is trying to do his own time and
> they leave him alone. Those guys that
> get messed over are usually asking for

> it. If you stay away from the low-
> riders and the punks and don't get
> into debt or snitch on somebody you
> won't have no trouble here."(43)

Likewise in his dealings with the guards, the right guy is
consistently unsympathetic. Between 75% and 80% reject the as-
sertion that prison line staff are just doing their job and should
not be held accountable for enforcing prison rules. Here is a
representative expression of their view of prison guards:

> "I have a terrific animosity towards
> the type of people they hire in these
> penitentaries. They pay them the lowest
> salary there is and get the lowest type
> labor. And they get very personal
> picking on guys and things like that,
> to debase a man."(44)

Right guys are firmly entrenched in the prison culture.
They therefore have the keenest interest in knowing what does on
at other prisons. It is likely, given their long records and high
regard for convicts, that they have many former acquaintances and
partners elsewhere in the correctional system, as is the case with
the following east coast man:

> "Now when I go back to the joint, any-
> where I go, I know some people. If I
> go to any of the jails in New York, or
> if I go to a slam in Jersey even, I
> still run into a lot of cats I know.
> It's almost like a family."(45)

Support for prison riots such as the one at Attica is also
strongest among right guys. The majority of all the California
inmates sampled express the belief that such riots are helpful in
bringing the problems of inmates to the attention of the public.
After spending several months in prison, however, right guys en-
dorse this view more than any other inmate group. The tendency

during incarceration is for hostile inmates to express slightly
stronger support for prison riots, while other inmates tend to
move to the position that riots do more harm than good.

In terms of his comparison level, the right guy does not feel
the degree of status inferiority held by the outlaws, but he does
feel more deprived than the square John and the politician. So
even though resentment of officials varies directly with status
inferiority, within the most resentful segment of the inmate popu-
lation, solidarity with one's peers is tied to more moderate
feelings of status inferiority. When asked about expected depri-
vations after release, however, right guys feel much the same as
outlaws; the majority anticipate social rejection even if they
stay out of trouble with the law.

D. Discussion

Incarceration is generally treated as a temporal phenomenon,
measured in weeks, months, and years. Implicit in such a con-
ceptualization is the assumption that the effects of confinement
are best understood by relating inmate socialization to sentence
length or stage.

Without denying the merits of such an approach, I contend
that the foregoing cross-sectional analysis of inmate role dif-
ferences also adds a great deal to our understanding of the mean-
ing of incarceration. Both cross-sectional and longitudinal
patterns, in other words, deserve attention. Schrag's typology,
as I have operationalized it, permits each to be studied.

TABLE 4

SOCIAL BACKGROUND CHARACTERISTICS BY INMATE ROLE

	Square John	Polit- ician	Outlaw	Right Guy	Signifi- cance
Mean Age					
All Incumbents:					
T_1	29.0	31.5	26.7	26.6	F=4.16,
(N)	(46)	(95)	(54)	(93)	p=.01
T_2	29.2	30.4	26.8	27.1	F=2.44,
(N)	(30)	(64)	(53)	(92)	p=NS
Stable Incumbents:					
T_1	29.7	32.7	25.8	27.3	F=3.32,
(N)	(8)	(35)	(16)	(36)	p=.05
Race					
T_1					
% White	49	58	45	61	x^2=8.16
% Black	30	32	36	21	d.f.=6
% Chicano	21	10	19	18	p=NS
(N)	(27)	(62)	(52)	(87)	
T_2					
% White	63	65	48	55	x^2=5.01,
% Black	22	23	35	32	d.f.=6,
% Chicano	15	13	17	13	p=NS
(N)	(27)	(62)	(52)	(87)	
Marital Status					
T_1					
% Single	42	31	60	48	x^2=13.40,
% Married	44	44	33	38	d.f.=6,
% Divorces	13	24	6	14	p=.05
(N)	(45)	(86)	(48)	(81)	
T_2					
% Single	46	27	54	51	x^2=10.35,
% Married	38	51	31	35	d.f.=6,
% Divorces	17	22	15	14	p=NS
(N)	(24)	(59)	(48)	(79)	

TABLE 5

CRIMINAL BACKGROUND CHARACTERISTICS BY INMATE ROLE

	GRAND Mean	Square John	Politician	Outlaw	Right Guy	Significance
Mean Criminal Record						
All Incumbents:						
T_1	6.87	6.15	6.57	7.32	7.28	F=3.52,
(N)	(238)	(40)	(77)	(47)	(74)	p=.05
T_2	6.83	6.21	6.15	6.98	7.40	F=4.53,
(N)	(204)	(24)	(54)	(48)	(78)	p=.01
Stable Incumbents:						
	7.0	4.83	6.46	7.24	7.77	F=4.36,
(N)	(82)	(6)	(28)	(17)	(31)	p=.01
Mean Personal Experience with Violence						
All Incumbents:						
T_1	14.87	14.11	14.53	15.12	15.46	F=4.27,
(N)	(275)	(47)	(88)	(52)	(88)	p=.01
T_2	14.89	13.62	14.60	15.51	15.10	F=4.12,
(N)	(224)	(26)	(60)	(51)	(87)	p=.01
Stable Incumbents:						
	14.84	12.88	14.36	15.38	15.47	F=3.74
(N)	(93)	(8)	(33)	(16)	(36)	p=.05

CONTINUED

1 OF 3

TABLE 6

INMATE PRIMARY ASSOCIATIONS BY INMATE ROLE

"My friends in prison stick together better than most people do." (% Agree)	Square John	Politician	Outlaw	Right Guy	Significance
All Incumbents:					
T_1	51	44	54	25	x^2=14.79,d.f.=3,
(N)	(42)	(90)	(52)	(87)	p=.01
T_2	67	53	51	38	x^2=8.67,d.f.=3,
(N)	(30)	(65)	(53)	(92)	p=.03
Stable Incumbents:					
T_1	75	54	59	17	x^2=16.43,d.f.=3,
(N)	(8)	(35)	(17)	(35)	p=.01
T_2	88	57	71	28	x^2=15.17,d.f.=3,
(N)	(8)	(35)	(17)	(36)	p=.01

TABLE 7

INMATE INVOLVEMENT IN THE COLLECTIVE PRISON CULTURE BY INMATE ROLE

"I take no interest in events at other prisons" (% Disagree)	Square John	Politician	Outlaw	Right Guy	Significance
All Incumbents: T_1	72	76	66	89	$x^2=11.35, d.f.=3,$
(N)	(47)	(90)	(53)	(89)	p=.01
T_2	53	88	72	92	$x^2=28.25, d.f.=3,$
(N)	(30)	(65)	(53)	(92)	p=.01
Stable Incumbents: T_1	38	77	71	92	$x^2=12.17, d.f.=3,$
(N)	(8)	(35)	(17)	(36)	p=.01
T_2	38	80	65	94	$x^2=15.69, d.f.=3,$
(N)	(8)	(35)	(17)	(36)	p=.01
"Prison guards are only following orders and cannot be blamed for what they do" (% Disagree)					
All Incumbents: T_1	50	62	59	73	$x^2=7.39, d.f.=3,$
(N)	(46)	(89)	(53)	(88)	p=.06
T_2	48	60	74	81	$x^2=15.41, d.f.=3,$
(N)	(29)	(65)	(53)	(91)	p=.01
Stable Incumbents: T_1	13	63	59	78	$x^2=12.32, d.f.=3,$
(N)	(8)	(35)	(17)	(36)	p=.01
T_2	25	54	65	83	$x^2=12.64, d.f.=3,$
(N)	(8)	(35)	(17)	(36)	p=.01

TABLE 8

APPROVAL OF PRISON RIOTS BY INMATE ROLE

"Prison riots such as the one at Attica make people listen to inmates' problems" (% Agree)		Square John	Politician	Outlaw	Right Guy	Significance
All Incumbents:						
	T_1	63	68	64	72	X^2=NS
	(N)	(31)	(63)	(36)	(68)	
	T_2	50	50	67	79	X^2=20.58,d.f.=6,
	(N)	(15)	(33)	(36)	(73)	p=.002
Stable Incumbents:						
	T_1	50	62	65	78	X^2=NS
	(N)	(8)	(34)	(17)	(36)	
	T_2	25	51	75	86	X^2=20.02,d.f.=6,
	(N)	(8)	(35)	(16)	(36)	p=.003

TABLE 9

SELF-ESTEEM AND STATUS INFERIORITY BY INMATE ROLE

	Grand Mean	Square John	Politician	Outlaw	Right Guy	Significance
Mean Self-Esteem(a)						
All Incumbents:						
T_1	17.31	17.50	17.41	16.70	17.48	F=2.18,
(N)	(276)	(44)	(90)	(53)	(89)	NS
T_2	17.47	17.28	18.03	16.57	17.67	F=5.29,
(N)	(225)	(29)	(60)	(51)	(85)	p=.01
Stable Incumbents:						
T_1	17.20	17.50	17.75	15.82	17.29	F=3.58,
(N)	(92)	(8)	(32)	(17)	(35)	p=.05
T_2	17.43	17.63	18.00	15.71	17.71	F=4.89
(N)	(91)	(8)	(32)	(17)	(34)	p=.01

(a) higher scores denote higher self-esteem

	Grand Mean	Square John	Politician	Outlaw	Right Guy	Significance
Mean Status Inferiority(b)						
All Incumbents:						
T_1	9.51	8.74	8.97	10.38	9.95	F=7.12,
(N)	(292)	(43)	(87)	(50)	(80)	p=.01
T_2	9.72	8.68	8.75	10.80	10.17	F=9.64,
(N)	(236)	(25)	(61)	(49)	(81)	p=.01
Stable Incumbents:						
T_1	9.65	8.88	8.14	11.50	10.50	F=17.24,
(N)	(93)	(8)	(35)	(16)	(34)	p=.01
T_2	9.73	8.25	8.49	11.35	10.56	F=12.77
(N)	(94)	(8)	(35)	(17)	(34)	p=.01

(b) higher scores denote greater status inferiority

TABLE 10

ANTICIPATED DEPRIVATIONS BY INMATE ROLE

"Most convicts who go straight will still be rejected by most people." (% Agree)	Square John	Politician	Outlaw	Right Guy	Significance
All Incumbents:					
T_1	51	37	66	59	$x^2=16.72$, d.f.$=6$,
(N)	(49)	(94)	(56)	(95)	p$=.01$
T_2	31	26	54	66	$x^2=32.34$, d.f.$=6$,
(N)	(29)	(65)	(52)	(92)	p$=.01$
Stable Incumbents:					
T_1	63	26	77	72	$x^2=23.71$, d.f.$=6$,
(N)	(8)	(35)	(17)	(36)	p$=.01$
T_2	25	11	69	81	$x^2=47.95$, d.f.$=6$,
(N)	(8)	(35)	(16)	(36)	p$=.01$

TABLE 11

SUPPORT FOR STRONG SOCIAL CONTROLS BY INMATE ROLE

"Without strong laws, most people would behave like animals" (% Agree)		Square John	Politician	Outlaw	Right Guy	Significance
All Incumbents:	T_1	74	54	50	31	x^2=28.80,d.f.=6,
	(N)	(49)	(94)	(56)	(95)	p=.01
	T_2	63	51	42	37	x^2=8.59,d.f.=6,
	(N)	(30)	(65)	(53)	(91)	p=NS
Stable Incumbents:	T_1	50	63	53	19	x^2=19.42,d.f.=6,
	(N)	(8)	(35)	(17)	(36)	p=.01
	T_2	75	51	41	31	x^2=7.48,d.f.=6,
	(N)	(8)	(35)	(17)	(35)	p=NS
"This country would be better off with laws that give people even more freedom than they have now." (% Agree)						
All Incumbents:	T_1	51	63	75	82	x^2=18.45,d.f.=6,
	(N)	(49)	(95)	(56)	(94)	p=.01
	T_2	63	63	81	86	x^2=20.21,d.f.=6,
	(N)	(30)	(64)	(53)	(92)	p=.01
Stable Incumbents:	T_1	50	51	65	86	x^2=11.33,d.f.=6,
	(N)	(8)	(35)	(17)	(38)	p=.08
	T_2	38	65	77	92	x^2=14.39,d.f.=6,
	(N)	(8)	(34)	(17)	(38)	p=.03

TABLE 12

MEAN ETHNOCENTRISM BY INMATE TYPOLOGY

	Grand Mean	Square John	Polit- ician	Outlaw	Right Guy	Signifi- cance
All Incumbents:						
T_1	5.15 (n=279)	5.13 (n=46)	4.96 (n=91)	5.54 (n=54)	5.13 (n=88)	F=3.20 p=.05
T_2	5.04 (n=225)	4.97 (n=29)	4.74 (n=61)	5.31 (n=51)	5.12 (n=84)	F=3.66 p=.02
Stable Incumbents:						
T_1	5.07 (n=92)	4.75 (n=8)	4.97 (n=34)	5.44 (n=16)	5.06 (n=34)	F=1.08 p=NS
T_2	4.95 (n=91)	4.63 (n=8)	4.70 (n=33)	5.12 (n=17)	5.18 (n=33)	F=1.85 p=NS

The existence of four contrasting patterns of accomodation
to prison cross-pressures has been posited by Schrag and supported
by cross-sectional data from the present group of convicted felons.
The typology can also be used in two complementary ways to reveal
the longitudinal effects of imprisonment. The first way is to
compare the marginal distributions of the four roles at each ob-
servation; the second is to compare the stability of different
initial predispositions by examining the main diagonal of the
turnover table (Table 13).

As the marginals show, net turnover is away from the square
John and politician roles and towards the right guy and outlaw
roles. Operationally, this is just another way of saying that in-
mate attitudes towards correctional authorities deteriorate over
time.

Among inmates whose role orientation changes, 38% move to the
right guy style, 28% adopt the outlaw perspective, 21% enter the
politician role and only 13% gravitate towards the square John
position. The most antisocial prison style, therefore, is nearly
three times more frequent than the most prosocial position among
men with unstable reactions to prison cross-pressures.

Within the sample as a whole, right guys and politicians
are the least likely to abandon their views about prison reference
groups. Over half the incumbents of these roles retain their
original levels of respect and resentment. The square John is
the most vulnerable role to attrition. Only one man in five who
enters prison with a relatively prosocial orientation preserves
his beliefs for more than seven months.

TABLE 13

TURNOVER IN THE INMATE TYPOLOGY

First Observation

Second Observation	(N=38) Square John	(N=67) Politician	(N=44) Outlaw	(N=69) Right Guy	Total %
Square John (N=25)	21	9	14	7	12
Polit- ician (N=60)	26	52	2	20	28
Outlaw (N=69)	26	13	39	20	23
Right Guy (N=83)	26	25	46	52	38
Total %	17	31	20	32	N=218
Collumn %	100%	100%	100%	100%	

The combined forces of increased resentment of the administration and the reward value of involvement in the inmate social system are the prime movers in inmate role turnover. Net changes occur along the resentment direction, while stability rates are tied to the respect dimension. If role stability is taken as a measure of that role's success in handling prison cross-pressures, then incoming prisoners who try to meet both sets of demands do as well as the most antisocial prisoners.

Incarceration effects, it appears, are comprised of two components, which are not necessarily interdependent. One is the tendency to acquire a more negative view of prison authorities, the other is the tendency for inmates who manifest the most positive identification with other prisoners to be less vulnerable to attitude change. Only in the case of right guys do these two phenomena interact.

These turnover data show that inmates are not unaffected by even a marginal increase in their exposure to prison. Despite widespread previous experience as convicts, many men do not immediately assume a fixed position on the key issues of life in prison. Over half the prisoners display a different perspective after transfer out of the Reception-Guidance Center from that manifested upon their arrival.

The tendency towards greater attitudinal congruence is not an important factor in accounting for the changing attitudes of prisoners. Square Johns decline more in numbers than politicians, despite the latter's inconsistant attitude configuration. Outlaws attract more inmates to their side despite their failure to

ally with either inmates or staff. Men who identify strongly and positively with their peers, however, are less apt to change their views than isolated inmates, regardless of their degree of hostility towards prison administrators and programs.

There are three advantages to using the inmate typology as a way of organizing inmate attitude patterns. First it avoids the unidimensional assumptions of many prisonization studies. This allows a richer and more thorough analysis of inmate differences.

Second, it allows incarceration to be conceptualized in two complementary fashions. Viewed as a temporal phenomenon, incarceration leads to differential patterns of migration and stability rates among the four roles. As a cross-sectional phenomenon, incarceration places inmates under cross-pressures which result in four contrasting styles of doing time. These contrasts reflect both attributional differences within the prison population and attitudinal differences regarding a broad range of issues and phenomena.

Both types of patterns are necessary to an adequate understanding of prisonization. Consider racial effects, for example. Cross-tabulations between race and inmate role reveal no reliable association at either observation. Racial effects cannot, therefore account for the differing perceptions of prison life which distinguish the four prison styles.

Over time, however, whites and chicanos do not react to incarceration in the same way as blacks. Whites and chicanos are more apt to move into positions of at least partial conformity with staff expectations: 42% of white prisoners and 39% of

chicanos whose prison style changes between observations adopt
the square John or politician role, compared to only 17% of blacks
who change.

The final advantage of the typology is that both cross-sec-
tional and longitudinal data can be combined by comparing the
attitudes of stable and unstable role incumbents at the two points
in their prison sentence. As Tables 4 through 12 show, men whose
adherence to a given prison style does not change, at least during
the initial months of confinement, are generally more distinctive
in their prison styles than other inmates. As will be shown in
subsequent chapters, contrasts in their political attitudes are
also greater than those separating all role incumbents.

On the other hand, there are instances where men whose role
orientation changes over time also manifest concurrent changes in
their political beliefs. The typology allows, in other words,
examination of the political concomitants of both fixed and
changing prison styles among California inmates.

In summary, it bears repeating that the consequences of con-
fining convicted criminals in total institutions are many. The
degradations, deprivations and subordinate status of prisoners do
have an impact on men's feelings about themselves, their relation-
ships, and their futures. As important as the changes which occur
among prisoners over time are the cross-sectional patterns which
emerge among different inmate subgroups. They reflect divergent
responses to the normative conflict which surrounds prisoners.

At every turn inmates are faced with two competing value
systems which are at odds with each other on nearly every aspect

of prison life. All must cope somehow with the cross-currents,
but there are not just one or two modal response patterns. Cross-
sectional data at two points in men's prison terms have uncovered
four more-or-less unique clusters of attitudes.

Turnover data have shown that certain inmates, particularly
blacks, are more vulnerable to prisonization than others. And yet
men who represent the same role at both observations consistently
portray the array of predispositions associated with that role
more clearly than men whose beliefs change over time. The in-
mates' world is a complex and difficult one to survive in. Each
man faces a struggle for security, companionship and success in
prison. Not all men enter the struggle in the same way or to
meet the same goals.

Whether these contrasting attitudinal patterns are carried
over into the larger world outside prison after incarceration can-
not be known on the basis of the available information. But it
would be highly surprising if inmate types did not at least
continue to hold different orientations to prison life throughout
most of their sentences. Variations in their perceptions of and
access to the rewards and penalties inherent in prison life are
likely to continue to be reflected in the attitudes of confined
criminals.

NOTES

1. Donald Clemmer, The Prison Community, Boston, Christopher Publishing Co., 1940.

2. Erik Wright, The Politics of Punishment, New York, Harper and Row, 1973, p. 146.

3. Charles Tittle, Society of Subordinates, Bloomington, Ind., Indiana University Press, 1972, p. 6.

4. Irving Goffman, Asylums, Garden City, N. Y., Doubleday, 1961; see also Harold Garfinkle, "Conditions of Successful Degradation Ceremonies", in Lawrence Hazelrigg (ed.) Prison Within Society, Garden City, N. Y., Doubleday, 1968, pp. 68-77.

5. Erik Wright, op. cit., p. 149.

6. Ibid., p. 146.

7. This argument is most clearly made in Gresham Sykes and Sheldon Messinger, "The Inmate Social System", in Richard Cloward et al., Theoretical Studies in Social Organization of the Prison, New York, Social Science Research Council, 1960, pp. 5-19.

8. See John Irwin and Donald Cressey, "Thieves, Convicts, and the Inmate Culture", Social Problems (10) Fall, 1962, pp. 142-55.

9. Sykes and Messinger, op. cit., pp. 6-9.

10. Johan Galtung, "The Social Functions of a Prison", in Hazelrigg, op. cit., pp. 33-34.

11. Clemmer, op. cit., p. 297.

12. Stanton Wheeler, "Socialization in Correctional Communities", American Sociological Review (26) Oct., 1961, pp. 697-712; Peter Garabedian, "Social Roles and Processes of Socialization", Social Problems (11) Fall, 1963, pp. 139-52.

13. Erik Wright, op. cit., pp. 109-110.

14. Analysis of variance performed on inmate prison ratings by prison yields an F-score of 24.08 and an Eta^2 of .52.

15. Tittle, op. cit.; Bernard Berk, "Organizational Goals and Inmate Organization", American Journal of Sociology (71) 1966, pp. 522-34; Oscar Grusky, "Organizational Goals and the Behavior of Informal Leaders", American Journal of Sociology (65) 1960, pp. 59-67; Thomas Wilson, "Patterns of Management and Adaptations to Organizational Roles: A Study of Prison Inmates", American Journal of Sociology (74) 1969, pp. 146-57.

16. T=1.70, d.f.=186, p=.05.

17. In a Department of Corrections Report entitled "Incidents in Institutions, 1965 through 1973" (Sacramento, Ca., 1974, State of California Health and Welfare Agency), the violence rate for the correctional system as a whole for 1973 was put at 3.64 incidents per 100 average institutional population. But for conservation centers the rate was only 1.39, while at San Quentin it rose to 6.03, and at Deuel Vocational Institution the rate was 9.57, or nearly seven times the conservation center rate.

18. Samuel Strong, "Social Types in a Minority Group", American Journal of Sociology (48) 1943, p. 564.

19. Clarence Schrag, "Some Foundations for a Theory of Corrections", in Donald Cressey (ed.) The Prison: Studies in Institutional Organization and Change, New York, Holt Rinehart and Winston, 1961, pp. 309-357.

20. Ibid., p. 347.

21. Ibid., pp. 342-43.

22. The distribution of responses to questions comprising the Inmate Solidarity scale does not permit a more balanced dichotomization.

23. The small number of stable square Johns (N=8) restricts reliable estimates of their predispositions. Their responses are reported only to demonstrate the tendencies of their prison style.

24. Schrag, op. cit., p. 348.

25. John Irwin, The Felon, Englewood Cliffs, N. J., Prentice-Hall, 1970, p. 72.

26. Schrag, op. cit., p. 347.

27. Ibid., p. 356.

28. Bill Chambliss, Box-Man: A Professional Thief's Journey, New York, Harper and Row, 1972, p. 76.

29. Berk, op. cit.; David Street et al., Organization for Treatment, New York, Free Press, 1966; Wilson, op. cit.; Tittle, op. cit.

30. Irwin, op. cit., pp. 72-73.

31. These questions are fashioned after the concept of "comparison level", as expressed by J. W. Thibaut and H. H. Kelley, The Social Psychology of Groups, New York, Wiley and Sons, 1959, p. 81ff. The concept is essentially similar to that of relative deprivation.

32. Schrag, op. cit., p. 347.

33. Ibid., p. 349.

34. Donald Garrity, "The Prison as a Rehabilitation Agency", in Cressey (ed.) op. cit., p. 377.

35. Irwin, op. cit., p. 62.

36. Chambliss, op. cit., pp. 124-129.

37. Schrag, op. cit., p. 350.

38. Irwin, op. cit., p. 75.

39. Ibid., p. 25.

40. Sykes and Messinger, op. cit., p. 10.

41. Schrag, op. cit., p. 347. As the term "antisocial" is applied to the right guy in this study, it denotes opposition to society, not an inability to get along with others. In this latter sense, the term would be more descriptive of outlaws than right guys, who are generally admired by prisoners.

42. Chambliss, op. cit., p. 23.

43. Irwin, op. cit., p. 69.

44. Chambliss, op. cit., p. 125.

45. Claude Brown, Manchild in the Promised Land, New York, The Macmillan Co., 1965, pp. 412.

Chapter IV

THE POLITICAL CULTURE OF STATE PRISON

A. Introduction

Prisoners come from a subculture which sets them apart from most people. It was pointed out in Chapter 2 that the nature of criminal and legal processes is such that the majority of people who commit crimes are diverted from prison. Consequently the prison population consists almost entirely of peripheral, dis- advantaged men, a population highly skewed in terms of marginal social status, repeated involvement in violent situations, and frequent legal problems.

It comes as no surprise, therefore, that prisoners are also atypical in their political beliefs and patterns of political participation. As I argue at the end of Chapter 2, the political culture of the prison differs from the larger political culture on the outside in that two groups of men are overrepresented in prison: men for whom politics holds little meaning or interest, and men who prefer political militancy over conventional, non- violent forms of participation. The distribution of political preferences is more dispersed inside prison than in contemporary society.

In addition to their criminal failures, prisoners share a common status as outcasts and, nonwithstanding variations in prison climates, face a common environment behind bars. Chapter 3 detailed prisoners' responses to that environment. The point was made that dissensus exists among prisoners even on the ques- tion which is most central to them, namely how to do time in prison.

The thrust of this chapter is to establish the nexus between an individual's response to the harsh realities of prison life and his views of the larger political system. There are marked differences among inmates in terms of their orientation to the political system, just as there are differences in their responses to the punishments meted out by that system. Inmate political beliefs, in other words, are not only unlike those of other men, they are consistently associated with the intramural differences among inmates on questions of mutual solidarity and conformity to staff norms.

Later in this chapter, the argument that variations in the political attitudes of inmates are a function solely of differences in attributional factors is examined and found wanting. These factors are not unimportant. Nevertheless, inmate political attitudes have an association with styles of prison adaptation which goes beyond the effects of age, race and criminal history. Finally the question of how political beliefs are affected by incarceration in the California prison system is answered.

State prisons are government institutions run by representatives of the government. They were established for individuals who have violated the rules enunciated by the political system, and who are consequently to be punished by that system. Whether their crimes were politically motivated in any sense of that nebulous term, their punishment represents a conscious political decision to invoke the legitimate authority of the state against them.

The criminal justice system, and especially the prison system, is the most obvious link between the day-to-day world of the prisoner and the operation of the government. Symbols of state authority, such as the flag and uniformed officers, are highly visible. Many prisoners rarely see anyone, in fact, except fellow prisoners and those in the employ of the Corrections Department. Nor is it any secret among prisoners that the members of the Adult Authority and the Director of the Department of Corrections are political appointees:

> "Politically appointing the warden of an
> institution or the parole board for a state
> is way out of bounds. It's outrageous. We
> have a few wardens in the country that are
> picked by examinations, but the majority of
> them you'll find, your chief of police, your
> wardens, your parole boards, are all political
> plums..."(1)

The bitterness and opposition which increasingly colors inmates' styles of doing time need not be confined to their immediate surroundings. A question of broad concern is whether their bitterness and opposition are generalized to encompass the political establishment as a whole, or whether a distinction is maintained between this one arm of the government and the larger political body.

Given the large number of politically apathetic men found entering prison, some inmates must maintain such a distinction. Nonetheless, we have seen that both militancy and resentment of correctional authorities are more common among men whose acculturation into the criminal world is strongest. This chapter, then, explores evidence pertaining to whether one's degree of

hostility towards the prison administration and one's degree of solidarity with inmates have repercussions for one's overall political outlook.

It bears remembering that state prisons are unlike most governmental institutions in two major respects. First, be they conservation camps or close-security prisons, correctional institutions are total institutions. Second, they possess a highly anomic character. Durkheim most commonly used anomie to mean deregulation, particularly in groups with low levels of agreement on norms and values.[2] Merton, although he uses anomie in a more restricted way, agrees with Durkheim that anomie is a condition of a collectivity where "norms are robbed of their power to regulate behavior."[3]

Anomie is a structural, macro-level concept which is a property of a culture, a society or an institution, not of individuals. Because of the "total" nature of prisons and the violent nature of many of their inmates, prisons may be the closest of all social institutions to the ideal type in terms of its anomic properties.

Conventional norms which regulate behavior, admittedly with varying success, in the larger society, are of necessity replaced by fear and physical coercion in prison. Frank Rundle, chief psychiatrist at Soledad from December, 1970, until May, 1971, reflects on this point:

> Shortly after I began working at Soledad,
> I was impressed as I walked the quarter-
> mile-long mainline corridor by the fact
> that there were hundreds of inmates
> walking there, with only 8 or 10 unarmed

> guards in view. I suddenly wondered why
> the inmates submitted to the dreary
> regimentation, the oppressive power, the
> unreasonableness and arbitrariness of the
> prison. Why didn't they just take the
> place over?... It suddenly dawned on me
> that the ultimate enforcer was the gun-
> power in the hands of the staff, locked
> in cabinets throughout the prison and
> at the ready in the gun towers. And
> everybody knew that even if they suc-
> ceeded in taking over a prison or a
> section of it, the vast police and
> military resources of the state, and
> the nation if necessary, would be
> brought against them."(4)

Nor can it be argued that subcultural norms effectively re-
place conventional ones as regulators of inmate behavior. The
lack of consensus among inmates on many major normative issues of
prison life has, I hope, been made plain by now. Problems which
appear to some inmates to require violent solutions other handle
by manipulation, others by avoidance. Yinger, in his review of
anomie and alienation, points out that "violence, discord, and
deviation are highly visible and readily seen as clear indexes
of anomie... Crime rates and other forms of 'deviation' have been
used as indexes."(5) By these standards prison populations would
necessarily be highly anomic.

Anomie as a contextual variable, although not frequently
studied empirically, is relevant to political beliefs. Yinger,
for example, argues that the extent of anomie

> "is a crucial variable for the student of
> politics and other social processes...
> Anomic settings produce alienation; and/or
> alienated individuals increase the level of
> anomie... The closeness of this relation-
> ship, however, makes the drawing of careful
> analytic distinctions all the more necessary.
> Some of the most important questions arise

> in connection with nonalienative be-
> havior in highly anomic situations and
> with alienation among those who live in
> relatively eunomic settings..."(6)

Yinger's point is that the relationship between anomie and individual responses to it is not determinate. Merton's well-known list of possible reactions is apposite; faced with an anomic situation, people may react in conformist, ritualistic, innovative, apathetic or rebellious manners.(7)

What is of interest then is not the simple fact that prisons are anomic and totalitarian political institutions. To understand the importance of incarceration for political beliefs, one must seek out patterns between affective reactions to incerceration and affect towards the political system. Whether and how inmates perceive the symbolic, institutional and policy linkages between the political system and prisons as punitive instruments of social control reflects to a considerable extent their reactions to the normlessness and tension of prison existence.

B.   The Dimensions of Prison Political Culture

The task of mapping out the virgin territory of prison political culture would be considerably easier if Merton's typology of responses to anomie had been systematically applied to political attitudes. The job would also be simpler if there were more prior explorations of political attitudes among inmates in total institutions. As it stands now, Merton's typology has been applied most intensively in studies of delinquency[8] while our knowledge of inmate politics is limited to findings of above-average alienation, ethnocentrism and right-wing authoritarianism in prison populations.[9]

Given that an overriding concern of this paper is to explore
the nature and distribution of political militancy among pris-
oners, it is worthwhile to focus on those aspects of political
belief which have been linked to political violence both theo-
retically and empirically. The relevant dimensions come under
three headings: affective beliefs, conative beliefs, and locus
of control beliefs. Each is associated with intramural dimen-
sions of the prison culture.

The measure of political affect used here is alienation.
Kon has argued persuasively that, to be useful, the concept of
alienation must be delimited by answers to three questions: Who
is alienated? From what is he alienated? And how is this
alienation manifested? As used here, the term refers to an indi-
vidual's alienation from the political system.[10] The manifes-
tation of this alienation is a set of attitudes which indicate
separation from or rejection of the political system.

The degree to which one is alienated is determined by the
extent to which his perception of government is trusting or
cynical, allegiant or estranged, committed or disenchanted. The
items used to measure political alienation tap respondents'
identification with and pride in the government and their per-
ceptions of governmental honesty and responsiveness (Appendix).
Because these questions refer to the political system as a whole,
an individual who views the correctional system unfavorably need
not necessarily be alienated from government generally.

The second cluster of beliefs which are examined concern not
the valence of one's political views but their action component.

The distinction between affective and conative components of belief has been drawn by Leonard Doob,[11] who argues that both predispositions toward an object and behavioral intentions regarding the object must be considered in understanding the relationship between attitudes and actions.

The heart of one's conative political beliefs is the extent to which he believes in his competence and effectiveness in dealings with political problems or agents. Campbell's well-known definition of political efficacy is "the feeling that individual political action does have or can have an impact on the political process, i.e., that it is worthwhile to perform one's civic duties."[12]

For men in prison the performance of "civic duties" is not an entirely appropriate concept. They are denied by law the right to exercise many such duties, while others are in effect denied to them by virtue of their isolation from the daily flow of political activities. Care must be taken not to assume that efficacy is a global, unitary concept which operates identically over the whole political range. Robert Hess points out that

> "The diffuse nature of the feeling... is
> almost certainly modified quickly and
> sharply in individual encounters with
> various representatives of institutions
> and of government. That is, it is entirely
> possible for an individual who feels effi-
> cacious in relation to a broad entity such
> as the government- to feel completely help-
> less in verbal encounter with a traffic
> policeman. A sense of efficacy can sustain
> some negative instances presumably, but the
> impact of such experiences is scarcely
> studied or understood."[13]

It was observed in Chapter 2 that factor analysis of questions concerning inmates' perceived political effectiveness confirms the non-unitary nature of the concept. Items referring to legal problems form a separate dimension from those having to do with activities in other political arenas. The discovery was also made that, while inmate efficacy in the criminal justice sphere falls far below the norm for non-inmates, their efficacy in other matters resembles much more closely that of the general population. Each of these dimensions is considered in this chapter.

The third attitude dimension is based upon Rotter's concept of internal versus external locus of control.[14] The component items tap a generalized expectancy that outcomes are contingent upon one's own behavior (internal control) or independent of it (external control). Internal locus of control is distinct from high efficacy in two ways. First the five items used to measure it have no manifest political content (e.g., "I have found that the things that happen to me are: a) beyond my control, or b) my own doing."). It is therefore not linked to any presumptions about the legitimacy of the political system.[15]

Second, locus of control is not always related to behavior in the same fashion as efficacy, at least within highly deprived populations. Among individuals with a history of much failure, high internal control has been found to imply responsibility for those failures, thus reflecting intrapunitiveness rather than efficaciousness.[16] Conversely, external control appears to mean placing the blame for one's plight on external forces over

which one can have no influence, thus depicting oneself as the

victim not of a self-inflicted wound but of circumstance.

The distinction between internal control as efficacy versus

intrapunitiveness is particularly germane to the prison population.

They are men whose lives are replete with failure. Cloward and

Ohlin associate one's interpretation of such failure with the

acceptance of a deviant value system:

> "The most significant step in the with-
> drawal of sentiments supporting the
> legitimacy of conventional norms is the
> attribution of the cause of failure to
> the social order rather than to one-
> self."(17)

Deviant individuals, that is, are more likely to have a sense of

external control than conforming individuals.

McCorkle and Korn argue further that the deprivations of

prison life may justify in a prisoner's mind the feeling of

> "absolution of any personal sense of guilt
> or responsibility for his offense by em-
> phasizing and concentrating on society's
> real or fancied offenses against him."(18)

If such is the case, the most resentful inmates are less apt to

display high internal control.

All three of these dimensions, alienation, efficacy, and

locus of control, require examination in order to understand the

political culture of the prison. Each provides an additional

perspective on the contrasting styles of men in confinement.

And, as we shall see in the next chapter, each is related in a

direct way to one or more dimensions of inmate militancy.

The findings are organized into three parts. First the

importance of social marginality and criminal acculturation on

the dimensions of the inmate political culture are reviewed.
Then differences among adherents to the four major prison styles
on these dimensions are presented, both before and after control-
ling for the effects of antecedent factors. Finally, change over
time in inmates' level of alienation, efficacy and locus of
control is explored.

C. Findings

In Chapter 2 the relationship between criminal deviance and
the alienation and efficacy scores of incoming inmates was dis-
cussed. In Table 1, these correlations are reproduced for both
observations along with comparable measures of association be-
tween deviance and locus of control.[19] Intercorrelations among
the political attitude dimensions are also included.

Men with the longest records of personal violence and crimi-
nal failure are somewhat more likely to hold external forces
accountable for their condition than less criminally acculturated
inmates. This is congruent with Cloward and Ohlin's argument that
denial of personal responsibility for one's plight contributes to
the acquisition of a deviant value system. Not surprisingly,
those who deny responsibility for their condition also tend not
to feel confident of their capacity to influence the outcome of
confrontations with the criminal justice system. Finally, both
low legal efficacy and external control are associated with nega-
tive opinions of the government.

Political effectiveness, on the other hand, has no relation-
ship with one's degree of alienation from the political system,

TABLE 1

RELATIONSHIPS[a] BETWEEN CRIMINAL DEVIANCE, ALIENATION, EFFICACY AND LOCUS OF CONTROL

		Personal Violence	Political Alienation	Political Efficacy	Legal Efficacy	Internal Control
Criminal Record	T_1	.42 (n=270, p=.001)	.20 (n=271, p=.001)	-.06 (n=212, p=NS)	-.10 (n=212, p=NS)	-.14 (n=264, p=.01)
	T_2		:26 (n=219, p= 001)	.03 (n=161, p=NS)	-.12 (n=195, p=.05)	-.23 (n=216, p=.001)
Personal Violence	T_1		.24 (n=328, p=.001)	-.13 (n=292, p=.01)	.01 (n=247, p=NS)	-.15 (n=321, p=.004)
	T_2		.25 (n=258, p=.001)	.04 (n=189, p=NS)	-.21 (n=225, p=.001)	-.12 (n=253, p=.03)
Political Alienation	T_1			.07 (n=244, p=NS)	-.30 (n=289, p=.001)	-.37 (n=315, p=.001)
	T_2			.08 (n=187, p=NS)	-.25 (n=222, p=.001)	-.32 (n=252, p=.001)
Legal Efficacy	T_1					.18 (n=281 p=.001)
	T_2					.30 (n=220, p=.001)

(a) Pearson's r

nor is it closely linked with locus of control beliefs. Efficaciousness cannot be viewed as a unitary concept among California inmates.

Legal effectiveness is part of a syndrome, or clustering, of inmate political beliefs. Included in this cluster of beliefs are relatively favorable opinions of the government, and a tendency to accept responsibility for one's condition. This syndrome is more frequent among the less deviant members of the prison population, while the most deviant inmates, particularly at the second observation, tend to trace their problems to external forces, doubt their ability to deal successfully with the legal system, and hold negative sentiments about the government generally.

Political efficacy is not a part of either cluster of beliefs. Politically efficacious inmates are no more likely than inefficacious ones to be politically alienated or to blame external forces. Nor are they more criminally deviant than other inmates.

Social marginality, although not related to criminal deviance among prisoners, does contribute to feelings of efficacy, external control and alienation. In Table 2 the relationships between age, race and education, taken as indices of marginality, and inmate political beliefs are presented. Contrary to expectations, minority-group inmates are not significantly more alienated than whites. Having seen the disparity between the alienation levels of inmates versus non-inmates in Chapter 2, the explanation must be that white inmates are far more alienated

TABLE 2

<u>SOCIAL MARGINALITY AND THE INMATE POLITICAL CULTURE</u>[a]

		Political Alienation	Political Efficacy	Legal Efficacy	Internal Control
<u>Age:</u>	T_1	-.31 (n=325, p=.001)	.07 (n=247, p=NS)	.07 (n=292, p=NS)	.16 (n=317, p=.002)
	T_2	-.33 (n=250, p=.001)	.10 (n=189, p=NS)	.04 (n=223, p=NS)	.14 (n=252, p=.01)
<u>Education:</u>	T_1	.001 (n=329, p=NS)	.20 (n=249, p=.001)	.05 (n=294, p=NS)	.10 (n=322 p=.04)
	T_2	.09 (n=259, p=NS)	.16 (n=191, p=.01)	.05 (n=225, p=NS)	.09 (n=255, p=NS)

Mean Scores
By Race:

T_1

	Political Alienation	Political Efficacy	Legal Efficacy	Internal Control
All (N)	11.76 (314)	7.33 (239)	6.46 (279)	11.66 (305)
White (N)	11.50 (174)	6.99 (137)	6.52 (159)	12.06 (165)
Black (N)	11.95 (95)	8.28 (69)	6.78 (80)	11.28 (95)
Chicano (N)	12.40 (45)	6.82 (33)	5.58 (40)	11.02 (45)
Significance	F=2.31, p=NS	F=8.04, p=.01	F=3.66, p=.05	F=3.89, p=.05

T_2

	Political Alienation	Political Efficacy	Legal Efficacy	Internal Control
All (N)	11.81 (250)	7.17 (185)	6.32 (219)	12.20 (245)
White (N)	11.55 (141)	7.04 (106)	6.09 (132)	12.54 (137)
Black (N)	11.91 (75)	7.68 (57)	7.05 (59)	11.83 (75)
Chicano (N)	12.68 (34)	6.45 (22)	5.89 (28)	11.67 (33)
Significance	F=2.70, p=NS	F=3.03 p=.06	F=4.18 p=.05	F=2.63, p=NS

(a) For age and education, coefficients are Pearson's r; for race, analysis of variance.

than their counterparts outside, thus erasing the usual racial
contrasts.

Race is an important distinguishing factor in terms of effi-
cacy, however. In keeping with the recent politicization of
blacks generally, black inmates are well above the prison norm
for political efficacy, and to a lesser extent, legal efficacy.
Chicanos manifest the poorest ratings of their political and legal
capabilities. Chicanos are also the least willing to accept
responsibility for their situation, while whites most readily
acknowledge personal control over their lives. These last dif-
ferences are significant only at the initial observation.

Education has an effect only on political efficacy. Edu-
cation increases inmates' political confidence, but has no sub-
stantial effect on legal efficacy, political alienation or locus
of control. Age, by contrast, has no influence on either measure
of efficacy. Its effects are most visible in regard to political
alienation. Younger inmates have a more disaffected orientation
towards the government than older prisoners. Youth is also re-
lated to external control, beliefs, although less closely than to
alienation.

In sum, both criminal deviance and social marginality
influence inmate political beliefs. Political alienation is
found most frequently among highly deviant young prisoners, re-
gardless of race or education. Political efficacy is highest
among blacks and educated inmates. Legal efficacy covaries with
political efficacy, and is also higher among blacks. But in
addition, it is stronger among men with low levels of alienation.

Chicanos and, at the second observation, more deviant inmates
feel relatively incompetent in this area. Personal control
increases with age, but decreases with criminal acculturation.
It is most frequent among whites and men who are politically
allegiant and legally efficacious.

Setting aside for the moment the importance of these ante-
cedent factors, let us examine the distribution of political be-
liefs across the inmate typology. If prison styles and political
styles are related, each role should display its own configura-
tion of political beliefs. We shall subsequently see whether
inter-role differences disappear when the effects of criminal
deviance and social marginality are removed.

Evidence pertaining to the association between inmate prison
styles and political orientations is presented in two fashions.
In Table 3 simple correlations between the two major axes of
prison life- resentment of correctional authorities and inmate
solidarity- and the measures of alienation, efficacy and locus
of control are displayed. Tables 4 through 7 give the breakdown
of mean scores on the political attitude scales for each role at
both observations. As before, scores for stable role incumbents
are also presented to document more clearly the political orienta-
tion of each role.

It is plain from Table 3 that the principle connection be-
tween one's response to prison and one's political predisposi-
tions has to do with the degree of hostility one expresses to-
wards prison programs and officials. Only political efficacy is
independent of this dimension. The greater one's resentment, the

TABLE 3

CORRELATIONS[a] BETWEEN RESENTMENT OF OFFICIALS, INMATE SOLIDARITY, AND INMATE POLITICAL ATTITUDES

		Alien-ation	Legal Efficacy	Political Efficacy	Internal Control
Resentment of Correctional Officials	T_1	.41 (n=302, p=.001)	-.19 (n=271, p=.001)	-.09 (n=232, p=NS	-.36 (n=297, p=.001)
	T_2	.41 (n=243, p=.001)	-.32 (n=212, p=.001)	-.06 (n=180, p=NS)	-.24 (n=239, p=.001)
Inmate Solidarity	T_1	.03 (n=306, p=NS)	-.01 (n=272, p=NS)	.09 (n=236, p=NS)	.07 (n=302, p=NS)
	T_2	.08 (n=251, p=NS)	.11 (n=217, p=.05)	.17 (n=184, p=.01)	.13 (n=245, p=.02)

(a) Pearson's r

less allegiance one feels towards the government, the less opti-

mistic one is of dealing successfully with legal troubles, and

the more likely one is to blame others for one's condition.

Inmate solidarity shows no relationship to any political

attitude among incoming prisoners. After transfer, small but

significant correlations exist between inmate solidarity and

internal control, political efficacy and legal efficacy. That

is, men who hold positive feelings about their fellow captives

after several months of confinement also hold more positive

feelings about their competence as political actors and acknowl-

edge responsibility for their situation more frequently than

isolated prisoners. These interrelationships are more precisely

expressed by comparing the political beliefs of the four inmate

roles.

Political alienation among the four groups differs substan-

tially at both observations (Table 4). Square Johns and polit-

icians have a more favorable disposition towards the political

system, outlaws and right guys a more unfavorable one. Positive

feelings towards one's fellow inmates as well as hatred of the

prison authorities have some effect on attitudes towards the

government. Politicians are somewhat more alienated than square

Johns and right guys marginally more alienated than outlaws

among incoming, established and stable incumbents. Group soli-

darity appears to facilitate the expression of political dis-

affection.

The combined effects of resentment towards officials and

respect for other convicts are also important in conative

TABLE 4

MEAN ALIENATION[a] BY INMATE TYPOLOGY

	Grand Mean	Square John	Polit- ician	Outlaw	Right Guy	Signifi- cance
First Observation	11.77 (n=291)	10.37 (n=38)	10.96 (n=77)	12.65 (n=44)	12.80 (n=82)	F=15.32 p=.01
Second Observation	11.88 (n=238)	10.07 (n=28)	10.66 (n=65)	12.39 (n=53)	12.99 (n=92)	F=19.25 p=.01
Both Observations[b]						
T_1	11.81 (n=93)	9.0 (n=8)	10.36 (n=33)	12.63 (n=16)	13.39 (n=36)	F=14.08 p=.01
T_2	11.68 (n=96)	8.88 (n=8)	10.11 (n=35)	12.24 (n=17)	13.56 (n=36)	F=15.81 p=.01

(a) A high score denotes a high level of political alienation

(b) Mean scores for men whose inmate role remains the same at both observations

TABLE 5

MEAN LEGAL EFFICACY$^{(a)}$ BY INMATE TYPOLOGY

	Grand Mean	Square John	Polit- ician	Outlaw	Right Guy	Signifi- cance
First Observa- tion	6.41 (n=247)	6.55 (n=38)	6.78 (n=77)	6.30 (n=44)	5.81 (n=82)	F=2.31 p=NS
Second Observa- tion	6.30 (n=199)	6.29 (n=17)	7.34 (n=53)	5.80 (n=40)	5.72 (n=80)	F=8.25 p=.01
Both Observa- tions$^{(b)}$						
T_1	6.20 (n=89)	7.14 (n=7)	7.29 (n=34)	6.07 (n=14)	4.97 (n=34)	F=7.09 p=.01
T_2	6.40 (n=84)	7.0 (n=5)	7.61 (n=31)	6.0 (n=13)	5.40 (n=35)	F=6.30 p=.01

(a) A high score denotes high legal efficacy

(b) Mean scores for men whose inmate role remains the same at both observations

TABLE 6

MEAN POLITICAL EFFICACY[a] BY INMATE TYPOLOGY

	Grand Mean	Square John	Polit- ician	Outlaw	Right Guy	Signifi- cance
First Observation	7.37 (n=217)	7.31 (n=36)	7.73 (n=66)	7.0 (n=39)	7.28 (n=76)	F=0.83 p=NS
Second Observation	7.17 (n=169)	7.24 (n=21)	7.67 (n=49)	6.53 (n=38)	6.85 (n=61)	F=2.49 p=NS
Both Observations[b]						
T_1	7.16 (n=73)	5.83 (n=6)	8.28 (n=25)	5.67 (n=12)	7.10 (n=30)	F=3.70 p=.05
T_2	7.11 (n=70)	6.83 (n=6)	7.89 (n=27)	5.38 (n=13)	7.25 (n=24)	F=3.57 p=.05

(a) A high score denotes high political efficacy

(b) Mean scores for men whose inmate role remains the same at both observations

political attitudes. Politicians, not square Johns, have the
strongest feelings of efficacy. Their perceived effectiveness in
handling legal and political problems is the highest of the four
inmate types in every comparison. Inter-role contrasts in efficacy
both before and after transfer are most distinct among stable in-
cumbents. Among all incumbents the only significant variation
concerns legal efficacy at the second observation.

Among highly resentful inmates the picture is less consistent
than among square Johns and politicians. Right guys are in all
cases the group with the lowest efficacy in terms of legal prob-
lems. Outlaws, while below the sample mean, are less afflicted
by pessimistic view of their capabilities in this area. Despite
the weak but politive correlation at the second observation be-
tween inmate solidarity and legal efficacy, right guys manifest
the poorest sense of legal effectiveness of the four inmate types.

A different picture emerges from Table 6. Among stable in-
cumbents at both observations, right guys are more politically
efficacious than any group other than the politicians. Stable
outlaws fall well below the prison norm on this measure, and also
score below square Johns, particularly at the second observation.
In this regard, then, both resentment of officials and inmate
solidarity play an important part.

As with the efficacy measure, the politicians' sense of
internal control is the highest among inmate types. Square Johns
are also above-normal in their willingness to express personal
control over their lives. Among all right guys and outlaws,
differences on this dimension are slight. Looking at stable

incumbents only, one sees a peculiar picture: rights guys are somewhat higher than outlaws upon entering prison, but after transfer they are the lowest of the four groups.

This is not consistant with the positive correlation between inmate solidarity and internal control; it demonstrates the necessity of comparing the mean scores of the four groups in addition to simply relying on correlation coefficients. Inmate solidarity increases with internal control only among the less resentful portion of the inmate sample. The same point is applicable in the case of legal efficacy, where politicians score above square Johns but right guys fall below outlaws. Moreover, despite the absence of any correlation between inmate solidarity and alienation, politicians and right guys show a tendency towards greater political disaffection than their more isolated counterparts.

To sum up, there are strong indications that men's prison styles are linked to certain political attitudes. Resentment of correctional authorities is the most potent source of variation; it is directly associated with political alienation and external locus of control, and varies inversely with legal efficacy. But within the most and least resentful halves of the prison population, variations in respect for other inmates also coincide with political differences. Respectful inmates are somewhat more apt to feel estranged from government, efficacious politically but inefficacious legally, than other men with similar feelings towards prison authorities. Respect also covaries with internal control, but only among men who are not highly resentful of prison officials.

TABLE 7

MEAN INTERNAL CONTROL[a] BY INMATE TYPOLOGY

	Grand Mean	Square John	Polit-ician	Outlaw	Right Guy	Signifi-·cance
First Observa-tion	11.70 (n=274)	12.18 (n=49)	12.73 (n=92)	10.71 (n=56)	10.88 (n=93)	F=10.58 p=.01
Second Observa-tion	12.20 (n=221)	12.61 (n=29)	13.09 (n=64)	11.53 (n=49)	11.59 (n=91)	F=5.45 p=.01
Both Observa-tions(b)						
T_1	11.52 (n=94)	12.13 (n=8)	13.59 (n=34)	9.53 (n=17)	10.34 (n=35)	F=13.69 p=.01
T_2	12.12 (n=94)	13.25 (n=8)	13.51 (n=35)	11.38 (n=16)	10.80 (n=35)	F=7.39 p=.01

(a) A high score denotes high internal control

(b) Mean score for men whose inmate role remains the same at both observations

Given the earlier discussion of the effects which social
marginality and criminal acculturation exert on inmate political
beliefs, it is necessary to carry the analysis one step further.
Background characteristics influence not only inmate alienation
and/or efficacy, but also help determine prison styles. To
establish whether the nexus between prison styles and political
beliefs goes beyond the effects of their covariance with ante-
cedent variables, analyses of variance were performed on each of
the four political attitudes. In each case, both the relevant
criminal + social attributes and the inmate typology were entered
as independent variables, and their separate effects on the de-
pendent variable assessed, controlling for the influence of all
other independent variables.

Political alienation varies with inmate role regardless of
the effects of antecedent factors. Among both incoming and
established prisoners, alienation levels among the four prison
styles are not greatly affected by adjusting for differences in
age, criminal history and past violence. The one exception in-
volves newly-arrived outlaws, whose political distrust just ex-
ceeds that of right guys. Among prisoners at the second obser-
vation, right guys retain their position at the extreme end of
the alienation continuum. Square Johns continue to show the
strongest political allegiance at each observation.

Turning to conative attitudes, the picture is more complex.
Perceived efficacy in dealing with legal problems does not vary
at the .05 confidence level among incoming prisoners either by
race when controlling for inmate role or by inmate role after

TABLE 8

MEAN ALIENATION BY INMATE TYPOLOGY, ADJUSTED FOR CRIMINAL
HISTORY, PERSONAL VIOLENCE, AND AGE[a]

	Grand Mean	Square John	Polit-ician	Outlaw	Right Guy	Signifi-cance
All Incum-bents:						
T_1	11.75 (n=231)	10.78 (n=38)	11.17 (n=76)	12.47 (n=44)	12.43 (n=73)	F=11.46 p=.01
T_2	11.96 (n=198)	10.50 (n=23)	11.05 (n=52)	12.31 (n=45)	12.79 (n=78)	F=17.98 p=.01
Stable Incum-bents[b]						
T_1	11.85 (n=78)	9.91 (n=6)	10.59 (n=27)	12.54 (n=14)	13.01 (n=31)	F=14.60 p=.01
T_2	11.75 (n=79)	9.34 (n=6)	10.49 (n=27)	12.13 (n=15)	13.13 (n=31)	F=13.70 p=.01

(a) Multiple Classification Analysis, providing distribution and
significance of mean alienation scores after controlling for
the effects of other independent variables.

(b) Mean scores for men whose inmate role remains the same at
both observations

adjustments are made for racial effects. In both cases, however, there is a tendency towards significance (race: F=2.78, p=.06; inmate typology: F=2.38, p=.07). Among inmates whose role is the same at each setting, the typology differentiates inmates quite clearly in terms of legal efficacy, with the strongest contrasts occurring between politicians and right guys.

After transfer from the Reception Guidance Center, inmate role orientation and race are both reliably related to legal efficacy. Racial variations are not as powerful as those among inmate types, however. Politicians remain well above the sample mean; right guys as before score lower than outlaws and far below less resentful inmates.

Differences between inmate roles in non-legal activities remain insubstantial when the effects of race and education are partialled out. It is consistent with the earlier discussion, however, that the two extreme groups are the politicians at the high end and outlaws at the low end. Significant differences do emerge among stable role incumbents at the second observation. Politicians and outlaws are again the most dissimilar.

Regardless of age, race or education, inmates with opposing responses to prison have different perceptions of personal control versus external control. Less hostile inmates, particularly politicians, have a clearer sense of being able to determine their own fate than men who oppose conventional expectations.

In general, then, one cannot dismiss the political differences among inmate types as due to a spurious association with social or criminal background factors. Even among prisoners in

TABLE 9

MEAN LEGAL EFFICACY BY INMATE TYPOLOGY,

ADJUSTED FOR RACE[a]

	Grand Mean	Square John	Polit-ician	Outlaw	Right Guy	Signifi-cance
All Incumbents:						
T_1	6.41 (n=247)	6.55 (n=39)	6.77 (n=80)	6.66 (n=45)	5.86 (n=83)	F=2.38 p=.07
T_2	6.30 (n=199)	6.80 (n=19)	7.37 (n=55)	5.85 (n=44)	5.70 (n=81)	F=7.75 p=.01
Stable Incumbents[b]						
T_1	6.12 (n=84)	7.14 (n=6)	7.14 (n=31)	5.77 (n=14)	5.13 (n=33)	F=5.97 p=.01
T_2	6.44 (n=80)	6.90 (n=4)	7.72 (n=29)	5.92 (n=13)	5.49 (n=34)	F=6.38 p=.01

(a) Multiple Classification Analysis, providing distribution and significance of legal efficacy scores after controlling for the effects of other independent variables

(b) Mean scores of men whose inmate role remains the same at both observations

TABLE 10

MEAN POLITICAL EFFICACY BY INMATE TYPOLOGY,

ADJUSTED FOR RACE AND EDUCATION[a]

	Grand Mean	Square John	Polit-ician	Outlaw	Right Guy	Signifi-cance
All Incumbents:						
T_1	7.37 (n=217)	7.24 (n=36)	7.59 (n=66)	6.98 (n=39)	7.44 (n=76)	F=0.56, p=NS
T_2	7.17 (n=167)	7.18 (n=21)	7.43 (n=49)	6.66 (n=38)	7.27 (n=61)	F=1.10 p=NS
Stable Incumbents[b]						
T_1 controlling for race[c]	7.20 (n=54)	5.76 (n=4)	7.95 (n=19)	5.94 (n=10)	7.40 (n=21)	F=1.50 p=NS
controlling for verbal skills[c]	7.31 (n=58)	6.06 (n=5)	8.20 (n=21)	5.66 (n=10)	7.49 (n=22)	F=2.18 p=NS
T_2 controlling for race[c]	6.96 (n=54)	7.12 (n=4)	8.32 (n=19)	5.54 (n=10)	7.21 (n=21)	F=3.14 p=.035
controlling for verbal skills[c]	7.14 (n=58)	7.71 (n=5)	8.49 (n=21)	5.21 (n=10)	7.14 (n=22)	F=3.32 p=.02

(a) Multiple Classification Analysis, providing distribution and significance of political efficacy scores for inmate typology after controling for effects of other independent variables.

(b) Mean scores for men whose inmate role remains the same at both observations

(c) Due to small number of cases, only two independent variables could be entered simultaneously

TABLE 11

MEAN INTERNAL CONTROL BY INMATE TYPOLOGY, ADJUSTED FOR RACE AND EDUCATION[a]

	Grand Mean	Square John	Politician	Outlaw	Right Guy	Significance
All Incumbents:						
T_1	11.70 (n=274)	12.37 (n=47)	12.54 (n=87)	11.05 (n=53)	10.90 (n=87)	F=7.50 p=.01
T_2	12.20 (n=221)	12.86 (n=26)	13.11 (n=61)	11.61 (n=48)	11.69 (n=86)	F=5.40 p=.01
Stable Incumbents[b]						
T_1 controlling for race[c]	11.47 (n=88)	12.27 (n=7)	13.48 (n=31)	9.61 (n=16)	10.35 (n=34)	F=10.53 p=.01
controlling for verbal skills[c]	11.55 (n=93)	12.46 (n=8)	13.59 (n=34)	9.42 (n=16)	10.34 (n=35)	F=11.53 p=.01
T_2 controlling for race[c]	12.19 (n=88)	13.39 (n=7)	13.76 (n=31)	11.34 (n=16)	10.92 (n=34)	F=8.60 p=.01
controlling for verbal skills[c]	12.11 (n=93)	13.54 (n=8)	13.54 (n=38)	11.22 (n=16)	10.80 (n=35)	F=6.81 p=.01

(a) Multiple Classification Analysis, providing distribution and significance of mean internal control scores for inmate typology after controlling for the effects of other independent variables

(b) Means scores for men who inmate role remains the same at both observations

(c) Due to small number of cases, only two independent variables could be entered simultaneously

similar age, racial and criminal subgroups, political styles and prison styles intertwine. Resentment of officials is generally, but not always, more closely tied to political differences than inmate solidarity; nonetheless, each appears to play an important part in the prison political culture.

D. Effects of Incarceration

In the preceding chapter, the tendency during confinement towards increased opposition to correctional authorities was documented. Given the connection which exists between that opposition and the dimensions of inmate political culture, it would not be surprising to find a correspondence between growth in anti-social attitudes and a deterioration of personal control, legal efficacy, and commitment to the political system.

As it happens, no such direct correspondence exists. Political alienation, in spite of its close association with inmate role orientations both prior to and after transfer from the Reception-Guidance Center, remains unchanged by the increase in prisonization. This is frankly puzzling, given the modest but unmistakable migration pattern towards the roles characterized by high distrust of government.

Closer examination of the alienation scores of inmate subgroups is not of much help. There is no significant change in estrangement from the government within any racial, age or inmate role group. There is a slight tendency for alienation to increase among right guys: the mean scores of the entire post-transfer right guy group as well as that of men in the right guy role at

TABLE 12

CHANGE IN INMATE POLITICAL ATTITUDES
DURING INCARCERATION

	N	$\overline{X}_1$	$\overline{X}_2$	T Value	Significance
Political Alienation					
Entire Sample:	258	11.79	11.83	.31	NS
Internal Control					
Entire Sample:	249	11.63	12.13	3.29	.001
Right Guys: (T_1)	70	10.81	11.39	2.02	.025
Outlaws: (stable)	16	9.56	11.38	2.18	.025
Whites:	134	11.96	12.51	2.74	.007
Blacks:	70	11.24	11.86	2.04	.025
Legal Efficacy					
Entire Sample:	197	6.21	6.23	.59	NS
Whites:	125	6.33	6.02	-1.66	.06
Blacks	47	6.45	7.04	2.06	.025
Chicanos	25	5.20	5.76	1.71	.05
Political Efficacy					
Entire Sample:	160	7.43	7.27	-.99	NS
Blacks	46	8.20	7.59	-1.66	.06
Right Guys (T_1)	49	7.29	6.78	-1.78	.05

both observations are greater than the comparable scores among arriving prisoners. Other inmate types negate this effect by moving in an equally weak fashion towards greater political allegiance.

Within the California prison population, alienation from or allegiance towards the government is a relatively enduring orientation. It covaries with inmates' prison style, but is not as susceptible to incarceration effects as is affect towards the more immediate and visible agents of the government.

Turnover in other attitudes is more pronounced. The major shift occurs along the dimension of internal versus external control. For the sample as a whole, perceived external control drops between observations. Notwithstanding the relationship between hostility towards prison authorities and low internal control, after the initial impact of imprisonment, many inmates regain some sense of being able to influence the course of their lives. Once men are assigned to their respective institutions and have had time to become familiar with established routines, they are in a position to seek out activities and relationships which are more of their own choosing than is possible during their temporary observation period at the Reception-Guidance Center.

There is also reason to believe that the psychological impact of incarceration is more harmful during the initial adjustment stage than at later points in one's sentence. Both in prior studies and in the present sample, self-esteem increases during the early part of inmates' terms.[20] It is plausible, therefore,

that the increased responsibility which inmates feel reflects

both an objective increase in their ability to exert control over

their lives and a decline in the psychological need to avoid

accepting responsibility for the deprivations of imprisonment.

Not all inmates manifest greater internal control over time.

Whites, blacks and chicanos show roughly the same degree of

change, although the small number of chicanos reduces confidence

in their change scores. But significant change is restricted to

inmates in the 20 to 35 year-old group. The youngest and oldest

prisoners retain their mean level of internal control. Compar-

isons among inmate roles show that those most likely to manifest

greater internal control are incoming right guys and men who

retain the outlaw perspective throughout the 3 to 7-month interval

between surveys.

Legal efficacy remains unaffected by time for the sample as

a whole. But this does not mean that efficacy in this area is

as enduring and stable a dimension as political alienation. Ra-

cial membership is the key to understanding the effects of in-

carceration on subjective legal competence. Among white pris-

oners, legal efficacy suffers a decline between measurement dates.

Blacks and chicanos, by contrast, come to see themselves as

better able to cope with police and court problems.

These opposing trends cannot be attributed to a spurious

relationship with inmate role or age. Examination of turnover

within these inmate subgroups fails to unveil substantial move-

ment among prisoners with respect to their chances of success in

dealing with the law. Rather, cultural themes of pride and

assertiveness may provide minorities with an enlarged sense of their capabilities, even though they have had no actual opportunities to demonstrate that effectiveness between observations. This interpretation is highly speculative, however.

The disjunction between political and legal effectiveness carries over into patterns of change during confinement. As with legal efficacy, net change in political efficacy is negligible sample-wide. Racial effects are again present, but in this instance blacks display the largest _decline_ in confidence. The temporal differences within racial subgroups are less reliable on this dimension than on the measure of legal competence, which again suggests the remoteness of ordinary political activities from the concerns of many prisoners.

Men entering prison with the most antisocial attitudes are more prone than others to describe themselves as losing political effectiveness. There is also a peculiar pattern of change among different age groups. Decreased efficacy occurs only among men under 20 and between the ages of 26 and 35. No plausible explanation of this finding occurs readily.

As their sentences progress, both black and white inmates tend to experience greater overall responsibility over their lives. Among blacks this feeling is reinforced by an improved view of their fortunes in potential encounters with the apparatus of law enforcement. For each racial group, however, there is counterveiling movement against the trend towards efficaciousness. This appears among whites in their growing pessimism about fair treatment by police, lawyers and judges. Blacks express a loss

in confidence that their political activities will meet with
success.

There remains one final factor which must be taken into
account before closing out this discussion of prison political
culture. I refer to the contrasting social climates of indi-
vidual prisons. The harshness of the penal environment and in
particular the interracial hostility in close-security prisons
are perhaps the best-known facts of California penal life. A
reasonable observer could easily wonder if much of what appears
to be political in the thinking of inmates is nothing more than
a displacement of unfocused hostility and personal frustration
onto political targets. Fortunately we are in a position to
evaluate this proposition.

First the perceptions which inmates have of the deprivational
level of the prison to which they have been assigned can be ex-
amined. If the displacement theory is correct, men who rate
their prisons as worse than others in the state ought to express
stronger rejection of the political system and feel more impo-
tent both politically and otherwise than men who experience
their prison as relatively tolerable.

Prison ratings have no direct connection with variations in
the major issues of prison life. Differences among inmates on
questions of primary and collective affiliations, comparison
levels and anticipated deprivations after release are not a
function of the perceived severity of one's prison climate, but
are instead reflections of alternative responses to that climate.
Therefore, there is no compelling reason to believe that prison

deprivation levels reveal more about the inmate political culture than racial and role related differences do. Indeed, when comparisons are made of the political beliefs of men in the sample with opposing ratings of their prison, no substantial contrasts are present in terms of any political attitude.

The second dimension of prison social climates is specifically concerned with racism. Racial intolerance has been described as endemic in California close-security prisons. One young white prisoner from San Quentin says,

> "On the streets I never was a racist. I
> was never down on the blacks. But here
> I have been forced to be a racist. I
> was told the first rule was that 'you
> never talk to a black off the job'. If
> you talked with a black you would be
> isolated by the rest of the whites and
> then attacked."(21)

If ethnocentrism is a valid index of inmates' hostility towards opposing racial groups in prison, and if the political beliefs of intolerant inmates are an outgrowth of that hostility, then the more ethnocentric inmates should hold political beliefs unlike those of less bigoted prisoners. Correlations between the ethnocentrism scale and measures of alienation, political and legal efficacy, and internal control do not lend much credence to this hypothesis. None of the coefficients reaches .20, and three of the 8 are statistically as well as substantively trivial. Just as with the perceived severity of the prison, ethnocentrism among prisoners exerts little direct influence on their political culture.

TABLE 13

CORRELATIONS[a] BETWEEN ETHNOCENTRISM, ALIENATION, EFFICACY AND INTERNAL CONTROL

	Alien- ation	Political Efficacy	Legal Efficacy	Internal Control
Ethnocentrism T_1	.10 (n=300, p=.038)	.10 (n=268, p=.01)	-.01 (n=237, p=NS	-.18 (n=294, p=.001)
Ethnocentrism T_2	.14 (n=239, p=.02)	.003 (n=207, p=NS)	-.02 (n=177, p=NS)	-.19 (n=234, p=.001)

(a) Pearson's r

Nor does ethnocentrism exert an indirect influence via associations with age or race. It is relevant, however, to the contrasting political styles which have been the central focus of this study. It is possible, then, given the inter-role variations which have been found to exist in ethnocentrism, particularly between outlaws and politicians, that ethnocentrism exerts an indirect effect on political beliefs via the inmate typology. To determine whether controlling for either prison rating or ethnocentrism weakens the association between prison styles and political beliefs, multiple classification analyses were performed on the four political attitude measures, with ethnocentrism and prison rating entered as additional independent variables. In no instance either before or after transfer is the pattern of role or race-related political beliefs altered by these variables.

E. Discussion

Overall, the most consistent contrasts in the political attitudes of prisoners are between men with different opinions about the prison administration. As inmates' resentment of their captors goes up, allegiance to the government generally, perceived effectiveness in getting results and feelings of responsibility for one's plight tends to fall.

Prisoners tend to combine rejection of prosocial expectations with unfavorable opinions of governmental responsiveness and with denial of the idea that one can operate effectively to influence events. Alienation varies not only with inmate role, but also with personal control and legal efficacy.

There is an additional theme running through these data
which has to do with inmate solidarity and feelings of responsi-
bility and competence. At the second observation, the most
capable men tend to be ones who identify in a positive way with
their convict status. The trend is less clear-cut when outlaws
and right guys are compared. Legal efficacy is consistently
lower among antisocial than among asocial prisoners. Political
efficacy just as consistently is lower among the asocial group,
although inter-role differences are significant only among stable
incumbents. Internal control is lowest among outlaws in 5 of the
8 comparisons. The net impression suggests a modest relation-
ship, among men with equal degrees of hostility towards the au-
thorities, between a favorable attitude towards involvement in
the prison society and a favorable attitude towards outgoingness
in areas of endeavor beyond the criminal justice system.

Involvement in ordinary political activities beyond those
connected with the legal system, however, appears not to be a
central issue among inmates. The four inmate types are not
widely opposed in how they assess the likelihood of being effi-
cacious in solving political problems, except when stable incum-
bents are compared. Nor is political efficacy influenced by
alienation to the same degree as legal efficacy or internal
control. This squares with the inaccessibility of inmates to
most avenues of political involvement.

Feelings which prisoners have about the harshness of their
prison and about tolerance of outgroups play a minor role in the
inmate political culture. Without denying the importance of

these factors in the daily affairs of men in confinement, it is
not apparent that inmate political opinions stem from displace-
ment of racial hatred or personal dissatisfaction with one's
prison assignment onto political objects.

The passage of several months' time in prison does no fur-
ther damage to inmates' already poor opinions about the govern-
ment. There is no immediate connection between the spreading
opposition to correctional authorities among inmates and the
degree of detachment which prisoners feel from the larger polit-
ical system.

Perhaps there is a time lag between the growth in resent-
ment and the deterioration of affect towards the larger political
system. Or it may be that the potential link between increased
resentment of prison authorities and increased political dis-
affection is offset by the decrease among inmates in feelings of
external control. Resentment and external control both vary
directly with political alienation, and yet they change in con-
trary directions. The net result may be to cancel out any effect
which incarceration might have on inmate alienation.

As was found to be the case in terms of change in the inmate
typology, racial membership is crucial to understanding incar-
ceration effects on measures of efficacy. The most striking
finding is that blacks become more efficacious in the criminal
justice arena but less so in other political activities. Their
unusually high level of political efficacy upon entering prison
raises the possibility that regression effects account for their
decline in this area.

Their initial level of legal efficacy, however, while not as far above the mean as their political efficacy, is also higher than that of whites or chicanos. And yet it increases still further over time, while whites suffer a loss of confidence in their legal effectiveness. Chicanos also show stronger legal efficacy at the second observation, but their political efficacy remains unchanged.

Having established the patterning of political beliefs among men with differing prison styles, attention can now be given to the distribution of militant political proclivities among prisoners. Once again the goal is to assess the importance of both contextual and antecedent factors for the political action preferences of prisoners at two points in their prison career.

NOTES

1. Bill Chambliss, Box-Man: A Professional Thief's Journey, New York, Harper & Row, 1972, p. 136.

2. Emile Durkheim, The Division of Labor in Society, George Simpson (trans.), Glencoe, Ill., Free Press, 1933; and Suicide, A Study in Sociology, John Spaulding and George Simpson (trans.), Glencoe, Ill., Free Press, 1951.

3. Robert Merton, Social Theory and Social Structure, New York, Free Press, 1968, p. 223.

4. Frank Rundle, "The Roots of Violence at Soledad", in Erik Wright, The Politics of Punishment, New York, Harper & Row, 1973, pp. 170-171.

5. J. Milton Yinger, "Anomie, Alienation and Political Behavior", in Jeanne Knutson (ed.), Handbook of Political Psychology, San Francisco, Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1973, p. 184.

6. Ibid., pp. 174, 179.

7. Merton, op. cit., pp. 193-211.

8. M. B. Clinard (ed.), Anomie and Deviant Behavior: A Discussion and Critique, New York, Free Press, 1964; Richard Cloward and Lloyd Ohlin, Delinquency and Opportunity, New York, Free Press, 1960; A. K. Cohen, "The Sociology of the Deviant Act: Anomie Theory and Beyond", American Sociological Review (30), 1965, pp. 5-14.

9. See Chapter 1, note 10.

10. Igor Kon, "The Concept of Alienation in Modern Society", Social Research (34), Autumn, 1967, pp. 507ff. See also, Lewis Feuer, "What Is Alienation? The Career of a Concept", New Politics (1), Spring, 1962, pp. 116ff.

11. Leonard Doob, "The Behavior of Attitudes", Psychology Review (54), 1947, pp. 135-56. See also Martin Fishbein, "Attitude and the Prediction of Behavior", in Fishbein (ed.), Attitude Theory and Measurement, New York, Wiley & Sons, 1967, pp. 477-92.

12. Angus Campbell et al., The Voter Decides, Evanston, Ill., Row, Peterson, 1954, p. 187.

13. Robert Hess, "The Acquisition of Feelings of Political Efficacy in Pre-Adults", in Gilbert Abcarian and John Soule (ed.), Social Psychology and Political Behavior, Columbus, Ohio, Charles Merrill, 1971, p. 71.

14. Julian Rotter, "Generalized Expectancies for Internal Versus External Control of Reinforcement", _Psychological Monographs_ (80), 1966, pp. 1-28.

15. The importance of this is pointed out in Hess, _op. cit._, p. 68.

16. Patricia Gurin _et al._, "Internal-External Control in the Motivational Dynamics of Negro Youth", _Journal of Social Issues_ (25), 1969, pp. 29-53; John Forward and Jay Williams, "Internal-External Control and Black Militancy", _Journal of Social Issues_ (26), 1970, pp. 75-91.

17. Richard Cloward and Lloyd Ohlin, _op. cit._, p. 111.

18. Lloyd McCorkle and Richard Korn, "Resocialization Within Walls", _The Annals_ (293), May, 1954, pp. 88-98.

19. Non-inmate frequency distributions for the locus of control questions were not made available to the investigator for the present study. The strong expectation is that inmates are more likely to register external locus of control beliefs than non-inmates.

20. See Lawrence Bennett, "The Application of Self-Esteem Measures in a Correctional Setting: II", _Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency_ (8), 1972-73, pp. 1-9.

21. Wright, _op. cit._, p. 120.

Chapter V

POLITICAL MILITANCY IN THE INMATE SOCIETY

A. Dimensions of Inmate Militancy

We are now in a position to examine properly the relationship between incarceration and militancy. In Chapter 2, evidence on recruitment processes indicated that political and criminal deviance were related. Criminal deviance was at that juncture operationalized in terms of past record and personal experience with violence. In this chapter deviance is re-conceptualized in light of the inmate typology. The relationship between reactions to incarceration and political militancy is the central focus.

The inadequacy of most discussions of inmate militancy, apart from the lack of hard evidence, is that they fail to appreciate the complexity of the inmate society. Militancy is usually treated either as a growing wave of political mobilization sweeping through the prison culture, or as the clamor of a tiny faction of irresponsible trouble-makers who do not speak for the majority of prisoners. Each description founders on the attempt to sum up in a single neat phrase the nature and extent of inmate militancy.

Prison recruitment processes have been shown to produce a population whose political proclivities are highly unusual. By the standards of the non-inmate society, the mean level of participation in, and support for, protests and other forms of political agitation is high among prisoners. This is not to be taken, however, as justification for conceiving of the prison society as uniformly militant. Political apathy is also more widespread among prisoners than non-prisoners. One must be skeptical of reductionist descriptions of prison political culture.

There are, needless to say, many valid reasons for wishing to understand recent expressions of political radicalism from inside prison walls. Sudden eruptions of inmate agitation and violence directed at symbols of political authority are ominous symptoms which are ignored at great risk. Misinterpretation of such symptoms can be equally hazardous, however.

In Chapter 3 incarceration was shown to be a terribly complex phenomenon. Inmates disagree about the meaning of imprisonment and about the most appropriate response to it. Prison is not one reality but many. It is a mistake, therefore, to search for a single pattern of association between confinement and militancy.

Inmates' contrasting styles of adjustment to prison reveal a great deal of information about their political differences. A man's prison style is a valid litmus for his political beliefs. Political militancy among prisoners is best understood, therefore, within the context of their contrasting reactions to confinement.

If there is validity to assertions that militancy and criminal deviance are related, then militancy should be most common among prisoners with the most "prisonized", anti-social style. Of equal importance, their militant stance should be more than an expressive release of generalized hostility, but should be meaningfully related both to perceptions of the political process and to actual behavior. We have data which speak to each of these expectations.

The effects of an additional few months of confinement on the willingness of prisoners to support political violence is

similarly incapable of simplistic analysis. Just as inmates fail
to agree on responses to prison cross-pressures and evaluations
of the government, and as they display varying susceptibility to
prisonization, so the impact of incarceration on their degree of
militancy varies. Knowledge of inmates' racial background and
their prison style improves our understanding of the connection
between life in prison and changing political action preferences.

Rather than base the present analysis upon a single index of
militancy, several alternative approaches are taken. The results
of varying operational definitions can therefore be compared.
Moreover, the consistencies in the findings derived from these
distinct approaches increase the validity of the relationships
discovered.

The first and, as it happens, the least successful approach
is simply to ask respondents whether they consider themselves
radicals, liberals, moderates or conservatives. In the discussion
of contrasts between inmates and controls, disproportionate
numbers of prisoners who either failed to make a choice or de-
scribed themselves as radicals were discovered. Here the concern
is with which types of inmates conceive of themselves as radicals.

The second approach involves question which raise the issue
of political militancy and allows inmates to voice their approval
or disapproval. Two separate indices of this type are employed.
In the first, respondents are simply asked whether they feel that
various forms of conventional and unconventional behavior are
acceptable ways of influencing the political process. Endorse-
ment of activities which deviate from conventional modes of

political involvement is taken to reflect a militant political orientation. Such activities include civil disobedience, demonstrations and joining a revolutionary party to overthrow the government.

The other set of questions uses a multiple choice format, in which respondents choose between two contrasting political tactics. In each instance, one of the possible choices involves a conventional approach, the other a militant one. The specific items in each of these two approaches were presented during the comparison of inmates with non-inmate controls (Chapter 2). The scales which are derived from the summation of responses to the two types of questions provide different perspectives on respondents' feelings about political dissidence. In the former case, inmates are indicating whether violence and disruption are ever justified as political tactics; in the later, whether such tactics are preferable to more conventional activities as solutions to current political problems.

A third approach is to find out how often prisoners have taken part in unconventional forms of political activity, such as demonstrations, violent protests and sit-ins. This is particularly useful information in that it permits an analysis of the causal relationship between dissident political behavior preceding arrest and current inmate styles.

The fabric of militancy among California convicts is detailed both across groups and over time in this chapter. The relationship between the operational measures of political militancy and the background attributes, attitudinal characteristics

and prison style of men in prison is presented. In so doing, we
gain an understanding not only of the close ties between styles of
doing time and violent political tendencies, but also of the clus-
ter of factors which mediate between the two. Thus the nature of
militancy, at least among contemporary prisoners, is explicated
by placing it in the framework of its antecendent and contextual
correlates.

B. The Correlates of Militancy

The first step in the explication of inmate militancy is to
show its relationship with demographic characteristics and the
political beliefs discussed in the previous chapter. The distri-
bution of militancy across the inmate typology is then presented,
and the effects of demographics and political beliefs on that
distribution are assessed. Finally, differences in the militancy
of inmates before and after the commencement of their sentences
are examined.

The number of prisoners who describe themselves as radicals,
while proportionately larger than in the California population
generally, is less than 15% of the inmate population. As was
seen in Chapter 2, however, a great many more prisoners give at
least qualified endorsement to political dissidence when specifi-
cally given the chance. Thus, political self-labels are of lim-
ited utility as measures of militancy.

The radical label appears to have more rhetorical than sub-
stantive meaning among prisoners. Self-styled radicals are
neither more alienated nor more afflicted by feelings of external
control than other inmates, which casts doubt on the validity of

the self-identification measure.[1] Blacks and chicanos are
roughly twice as likely as whites to see themselves as radicals,
suggesting that the term is part of the minority-group sub-
culture in prison. The radical label fails to separate militant
inmates from non-inmates as effectively as questions which deal
directly with acts of political dissidence. Let us now examine
these questions in detail.

Table 1 presents the relationship between age, racial member-
ship, and the three militancy scales. Younger inmates have more
frequent involvement in protest activities than older men, and
give stronger support to such activities. Blacks report the
greatest number of prior protest experiences, but are not more
willing to condone political militancy than white or chicano
prisoners. No racial differences in approval of militancy emerge
until after confinement, when chicanos register the highest mili-
tancy rate. This finding is discussed more thoroughly in Section
C.

Attitudinal correlates of militancy are shown in Table 2.
Negative opinions of the government, as measured by the aliena-
tion scale, are consistently higher among militant prisoners. The
relationship is particularly strong between alienation and pref-
erence for violent as opposed to conventional political behavior.
Men who see the government as unresponsive and dishonest are more
likely to feel that working within the system is not an effective
way to make improvements in society.

Efficacy varies much less consistently with militancy than
alienation does. Only in terms of reported past protest activity

TABLE 1

INMATE MILITANCY BY AGE AND RACE

Correlation with Age[a]

Approval of Political Protests:	T_1	-.23 (n=236, p=.001)
	T_2	-.17 (n=162, p=.014)
Rejection of Non-Violent Political Tactics:	T_1	-.20 (n=323, p=.001)
	T_2	-.16 (n=252, p=.005)
Prior Protest Activity:	T	-.16 (n=292, p=.003)

Analysis of Variance by Race

		Grand Mean	White	Black	Chicano	Significance
Mean Approval of Political Protest:	T_1	6.51	6.33	6.74	6.89	F=1.08,
	(N)	(218)	(133)	(58)	(27)	p=NS
	T_2	6.58	6.18	7.00	7.88	F=4.66,
	(N)	(160)	(101)	(42)	(17)	p=.05
Mean Rejection of Non-Violent Political Tactics:	T_1	4.91	4.75	5.27	4.76	F=2.56,
	(N)	(311)	(168)	(98)	(45)	p=NS
	T_2	4.86	4.60	5.03	5.50	F=3.81,
	(N)	(248)	(136)	(78)	(34)	p=.05
Mean Prior Protest Activity:		6.91	6.57	7.54	7.08	F=5.0,
	(N)	(282)	(165)	(80)	(37)	p=.01

(a) Pearson's r

TABLE 2

SIMPLE CORRELATIONS[a] BETWEEN INMATE MILITANCY AND OTHER POLITICAL ATTITUDES

		Alienation	Political Efficacy	Legal Efficacy	Internal Control	Ethnocentrism
Prior Protest Activity:	T_1	.24 (n=296, p=.001)	.24 (n=227, p=.001)	−.10 (n=269, p=.05)	−.19 (n=287, p=.001)	−.06 (n=272, p=NS)
	T_2	.27 (n=236, p=.001)	.13 (n=179 p=.04)	−.07 (n=208, p=NS)	−.17 (n=230, p=.004)	.16 (n=217, p=.009)
Approval of Political Protests	T_1	.38 (n=277 p=.001)	.10 N=189 p=NS)	−.18 (n=214 p=.004)	−.32 (n=223, p=.001)	.22 (n=213 p=.001)
	T_2	.33 (n=163, p=.001)	.04 (n=139, p=NS)	−.19 (n=152, p=.009)	−.42 (n=159, p=.001)	.27 (n=153 p=.001)
Rejection of Non-Violent Political Tactics	T_1	.41 (n=325, p=.001)	−.01 (n=244, p=NS)	−.14 (n=289, p=.01)	−.35 (n=320, p=.001)	.12 (n=299, p=.02)
	T_2	.42 (n=256, p=.001)	−.04 (n=187 p=NS)	−.19 (n=222, p=.003)	−.40 (n=253, p=.001	.17 (n=235 p=.004)

(a) Pearson's r

−153−

is there a direct tie between political competence and political dissidence. Legal competence is somewhat lower among militants than non-militants, but this is a spurious relationship due to the association between alienation and both legal inefficaciousness and militancy. Controlling for alienation erases the correlation between legal efficacy and political action preferences.

Locus of control moves with militancy in a consistent fashion. Militant inmates have a more pronounced sense of external control than other prisoners. This relationship does not disappear when controlling for alienation. External control does not denote powerlessness in the same sense as does low efficacy, for protest participation increases with both external control and political efficacy. External control among prisoners denotes instead a tendency to blame the system rather than oneself for one's condition. Thus, militants do not just have a relatively low regard for the government, they also see themselves in some sense as victims of large socio-political forces which they cannot themselves regulate.

Ethnocentrism is not an important concommitant of prior protest activity. Attitudes towards political dissidence are more favorable among intolerant inmates, however. The size of these relationships is not as great as those between militancy and alienation or external control, but they indicate that, at least among some inmates, ethnocentrism is one ingredient in their militant political make-up.

Overall, militancy is most intense among young, relatively ethnocentric prisoners who are estranged from the political

system and who blame external forces for their inability to control their lives. Their feelings about the responsiveness of the criminal justice system bear on their degree of militancy only to the extent that those feelings are part of a broader picture of the government as unresponsive. Blacks and men who are confident of their political capability are more politically active than other inmates, but are not more willing to condone unconventional political behavior.

These correlates of militancy contribute to the association between the inmate typology and inmate militancy. Inmates whose prison style is characterized by strongly negative opinions of the prison administration (i.e, outlaws and right guys) tend to be younger, more alienated and ethnocentric, and more afflicted by feelings of external control than less resentful inmates. Not surprisingly given the association between these characteristics and militancy, they are also the most militant.

Support for political protests covaries consistently with negative opinions of prison authorities (Table 3). Both outlaws and right guys, in other words, are more prone to endorse political protests than square Johns or politicians.

Positive feelings towards one's peers are not totally unrelated to positive feelings about militancy, however. Right guys are stronger than outlaws in their belief that unconventional forms of political activity are justifiable. The contrasts are especially clear among stable incumbents. Differences on this measure between prosocial and pseudosocial inmates are altered by time in prison; square Johns are the most unfavorable to

TABLE 3

MEAN REJECTION OF NON-VIOLENT TACTICS BY INMATE TYPOLOGY

			Grand Mean	Square John	Politician	Outlaw	Right Guy	Significance
All Incumbents:	T_1		4.91	4.27	4.55	5.25	5.43	F=6.37,p=.01
		N=	(290)	(49)	(94)	(56)	(91)	
	T_2		4.90	3.93	4.25	5.40	5.39	F=9.27,p=.01
		N=	(235)	(30)	(63)	(52)	(90)	
Stable Incumbents:	T_1		4.92	4.13	4.14	5.47	5.67	F=5.22,p=.01
		N=	(93)	(8)	(35)	(17)	(33)	
	T_2		4.95	3.50	3.85	6.44	5.66	F=12.82,p=.01
		N=	(93)	(8)	(34)	(16)	(35)	

Mean Approval of Political Protests by Inmate Typology

			Grand Mean	Square John	Politician	Outlaw	Right Guy	Significance
All Incumbents:	T_1		6.50	5.61	6.09	6.53	7.33	F=5.90,p=.01
		N=	(203)	(33)	(67)	(36)	(67)	
	T_2		6.62	6.63	5.70	6.60	7.34	F=3.81,p=.05
			(154)	(24)	(43)	(31)	(56)	
Stable Incumbents:	T_1		6.63	5.17	5.92	6.60	7.34	F=3.80,p=.05
			(68)	(6)	(26)	(10)	(26)	
	T_2		6.36	5.20	5.15	6.57	7.74	F=6.88,p=.01
			(66)	(5)	(27)	(7)	(27)	

political violence initially, politicians are the least militant
at the second observations. We will return to this point during
analysis of change data.

When asked to choose between legitimate and illegitimate
solutions to current problems, inmates with divergent views of
their fellow inmates see more eye-to-eye than on the approval in-
dex. Right guys and outlaws are again most favorable towards
violent efforts to solve political problems both before and after
transfer.

In terms of willingness to condone political militancy, then,
outlaws and right guys are well above the prison norm. In order
to ascertain the extent to which their favorable attitudes to-
wards militancy coincide with actual behavior, however, one must
examine reports of prior protest behavior. Expressions of sup-
port for militancy which are not backed up by a willingness to
engage in dissident behavior should not be taken as reflections
of a genuinely militant stance. Those whose actions are congru-
ent with their predispositions, however, may be viewed as more
authentically militant.

In Table 4, the prior protest rates of the four inmate types
are reported. Men coming to prison with the most extensive in-
volvement in rallies, demonstrations and violent protests tend to
resent prison officials and to be engaged in the collective life
of the prison, both before and after transfer. This is demon-
strated by the high protest scores of right guys as opposed to
other prisoners. In every instance, right guys are the only
group whose prior protest rates are above the sample mean.

TABLE 4

Mean Protest Scores by Inmate Typology

		Grand Mean	Square John	Politician	Outlaw	Right Guy	Significance
All Incumbents:	T_1	7.03 (n=261)	5.93 (n=44)	6.95 (n=87)	6.60 (n=45)	7.91 (n=84)	F=7.61,p=.01
	T_2	6.90 (n=218)	6.37 (n=27)	6.52 (n=58)	6.50 (n=46)	7.54 (n=87)	F=3.90,p=.01
Stable Incumbents:		7.14 (n=88)	6.13 (n=8)	6.97 (n=32)	5.69 (n=13)	8.06 (n=35)	F=3.84,p=.05

Also noteworthy is the below-average participation rate of asocial prisoners, particularly stable ones. Despite their youth, lengthy criminal history, extensive use of violence, and high levels of political estrangement, men who are solidly committed to the outlaw prison style have the fewest experiences with oppositional politics. For them, alienation is tied not so much to active rebellion as to withdrawal and interpersonal combativeness. Deficient in the capacity to engage successfully in many social activities, outlaws' hatred of correctional authorities is unrelated to previous political participation.

The tendency is for political activists to gravitate immediately towards the most anti-social role within the prison community and to retain that orientation as time passes. For such men alienation and lack of personal control are associated less with apathy than with a relatively high level of rebellious activity. Over half of the right guy group report taking part in protests and rallies; between 35% and 40% indicate prior participation in sit-ins, pickets and boycotts, and violent demonstrations. The majority approve of all such activities, and two out of five approve joining a group to overthrow the government by force. In light of the fact that right guys are the group most likely to have participated in political protests and to express approval of such behavior, the plausible conclusion is that they are the most genuinely militant group.

The fact that they do not reject conventional politics more often than outlaws is not necessarily inconsistent with this conclusion. While most right guys openly condone many forms of

political protest, they do not totally reject the use of other, more conventional modes of political participation. This is supported by the fact that right guys report the most frequent involvement in conventional as well as protest behavior.[2] Outlaws are again below the inmate norm in this regard.

Thus when asked to evaluate the relative utility of the two political modes, right guys are likely to be more ambivalent than when asked simply to approve or disapprove of militancy in the abstract. Outlaws are generally inclined towards violent responses. Their low self-esteem, high status inferiority and ethnocentrism, and their inability to meet either set of social demands in prison suggests that their rejection of non-violent politics is largely a by-product of a nihilistic, defeatist outlook. Their sub-normal rate of political participation supports this conclusion.

As has been the case in every area of inmate attitudes, an adequate understanding of militancy in prison must be founded not on a unidimensional concept of acceptance or rejection of conventional values, but on a composite index of prison styles. Erik Wright, in The Politics of Punishment,[3] quotes the views of several San Quentin prisoners on the issue of inmate militancy. While these men are not identified by Wright in terms of their prison style, many of their comments appear to fit the contrasting political outlooks of the square John, politician, outlaw and right guy. Based upon the foregoing analysis of the inmate typology, I have selected excerpts from Wright's interviews to help summarize interrole political differences.

Square Johns are the most allegiant prisoners both in their

adherence to staff expectations and in their commitment to con-

ventional political beliefs. Their interest in political activ-

ities, both conventional and unconventional, is below the norm

for prisoners. Less than one-third of this group has ever taken

part in any of the political activities listed.[4] Their lack of

identification with prison militants is captured in the following

statement by a white inmate in his mid-thirties:

> "There is tremendous bitterness here,
> especially among the radicals, it seems.
> They feel bitter at the prison because
> they deny their own guilt. I'm not
> bitter. I did wrong. I broke the law.
> I did about as low a thing as you could
> do. But I'm not bitter because I
> needed the punishment."[5]

Politicians are close to the norm among prisoners in terms

of prior protest activity. Fewer than half of this group reports

ever taking part in any form of protest. They have, nonetheless,

a strong sense of confidence in their capabilities, political

and otherwise. They are largely self-interested, not unusually

alienated, and moreover, are relatively reluctant to endorse many

forms of political violence. One black prisoner gives the flavor

of their view of prison militants:

> "I dig a lot of what the Panthers talk about,
> but I always try to avoid those kinds of
> groups, because I always try to think how
> the people who count will look at it. Here
> that means the Adult Authority. If they
> know you are with the militants, they'll
> just let you sit here."[6]

Outlaws are favorably disposed to the use of violence, in-

cluding political violence. They refuse to see themselves as

responsible for their condition, blaming society and the prison
administration for their problems. Their low estimate of the
political process is coupled with relatively high racial intol-
erance, not with the personal skills or confidence necessary to
partake in effective, purposeful political action. Support for
political violence among these men is more expressive than in-
strumental, as evidenced by the resigned tone of the following
comments:

> "When we come here, we don't expect to
> get out. We know that. We are just tired
> of getting fucked over so we are going to
> fight. Once you decide that, it doesn't
> matter so much whether you fight here or
> on the streets. If you fight on the streets,
> you'll end up back here anyway... If the
> shit does start, we will blow the top off.
> There will be a blood bath."[7]

The militancy of right guys goes beyond personal bitterness
and invective. Their defiance of correctional authorities is
presaged by their defiant political style prior to confinement.

Support for political militancy among these men is not
superficial or rhetorical; it reflects a firm belief, held by the
majority of right guys, that such behavior is defensible as right
and just. Here are the illustrative views of a white prisoner:

> "I've been poor always. That is all there
> is in prison- poor people. I am beginning
> to realize that there is not a war on pov-
> erty in this country, there is a war on
> poor people. There is not much fanfare
> about it, but it is true. Poor people
> have to start fighting back. That is why
> they have prisons and I guess that makes
> us all prisoners of war. People aren't
> buying this so much any more. We know
> we have to get together and fight back."[8]

There is plainly an association between political militancy and prison styles. The most reliably militant prisoners tend to adopt the right guy style. There is a further question concerning the dynamics of this association. The issue now is the extent to which the relationship between militancy and antisocial reactions to confinement is mediated through feelings of political alienation, ethnocentrism, efficacy and external control. In other words, does the political militancy of right guys and the political acquiescence of square Johns tell us anything beyond the fact that these two groups hold different combinations of political beliefs?

The importance of these beliefs for inmate militancy is determined by performing multiple classification analyses on the militancy measures. In each case, the relevant background attributes and political attitudes were entered as sources of variation along with the inmate typology. The resulting distribution of mean militancy scores for the four roles provides a measure of the relationship between militancy and prison style after partialling out the effects of all other factors.

For the measure of prior protest activity, the relevant attributes were age and race. The major covariates among the attitudinal dimensions were alienation and political efficacy. The adjusted mean protest scores for the inmate typology are shown in Table 5. The results confirm that prior protest is directly linked to prison style even when controlling for all other sources of variation (partial beta=.21).

TABLE 5

PRIOR PROTEST ACTIVITY BY INMATE TYPOLOGY, ADJUSTED FOR RACE, AGE, ALIENATION AND POLITICAL EFFICACY[a]

		Grand Mean	Square John	Politicians	Outlaw	Right Guy	Significance
Adjusted Mean Level of Prior Protest:		7.17	6.31	7.45	6.60	7.56	F=3.25,p=.023
	(N)	(195)	(32)	(63)	(30)	(70)	Beta=.21

Multiple $R^{(b)}$=.472

(a) Multiple Classification Analysis, providing distribution and significance of mean protest scores for the inmate typology, controlling for the effects of other variables.

(b) Multiple correlation coefficient between prior protest and all other variables.

Square Johns and outlaws fall well below the sample mean. Right guys remain significantly higher than their peers. Even among men of the same age and race, who share the same sense of political confidence and trust, protest behavior is associated with inmate solidarity and, to a lesser degree, bitterness towards the prison administration. It may be that one of the consequences of engagement in unorthodox collective political activities is the acquisition of a greater sense of solidarity with one's peers and resentment of authority figures, which then carries over into prison. Alternatively both protest behavior and inmate resentment and solidarity may be manifestations of some antecedent factor, an idea to which we will return in the conclusion.

There is also a direct link between prison style and approval of political protests even when controlling for race, alienation, external control and ethnocentrism (Table 6). Adjusted inter-role differences fall just short of the .05 confidence level among newly-arrived prisoners, but attain significance among the same men after transfer. The partial beta between the inmate typology and willingness to condone militant acts is .17 at the first observation, and .21 at the latter setting.

Racial differences are less pronounced than those between inmate roles. Right guys continue to hold the most favorable opinions of political violence before and after transfer. Outlaws, it should be pointed out, fall from an unadjusted level of

TABLE 6

APPROVAL OF POLITICAL PROTESTS BY INMATE TYPOLOGY, ADJUSTED FOR RACE,
ALIENATION, INTERNAL CONTROL AND ETHNOCENTRISM[a]

		Grand Mean	Square John	Politician	Outlaw	Right Guy	Significance
Mean Approval of Political Violence:	T_1	6.51	6.07	6.54	6.01	6.98	F=2.21,p=.09
	N=	182	30	60	33	59	Beta=.17
	T_2	6.59	6.76	6.21	5.89	7.18	F=2.67,p=.05
	N=	135	20	40	25	50	Beta=.21

Multiple R[b]: .543

(a) Multiple Classification Analysis, providing distribution and significance of mean approval of political violence scores for the inmate typology, controlling for the effects of other sources of variation.

(b) Multiple correlation coefficient between approval of political violence and all sources of variation.

support which is very close to the sample mean, to the least

militant position.

This is due to the tendency for ethnocentrism to inflate in-

mate approval of political violence. The partial beta between

ethnocentrism and the approval index is .36 at both observations.

Outlaws are the most ethnocentric inmate group; hence much of

their endorsement of political radicalism simply reflects their

intolerance of outgroups. By removing the effects of ethnocen-

trism from the relationship between prison style and approval of

political violence, outlaws emerge as the group least favorable

towards protest politics.

The right guys' taste for militancy, by contrast, is only in

part a measure of their feelings of alienation, ethnocentrism,

and external control. Other inmates who share those feelings are

not as willing to defend the use of political violence. The

causal ordering of this association is not self-evident. Mili-

tancy may lead certain inmates to adopt an antisocial position

in the prison community. Conversely, those who have acquired the

right guy orientation may thereby be receptive to dissident po-

litical views. Or each of these two orientations may be out-

growths of some antecedent, unmeasured factor.

The final index of inmate militancy, preference for violent

versus non-violent political tactics, is related to inmate roles

only via the effects of alienation, personal control, and past

personal violence (Table 7). The tendency to reject conventional

political solutions does not change significantly across the

typology after adjusting for these other variables. The partial

TABLE 7

REJECTION OF NON-VIOLENT POLITICAL TACTICS BY INMATE TYPOLOGY, ADJUSTED FOR RACE, ALIENATION, INTERNAL CONTROL AND PRIOR PERSONAL VIOLENCE[a]

		Grand Mean	Square John	Politician	Outlaw	Right Guy	Significance
Mean Rejection of Non-Violent Political Tactics:	T_1	4.85	4.79	4.78	4.80	4.98	F=0.24,p=NS
	N=	266	47	85	50	84	Beta=.05
	T_2	4.94	4.53	4.74	5.13	5.08	F=0.93,p=NS
	N=	216	24	59	48	85	Beta=.11

Multiple $R^{(b)}$=.538

(a) Multiple Classification Analysis, providing distribution and significance of mean rejection of non-violent tactics for the inmate typology, controlling for the effects of other sources of variation.

(b) Multiple correlation coefficient between rejection of non-violent tactics and all sources of variation.

betas are insubstantial (.05 at the first observation, .11 at the second).

The right guys' failure to manifest relatively strong preferences for unconventional political behavior after controlling for other sources of variation is consistent with their history of active engagement in both conventional and unconventional modes of political action. They are opposed to conventional political behavior only insofar as they have lost faith in governmental trustworthiness and responsiveness, hold external forces responsible for their current status, and have been involved in violent personal encounters.

In effect, then, this finding only underscores the genuinely political nature of the right guys' support for militancy. To the extent that their evaluations of alternative political strategies are not reflexive, but are tied to unfavorable opinions about the political system and its accountability for their condition, those evaluations can be considered reasoned, instrumental beliefs.

This does not, of course, negate the previous findings of direct associations between inmate role, prior protest, and positive regard for unconventional political acts. Prior engagement in and current support for political protests play an important part in differentiating inmate prison styles. Nevertheless, evaluations of the relative utility of such violence are more a function of larger political orientations. This distinction is primarily analytical, however, since those larger political

orientations are themselves distributed differently among the four inmate types.

To this point it has been established that the most anti-social prison style is linked with the most militant political proclivities. The authenticity of those proclivities has been given credence by evidence of above-average political activism among right guys. The relevance of personal violence and negative feelings towards the political system is verified by the fact that right guys are more apt to prefer unconventional political behavior only to the extent that they differ from other inmates on these factors. The association between their political activism, their approval of protests, and their prison style remains, however, even when the effects of youth, racial membership, and other political beliefs are cancelled out.

The relatively militant perspective of right guys reflects many aspects of their prison style. They are no strangers to violence, political and otherwise. They more often than most inmates see themselves as the victims of circumstances over which they have no control, which, given their convict status, is not unwarranted. They lack faith in the government generally and the criminal justice system in particular. Even at the outset of their sentence they are strongly opposed to correctional officials and hold the company of their peers in higher regard than that of conventional society. In this light, their militancy is not hard to understand.

C. Effects of Incarceration

Of the three principle indices of inmate militancy, only the two attitudinal measures are subject to modification during confinement. It is not easy to predict, based on what we know so far about attitude change in the inmate sample, how incarceration will act upon militancy.

Opposition to authorities strengthens, particularly among blacks. Given the covariance of such opposition with both militancy scales, one is warranted to expect militancy also to grow over time. Internal control, on the other hand, varies inversely with the same two scales, and increases over time, thus exerting a counterveiling trend. Alienation, which is also importantly tied not only to militancy but to resentment of authorities, shows no movement in either direction.

There is, then, evidence both to support and to contradict predictions that militancy will rise, fall and remain constant during the initial phase of inmates' sentences. The most confident expectation is that, whatever happens to the sample as a whole, the effects of incarceration will be felt differently by different inmate groups. It also is unlikely, considering earlier findings, that the severity of the prison climate will be as discriminating a factor in attitude change as will race and inmate role.

Allegations that prison turns men into hard-core radicals are not consistent with the mean militancy scores for the present sample (Table 8). Neither index reveals noticeable change over time from the level found among incoming prisoners. Whether such

TABLE 8

CHANGE IN APPROVAL OF POLITICAL PROTESTS
DURING INCARCERATION

	N	$\overline{X}_1$	$\overline{X}_2$	T Value	Significance
Entire Sample:	134	6.37	6.55	.95	NS
Inmate Typology: (All T_1 Incumbents)					
Square Johns	19	5.47	6.32	1.74	.05
Politicians	41	5.93	5.73	-.88	NS
Outlaws	20	6.05	6.65	1.01	NS
Right Guys	40	7.20	7.13	-.20	NS
(Stable Incumbents)					
Square Johns	4	4.0	4.50	99.0[a]	.01
Politicians	23	5.70	5.26	-1.74	.05
Outlaws	6	6.83	7.0	.09	NS
Right Guys	21	7.67	7.67	--	NS
Race:					
White	87	6.28	6.14	-.63	NS
Black	30	7.07	7.33	.56	NS
Chicano	13	5.92	7.54	3.15	.005

(a) The small number of cases renders the T value for this
subgroup meaningless.

CHANGE IN REJECTION OF NON-VIOLENT TACTICS
DURING INCARCERATION

	N	$\overline{X}_1$	$\overline{X}_2$	T value	Significance
Entire Sample:	242	4.93	4.86	-.59	NS
Inmate Typology: (All T_2 Incumbents)					
Square John	29	4.48	3.97	-1.88	.05
Politician	63	4.25	4.25	--	NS
Outlaw	52	5.31	5.40	.32	NS
Right Guy	87	5.37	5.41	.23	NS
Race:					
White	133	4.72	4.59	-.83	NS
Black	76	5.41	5.07	-1.56	NS
Chicano	33	4.67	5.45	2.57	.01

sweeping radicalization comes only after prolonged confinement or whether it never comes at all, there is no simple correlation between an additional few months in prison and support for political violence among California prisoners taken as a whole.

Nor are men in the harshest prisons more likely to embrace militant beliefs during confinement than others. Those who rank their prison below the state average do not display greater militancy in absolute terms nor a greater likelihood of becoming more militant than men doing easier time. The proposition that prison engenders radicalism is not totally lacking in support, however, if one examines what happens to different racial and inmate role groupings. Let us examine racial patterns first.

The most salient fact of life for racial groups in prison is the power of organized prison gangs. A California Senate Subcommittee report on crime in prison recently determined that most of the 80 killings and 200 serious assaults in the prison system over the last five years have been the work of four major gangs: The Black Guerrilla Family, The Aryan Brotherhood, Nuestra Familia, and the Mexican Mafia.[9]

The Black Guerilla Family has been in the public spotlight more often than the white or chicano gangs because of its association with radical organizations such as Venceremos and the Symbionese Liberation Army, and because of the noteriety of three of its members, the Soledad Brothers: George Jackson, Fleeta Drumgo, and John Clutchette. The small but active Aryan Brotherhood, originally known as "The Blue-Bird Gang" and later "the Nazis", claims Charles Manson as its most notorious member.

But the two groups which receive the least publicity- the Mexican Mafia and Nuestra Familia- provide prison officials and law enforcement agencies with the biggest problems. The Mafia, oldest of California's prison gangs, has an organization outside prison and has dominated street crime in the East Los Angeles area for the past decade.[10] Nuestra Familia was formed in 1966 during a meeting in Palm Hall at the California Institution for men at Chino. Its original aim was to protect rural Chicanos from harassment by the urban members of the Mafia. In 1968, the two gangs declared war on each other.[11]

Both organizations have issued orders for their members to kill opposition prisoners on sight, which has lead prison administrators to avoid assigning a gang member to an institution controlled by the rival gang. The facilities at Chino, Tracy, and Soledad Central are considered Familia territory; the Mafia prevails in Folsom and San Quentin.

It is more than the internecine hostility between the two chicano gangs which concerns criminal justice officials. Rather, they fear that the mobilization of dedicated and violent criminals in prison will spill over into illegitimate activities on the streets.

"There was a time when law enforcement didn't think the prison gangs were much of a threat in society, but that has all changed now," according to the head of the Federal Drug Enforcement Administration's Narcotics Task Force in East Los Angeles.[12] They worry about the spread of such gangs into Arizona, Washington, New Mexico, Michigan and New York. The basis of their

concern is the threat of a new chicano criminal organization similar to the Cosa Nostra, but with radical overtones.

Data on political militancy among chicano prisoners are not reassuring to law enforcement officials on this point. There occurs a marked jump during confinement in the willingness of chicanos to support the use of political protest and to reject more orthodox political tactics. The mean change in militancy on both indices is far larger among chicanos than among blacks or whites.

It may be true that chicano gangs are more interested in controlling drug traffic and extortion rings than making revolution. But there is now evidence of radical overtones to their mobilization efforts. Chicanos do not arrive at the Reception Guidance Center with a reliably greater level of militancy than other men. But after the first months in their assigned institutions, these same chicanos are well above the sample mean on both approval of political protest and rejection of legitimate tactics.

We cannot know with certainty that it is the rivalry between the two chicano gangs which engenders their more militant approach to politics. Something in the prison environment must account for this change, however; the one fact of prison life which plainly affects only chicanos is the "war" between Nuestra Familia and the Mexican Mafia.

Turning to change in militancy among inmate roles, there is additional evidence of a link between imprisonment and protest politics. The direction of incarceration effects is not uniform

across the typology, however. Prison fosters a greater willing-
ness to express support for political militancy among the one
group of incoming prisoners for whom correctional authorities
have the highest hopes- the square Johns.

Most men who initially manifest prosocial sentiments about
prison authorities and other convicts defect from that position
during the early part of their sentence. Comparison of the
militancy levels of these men at the two observations reveals
a concommitant change in their political action preferences.
Incoming prisoners who abandon either their sympathetic view of
prison officials or their distaste for inmate society, or both,
become more prone to condone the use of extremist political
activities. They are not, however, more apt to express a pref-
erence for such activities over conventional behavior.

It has already been argued that the most prisonized inmate
style includes themes of political participation and extremism.
Defectors from the least prisonized role change not just in their
attitudes towards prison reference groups but in their political
orientation as well. This suggests that there is a political
theme in the prosocial style, a conservative component which
stands in sharp relief against the militancy of antisocial in-
mates.

This is borne out by the fact that those men who adopt the
square John prison style after their sentence has begun display
increased support for conventional political solutions. Whatever
their initial response to prison may have been, these men demon-
strate again the relevance of politics to one's position in the

inmate society. Increased adherence to the expectations of their custodians is accompanied by greater adherence to prevailing political norms.

Fewer men switch over to the square John style during confinement than to any other role. Hence, they represent only a small faction within the prison community. But they are not alone in their growing opposition to the militancy which characterizes the right guy style. Men who are firmly established in the politician role become less approving of radical political acts during the initial months of confinement. This helps explain why, upon entering prison, square Johns are least likely to describe political protests as justified, while several months later they are more approving than politicians.

Stable politicians do not become less bitter towards prison officials, less admiring of other prisoners, or less alienated, and yet their expressed opinions about political behavior are modified by incarceration. They evidently learn something during the intervening months which leads them to conclude that approval of political dissidence is incompatible with their prison style. As one prisoner hold Erik Wright, "Once you know the way things function here, you only hurt yourself by fighting things".[13] Whether or not radical beliefs appeal to them, explicit endorsement of unconventional activities comes to be seen as pointless and self-defeating.

D. Discussion

The analysis of inmate political attitudes has been completed. The capstone of this study is the persistent and

pervasive contrasts among the four inmate roles in their attitudes towards political militancy. To the extent that political militancy is more frequently found among the most anti-social men in the prison community, the proposition that criminal and political deviance are related gains support. Further support accrues from the evidence that anti-social prisoners back up their approval of militancy with the most extensive involvement in dissident political activities.

Finally, their political action preferences are congruent with their perceptions of the social and political forces at work in this country, perceptions which are more negative than those of most prisoners. Neither the solidarity which right guys manifest with other prisoners nor their opposition to prison authorities can be understood fully unless viewed in their political context. Here are a group of political and social outcasts, refusing to abide by regime norms or to accept regime definitions of their behavior. They see themselves as fighting back against a system which has failed to perform adequately and which has abused and thwarted them.

At the other extreme of the inmate society is a smaller group of men who are submissive to correctional and political authority. They are the least likely to have engaged in any form of political activity, nor do they view such behavior favorably. This position is difficult to maintain, however, and those who abandon it- the majority of square John incumbents- become correspondingly more militant. Conversely, those few men who gravitate towards the square John role during the course of

confinement display measurably less favorable opinions about political dissidence than they did at the start of their sentence.

Politicians appear to see militancy not only as useless in prison, but as counterproductive to their strategy of optimizing personal benefits and avoiding any acts which would antagonize important others. The decrease in overt support for militancy among stable politicians should not be viewed as a strong vote of confidence in the political process.

By the same token, the willingness of asocial inmates to approve protests and reject non-violence should not be interpreted as genuine militancy. It is more a by-product of the antagonistic and violent style by which they cope with all manner of problems. They have not displayed a penchant for political activism in the past as have the right guys. Ethnocentrism plays a major part in the formation of their political views. Outlaws are more of a disciplinary phenomenon than a political one.

Racial gangs must also be considered relevant to our understanding of inmate politics. The revolutionary bent of the Black Guerrilla Family and the reactionary tenor of the Aryan Brotherhood do not alter black or white militancy. Chicano gangs, however, have received inadequate attention, especially as agents of political socialization.

Chicano inmates are the most militant racial group, but only after their sentence has begun. Something in the prison climate brings about this change; the stridency and agitation of chicano prison groups stands as the most obvious explanation.

For the California inmate population as a whole, however, militancy is more widespread than formal gang memberships. Data presented in Chapter 2 indicates that about one-fourth of those sampled prefer political violence over more conventional approaches. More than one-third of the sample describe protest politics as acceptable under some circumstances. Twenty-five percent report participating in at least one violent protest, while over half have attended a political rally.

Prison officials estimate that the formal membership in all racial gangs at about 10% of the inmate population, a figure which is probably somewhat high for whites and low for chicanos.[14] Thus, while organized gangs, particularly chicano gangs, probably have a direct bearing on the political and social climate of the inmate society, they cannot by themselves account for the breadth of prisoner support for political militancy.

Incarceration effects on inmate militancy are not uniform across the prison population. Incarceration may be conceptualized in two complementary ways. Viewed as a temporal phenomenon, incarceration promotes militancy among chicanos and incoming square Johns who defect to other roles; it simultaneously fosters decreased militancy among stable politicians and late entrants into the square John role.

If incarceration is conceived of in terms of normative cross-pressures to which all inmates must respond, the picture changes. There is no one modal prison style. Nonetheless, the most militant inmate role- the right guy- is generally considered to be the most adaptive and admired role in the convict society.

There is evidence to support that notion in this study. Over time the right guy position retains an above-average number of its incumbents and attracts more new adherents than the other three prison styles

Militancy and incarceration are thus related via the tendency for the most "prisonized" inmates to display the most support for political violence. Sykes and Messinger's comment becomes relevant now for the political scientist as well as for the penologist: "The right guy is the hero of the inmate social system."[14]

It is important to remember, however, that despite the increased popularity of the right guy role over time, neither alienation nor militancy increases among those inmates who adopt that style during confinement. There could be a time lag which separates acquisition of this prison style from the acquisition of its concommitant political beliefs, in which case militancy would increase at a subsequent stage of incarceration. The brief period of time between observations precludes a full understanding of the dynamics of attitude change in prison.

It also bears repeating that political militancy does not attain normative proportions in the California prison system. There are still large numbers of criminally deviant men in prison whose political style is either allegiant or apathetic. Even among right guys the majority do not prefer violent to non-violent political tactics. By the standards of the larger society, however, their militancy is undeniably strong. Criminal and political deviance do tend to occur together.

NOTES

1. Data on the political attitudes of men with differing political self-identifications are located at the end of these notes.

2. The mean participation rates of the four inmate roles for non-protest activities are located at the end of these notes.

3. Erik Wright, The Politics of Punishment, New York, Harper & Row, 1973, pp. 134-140.

4. These activities include writing to a newspaper or magazine, signing a petition, working with others to solve a local problem, attending a city or town council meeting, going to see a public official in person, going to a protest march, a sit-in, or a peaceful rally, participating in a political picket or boycott, and going to a violent protest.

5. Wright, op. cit., pp. 139-40.

6. Ibid., p. 139.

7. Ibid., p. 136.

8. Ibid., p. 137.

9. "Prison Gang Clout Spreads", San Jose Mercury, December 3, 1975, Sec. A, p. 2.

10. Ibid., Sec. A, p. 24.

11. Ibid., Sec. A, p. 24.

12. "Unique Cop Team State's Main Tool in Fighting Gangs", San Jose Mercury, Dec. 6, 1975, Sec. A, p. 2.

13. Wright, op. cit., pp. 137-38.

14. Gresham Sykes and Sheldon Messinger, "The Inmate Social System", in Richard Cloward, et al., Theoretical Studies in Social Organization of the Prison", New York, Social Science Research Council, 1960, p. 10.

INMATE POLITICAL ATTITUDES BY POLITICAL SELF-IDENTIFICATION

		Grand Mean	(N)	Conser-vative	(N)	Middle-of-the Road	(N)	Lib-eral	(N)	Radi-cal	(N)	Significance
Mean Alienation	T_1	11.17	(223)	11.47	(95)	10.35	(37)	11.11	(78)	11.69	(13)	F=1.70 p=NS
	T_2	11.39	(178)	11.61	(79)	10.84	(56)	11.16	(56)	12.42	(12)	F=1.36, p=NS
Mean Legal Efficacy	T_1	6.72	(204)	6.57	(87)	6.92	(36)	6.80	(71)	6.70	(10)	F=0.23 p=NS
	T_2	6.47	(156)	5.80	(64)	6.67	(27)	6.89	(54)	7.91	(11)	F=4.15, p=.01
Mean Political Efficacy	T_1	7.36	(182)	6.52	(73)	6.67	(30)	8.24	(67)	9.33	(12)	F=11.08, p=.01
	T_2	7.34	(139)	6.63	(54)	6.58	(24)	8.28	(50)	8.18	(11)	F=7.75, p=.01
Mean Internal Control	T_1	11.96	(217)	11.22	(90)	12.37	(38)	12.58	(76)	12.31	(13)	F=4.20, p=.01
	T_2	12.38	(174)	11.65	(77)	13.00	(29)	12.96	(55)	12.85	(13)	F=3.85, p=.025
Mean Ethno-centrism	T_1	5.09	(211)	5.20	(87)	5.14	(36)	4.79	(75)	5.92	(13)	F=5.24, p=.01
	T_2	5.03	(165)	5.10	(71)	5.16	(31)	4.75	(52)	5.55	(11)	F=2.69, p=.05

Footnote 2

MEAN PRIOR NON-PROTEST ACTIVITY BY INMATE TYPOLOGY

		Grand Mean	Square John	Politician	Outlaw	Right Guy	Significance
All Incumbents:	T_1	7.24	6.57	7.28	6.96	7.74	F=3.29,p=.05
	N=	254	44	83	47	80	
	T_2	7.25	7.16	7.29	6.95	7.41	F=0.48,p=NS
	N=	208	25	59	44	80	
Stable Incumbents:		7.49	7.13	7.66	6.46	7.87	F=1.43,NS
	N=	81	8	29	13	31	

CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSION

The goal of this study has been to explore the nexus between two disparate and hitherto unrelated bodies of knowledge, one dealing with the nature of the prison population, the other with the nature of political militancy. At the heart of the study from the outset has been the widely held but empirically untested belief that there exists an important yet poorly understood connection between criminal and political deviance.

The lack of prior studies has made it advisable to approach the question in more than one way. The initial research design therefore utilized an analytical distinction between the importance of prison recruitment processes versus the impact of imprisonment _per se_. Behind this distinction lay the desire to determine the degree to which the nature of the inmate political culture depends upon the kinds of people being sent to prison as opposed to the consequences of their being punished.

To be maintained, however, such a distinction requires access to two kinds of data: the distribution of political attitudes among inmates who have had no prior prison experience, and the political attitudes of both recidivists and non-recidivists at each stage of their sentence and after their return to society.

The research design employed here did not produce such data. The inmate sample contained insufficient numbers of first-time prisoners to permit an adequate assessment of convicted felons' pre-incarceration beliefs. The elapsed time between the two observations, moreover, allows us to examine only the effects of the initial months of imprisonment.

For most prisoners, this is less than half of the time they will ultimately serve for their present crime. Hence, the extent to which prior confinement affects inmates' attitudes at the start of their current sentences and the extent to which their attitudes change during the latter part of their sentence (and upon release) can only be speculated about at this point.

Owing to these limitations, the distinction between recruitment and incarceration effects proves to be of limited operational value with regard to the major thesis of this study. The gross contrasts between the attitudes of incoming prisoners and those of unmatched controls do tend to confirm that California prisons inherit an unusually militant population. Further support comes from the finding that, regardless of socioeconomic attributes, incoming prisoners whose criminal identities are most firmly engrained tend to be more militant than prisoners with weaker ties to the criminal subculture.

There must be qualifications to these two observations, however. While incoming prisoners more frequently manifest militant proclivities than do non-inmates, the absolute level of inmate militancy fails to attain normative proportions. Militancy is still a minority position among California prisoners, although admittedly a more popular one than is the case on the outside.

Nor is the strength of the relationship between political militancy and criminal acculturation so strong that the two forms of deviance can be treated as even roughly synonymous. There are extremely militant inmates who are not deeply imbedded in the criminal subculture, just as there are many hard-core criminals who do not support militant politics.

One must also remember that militancy is not the only polit-
ical orientation found more often among prisoners. Party and
ideologica. identifications, participation in conventional polit-
ical activities, and clear-cut political strategy preferences are
all found less commonly among prisoners than non-prisoners. It
is therefore more accurate to say that conventional forms of polit-
ical involvement are underrepresented in prison than to argue that
either militancy or apathy typifies contemporary convicts.

Prison recruitment processes, in short, have a substantial,
albeit mixed, effect on the prison political culture. The in-
bred character of the California prison population prevents, how-
ever, a precise assessment of how much of the difference between
prisoners and controls is attributable to the prior effects of
incarceration. Such an assessment could best be made in circum-
stances where recidivism is not such a strong prerequisite for
admission to prison as is the case in California.

The second approach used here to evaluate the proposition
that criminal deviance and political militancy are interrelated
required a more complex analysis. The key was to derive a satis-
factory conception of the phenomenon of incarceration.

Two complementary approaches have been used in this study:
incarceration as time and incarceration as style. The former
approach leads to examination of attitude change among the same
individuals before and after their prison sentences begin in
earnest. The latter seeks a correspondence between a person's
political predispositions and the adaptive pattern he displays
to prison cross-pressures.

The evidence with respect to the first of these approaches does not support the politicization of deviance hypothesis. The overall distribution of attitudes regarding militant political activities remains steady over time. Shifts in attitudes in the direction of greater militancy among some inmate groups are neutralized by concurrent change away from militant beliefs among other inmates. Nor do those with weak criminal identities or those assigned to the most deprivational prisons manifest unusual movement towards greater militancy. The marginal effects of an additional exposure to prison, in other words, do not include an overall increase in inmates' predispositions towards militancy.

This does not necessarily mean, of course, that length of imprisonment is unrelated to the prevalence of militant beliefs among inmates. Only evidence from repeated observations of the same individuals throughout their prison sentence and after their release can determine the full nature of this relationship. The discovery of counterveiling changes in militancy among inmate subgroups underscores the merits of obtaining such evidence.

The strongest indication of the interconnection between incarceration and militancy is the parallel between prison styles and political styles. Those prisoners most submissive to prison authorities are also the most acquiescent politically. Allegiance to conventional as opposed to criminal values is associated with an apathetic response to the political process. Moreover, migration into and out of the most prosocial prison style is associated with corresponding shifts in attitudes towards political militancy.

At the other extreme of the prison society, the most pris-
onized inmate role is characterized by the firmest support for
militant politics. Adherence to an antisocial prison style is
associated with more negative perceptions of government and great-
er rejection of conventional political tactics than is found among
other prison types. Such a prison style tends to be chosen by
inmates whose militancy is not only congruent with their per-
ceptions of the political process but is also accompanied by an
active record of participation in both conventional and unortho-
dox political activities.

Even in this context, however, the politicization of deviance
hypothesis is not fully supported. Many antisocial prisoners are
not politically involved. Militancy is not the rule even among
the most highly prisonized inmate group. The importance of the
association between the right guy style and militancy lies in the
positive regard which other inmates reportedly have for right
guys. Such high esteem gives them the potential to act as opinion
leaders or socialization agents within the prison community.

Moreover, political militancy, while most common among right
guys, is not their exclusive domain. Approval of militancy, for
example, is not infrequent among outlaws, although their below-
average political participation and the connection between
ethnocentrism and their political beliefs suggests that genuine
militancy is rare among such prisoners.

The fourth inmate type, the politician, displays nearly the
same disdain for militancy as the square John. But politicians'

records of participation in political protests shows them to be
more active in politics than square Johns or outlaws.

The fact that stable politicians become less willing to
approve of militant beliefs should therefore be interpreted
cautiously. Politicians' decreased militancy and outlaws' rela-
tive willingness to endorse militancy are best viewed in light of
their contrasting prison styles: one accomodating and mani-
pulative, the other violent and exploitative.

The inmate typology, in other words, emerges from this study
as the central framework within which both temporal and cross-
sectional relationships between incarceration and militancy should
be interpreted. This bivariate classification scheme does not
reveal everything worth knowing about the effects of imprisonment.
But without using the typology inmate political beliefs are diffi-
cult to understand.

Reliance on such fourfold heuristic devices is not uncommon
in social research. Merton's[1] typology of deviant reactions to
anomie, for example, uses goal attachment and drive towards goal-
attainment as the principle axes. The "ritualist" responds by
maintaining conventional goal attachments but employs no effective
means to actualize those goals. The "innovative" response seeks
to actualize approved goals by unconventional methods. "With-
drawal" is a response characterized by abandoning approved goals
without the substitution of new ones, while the "rebellious"
pattern combines rejection of conventional goals and active
striving towards the attainment of new ones.

Without endeavoring simply to equate Schrag's types and
Merton's, I would suggest that prison styles may reflect in part
differential responses to the anomic character of prison life.
Square Johns and politicians, for example, tend to endorse con-
ventional norms more strongly than outlaws and right guys. The
former types are not as overtly hostile towards government in
general and prison authorities in particular. They are more
likely to express negative opinions about militant political acts
than the latter types.

But in terms of goal-actualization, politicians and right guys
appear to make the greater effort. Outlaws and square Johns tend
to be less involved in the activities of the inmate world and also
to have less extensive histories of political participation than
other inmates.

Similar composite indices have also been used in political
research. James Barber[2] argues that the four combinations of
conation (activity-passivity) and affect (positiveness-negative-
ness) comprise basic tendencies in the behavioral styles of
politicians and non-politicians alike:

> "In nearly every study of personality,
> some form of the active-passive contrast is
> critical; the general tendency to act or be
> acted upon is evident in such concepts as
> dominance-submission, extraversion- intro-
> version, aggression-timidity, attack-defense,
> fight-flight, engagement-withdrawal, approach-
> avoidance.[3]

Similarly, the concept of valence tendency is a common theme
in discussing personality differences. Barber continues:

"We catch on fairly quickly to the
affective dimension— whether the person
appears to be optimistic or pessimistic,
hopeful or skeptical, happy or sad."[4]

The importance of such composite indices for political mili-
tancy has also been raised elsewhere. William Gamson, for example,
argues that "a combination of high efficacy and low trust is a
potent combination leading to high mobilization for political
action."[5] Jeffery Paige demonstrates Gamson's point in his
study of ghetto riot participants.[6] The individuals most likely
to report taking part in the 1967 Newark riot were those high in
political information (used to measure efficacy) and low in polit-
ical trust.

Paige goes on to present a four-fold typology based upon
efficacy and trust. A high trust— high efficacy combination he
calls allegiant; a high trust— low efficacy combination is de-
scribed as subordinate; low trust— low efficacy individuals are
termed alienated, and the low trust— high efficacy combination is
labelled dissident.

The point is that a common thread may be running through the
typologies of Schrag, Merton, Barber and Paige. They all attempt
to classify individuals in terms of two fundamental dimensions:
1) their attachment to legitimate values, be they the expectations
of correctional authorities (Schrag), goals of success and achieve-
ment (Merton), enjoyment of one's work (Barber) or support of the
government (Paige); and 2) their degree of outgoingness, i.e.,
solidarity with inmates (Schrag), drive towards goal-attainment
(Merton), activity level (Barber), or political efficacy (Paige).

The provisional evidence from this study suggests that inmate roles may be tied at least partially to differences among individuals on these two continua. Underlying prisoners' degree of solidarity with other inmates appears to be a general capacity for involvement in a variety of activities. Politicians and right guys are men who tend to be active in both prison and political affairs, rather than withdrawing into a small, protective clique. Square Johns and outlaws seem relatively unwilling or unable to enter into many such activities.

We may likewise view the resentment index as tapping, to some degree, a generalized predisposition towards favorable or unfavorable evaluations. Square Johns and politicians not only express less hatred of prison administrators, they are more positive in their self-esteem and comparison levels, their parole and post-release expectations, and their evaluations of the political system. Right guys and outlaws have correspondingly poor opinions in these matters.

The evidence here can only raise such a broad question; it cannot be properly evaluated or tested. The possibility, however, that processes of such generality are played out in the prison setting serves only to strengthen the case for further research in this area.

Questions concerning correctional policies are also raised by this study. In this regard the distinction between recruitment and incarceration processes again becomes useful. The implications of the present data for prison sentencing practices depend largely on the policy objectives. If the objective is merely to prevent

the popularity of militant beliefs in prison from increasing,
there is little in this study to indicate that a change is
necessary. Of course, without further observations of inmates,
it cannot be assumed that their mean level of militancy remains
constant throughout their stay in prison. The initial impact of
incarceration on the prison population does not, however, result
in a direct growth in militancy.

If the policy objective is to reduce prison militancy, then
decision-makers face a double-bind. Changing current California
recruitment policies so as to bring in a higher proportion of
relatively naive (and therefore non-militant) offenders runs the
risk that the number of men who become more militant during con-
finement will also increase. This is based upon the high de-
fection rate from the square John role, and the fact that those
who do defect manifest increased militancy during the early stage
of their sentence. Since naive offenders tend to gravitate ini-
tially towards that role, an increase in their numbers would
probably result in a greater proportion of the inmate population
which becomes prisonized (migrates away from the square John role
during imprisonment).

On the other hand, to divert more non-recidivists away from
prison in hopes of cutting down the number of men who are radi-
calized in confinement also entails risks. To the extent that
militancy is correlated with both criminal acculturation and
adherence to the most prisonized inmate style, any increase in
the proportion of "hard-core" offenders will likely produce a

corresponding increase in the proportion of men who enter prison already favorably disposed towards militancy.

The choice is not an easy one. It turns on whether it is preferable to have a prison population which is highly militant but stable over time, versus a prison population which is initially less militant, but which becomes increasingly so over time. Since, however, the absolute level of militancy is higher among right guys than among men who move away from the square John role, over-all inmate militancy is more likely to decline by decreasing the proportion of highly prisonized inmates.

The second set of policy implications concerns administrative practices within the prison rather than the recruitment policies which bring men there to begin with. In this context, the most important data are those demonstrating the direct tie between inmates' degree of resentment of the prison administration and their degree of political militancy.

No attempt has been made to establish the causal ordering of these correlations. It is unlikely, however, given the centrality of the resentment dimension in the lives of prisoners, that negative feelings towards prison authorities are totally the product of larger political preferences. Thus it is reasonable to assume that any steps which can be taken to reduce inmate hostility towards prison authorities would tend to ameliorate inmate support for political dissidence. Conversely, policies which aggravate inmate hostility are likely to encourage militant attitudes.

Prison deprivation levels do not directly affect resentment levels during the early months of imprisonment. The three

focal points for inmate hostility in the present study involve the indeterminate sentence, the fairness of prison guards, and the quality of prison programs. It cannot be determined if these are the most salient grievances of California prisoners, but it does appear that improvement in any or all of these areas might mitigate against inmate militancy.[7]

Clearly there are many other valid reasons for wishing to upgrade administrative-inmate relations, custodial personnel, and the vocational and treatment programs offered to inmates. These findings, in other words, lead to policy objectives which are to be desired regardless of their effect on inmate political attitudes. But the serious consequences of inmate resentment levels in terms of their opinions of the larger political system give added urgency to such objectives.

Finally, it should be evident, given the above data, that the relationship between the punishment of crime and political socialization processes is both intricate and important. Continuing attention can and should be given to the issues raised here, not only because of the theoretical and policy relevance of such issues, but because there is now good evidence of a relationship between imprisonment and political militancy.

NOTES

1. Robert Merton, Social Theory and Social Structure, New York, Free Press, 1968, pp. 193-211.

2. James Barber, The Presidential Character: Predicting Performance in the White House, Englewood Cliffs, N. J., Prentice-Hall, 1973.

3. Ibid., p. 12.

4. Ibid., p. 12.

5. William Gamson, "Political Trust and Its Implications", in Gilbert Abcarian and John Soule (ed.) Social Psychology and Political Behavior, Columbus, Ohio, Charles Merrill, 1971, p. 48.

6. Jeffery Paige, "Collective Violence and the Culture of Subordination", unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, Michigan University, 1968.

7. As of January 1, 1977, the state of California has formally abolished the indeterminate sentence system.

CHAPTER VII

METHODOLOGICAL APPENDIX

A. Data Set

The data for the present study come from two sources. The principle source is original panel data measuring the attitudes of a random sample of California male felons at two points during their confinement in state prison. Three types of data are therefore available for the experimental (inmate) group: information on inmate attributes and attitudes at the onset of confinement (T_1), comparable information after three to seven months of confinement (T_2) and data on attitude change between observations (T_2-T_1).

The universe for the experimental group consists of all recently arrived adult male felons in the California Department of Corrections prison system. The sample is comprised of all regular committals who arrived at the Reception-Guidance Center at Vacaville, California, between February 27 and May 6, 1974 (baseline N=447). The Reception-Guidance Center receives convicted California felons at the start of their terms for evaluation and classification, in order to determine their security risk and the prison or camp to which they will be assigned. Regular committals do not include men sent to the Center for pre-sentence observation, returning escapees, or men classified by the courts as mentally disturbed.

The second data source is control group information obtained from prior surveys containing measures comparable to those used in the experimental group questionnaire. The subjects of these studies were neither matched in demographic terms with the experimental group nor observed at the same two points in time.

Two of the studies were conducted by the Survey Research

Center at the University of California, Berkeley, as part of their

Social Indicators Project. One, the Bay Area Survey 2, is a cross-

sectional survey of a sample from the adult population in the five-

county San Francisco Bay area. The sample consists of 1,000 house-

holds, reduced by 100 to allow for a supplementary sample of blacks

from predominantly black areas (census tracts with 70% or more

black residents). This survey was conducted during the summer of

1972 (N=963). The second S.R.C. study, The Quality of Life Survey,

is comprised of data from a special subsample of the original Bay

Area Survey 2 (N=143), gathered during the Spring and Summer,

1974. Additional control group data were drawn from a national

sample survey conducted by Louis Harris Associates during October,

1968.[1]

B. Questionnaire Design and Administration

The research instrument is a 16-page self-administered

questionnaire consisting of 180 forced-choice items. Additional

data on the subjects' type of crime, sentence and prior California

prison terms were obtained from the Central Files Division of the

Reception-Guidance Center.[2] In order to permit comparison of

the experimental group with non-inmate controls, previously used

measures were included wherever possible. These measures have the

further advantage of previous validity and reliability checks.

Original items were constructed for those variables which had

not been measured in earlier studies. Item pools for each vari-

able were composed by the investigator. Four pre-tests of draft

questionnaires were conducted to determine which items were most

discriminating. The first three pre-tests were conducted among faculty and students at Stanford University. The final one was conducted among a trial group of recently-arrived prisoners at the Reception-Guidance Center. Revisions were made following each pre-test.

The questionnaire was designed to be legible and comprehensible to men with limited reading skills. A word frequency chart was used to simplify the wording of questionnaire items. (In some cases, this resulted in slight discrepancies between the wording of an item as it appeared in an earlier study and its wording in the inmate questionnaire.) Those who were unable to read had the questions read to them by the investigator and were shown how to mark their own answers. The questionnaire was translated into Spanish by a native-language speaker, permitting chicano inmates to choose the language in which they preferred to read.

Each week for ten weeks, all new regular committals were given passes to a classroom at the Center, where the initial survey was held. Participation in the study was voluntary. No one but the subjects and the investigator were present in the classroom.

To insure the informed consent of the subjects, they were told that the Department of Corrections had nothing to do with the study, and that their responses would neither help them nor hurt them in prison. They were told that Stanford University was sponsoring the study in order to find out how people who had had trouble with the law felt about politics. They were assured that

their answers would be confidential and anonymous, since only

aggregate data would be reported.

Three to seven months after the initial visit, all those who

successfully completed the questionnaire were relocated at the

various institutions in the California Correctional system. They

were again asked to complete the questionnaire. Subjects received

$2.00 for completing the first questionnaire and $3.00 for the

second. The breakdown of inmates by prison assignment is given in

Table 1 below:

TABLE 1

Inmate Prison Assignments

Prison	Location	N	%
California Conservation Center	Susanville	58	22
Deuel Vocational Institution	Tracy	57	21
Sierra Conservation Center	Jamestown	34	13
California Medical Facility	Vacaville	27	10
California Training Facility (Central)	Soledad	20	8
California Men's Colony (East)	San Luis Obispo	18	7
San Quentin Prison	San Quentin	17	6
Folsom Prison	Represa	16	6
California Training Facility (North)	Soledad	9	3
California Training Facility (South)	Soledad	4	2
California Correctional Institution	Chino	4	2
California Institution for Men	Tehachapi	3	1
TOTAL		267	100

C. Threats to Validity.

The subjects and setting of the present study raise unusual

problems. One the positive side, the very confinement which iso-

lates the prison population from society makes them accessible

for research purposes. They are readily locatable and identifiable, which is useful for a panel study of this type.

However, there were threats to the validity of their responses which do not always pertain in research on non-inmates. The release date of California prisoners is contingent upon their behavior in prison. This, coupled with the need to identify individual respondents for purposes of re-administering the questionnaire, could easily have aroused mistrust, especially on sensitive political matters.

Apart from assurances of anonymity and confidentiality, three steps were taken to assess the magnitude of this problem. The first was to divide the inmate pre-test group into two halves; one received a questionnaire which asked for the respondent's name, one did not. Comparison of the frequency distributions of the two sub-samples revealed no significant differences. It was decided that asking for respondents' names per se did not seriously impair the validity of the data.

The second gauge of inmate reluctance to reveal their political beliefs was their overt reaction to the questionnaire. The subjects displayed little suspicion or hostility during either investigation. Most, in fact, seemed flattered that their opinions were of interest to an outsider and responded favorably to the opportunity to speak for themselves, rather than having "experts" speak for them. The completion rate was 76% (N=340) for the original sample and 78% for the second observation (N=267). The prison staff was usually cooperative. For example, the investigator was allowed into special security wings to relocate subjects

who were in permanently locked cells. In no instance was any member of the staff present during completion of the question- naires

Several reasons existed for non-participation. In most cases, subjects failed to appear because of schedule conflicts (e.g., court appearances, illnesses, or visits by family or lawyers). Most of the 73 men who completed only the first ques- tionnaire were not relocatable due to their release from prison, recent transfer to another prison, or mismanagement by prison staff. One guard, for example, sent a group of subjects back to their cells to change from T-shirts to work shirts; they never returned. Other subjects were given inaccurate information on when or where to report. There is no a priori reason to believe that such men differ from those who completed both questionnaires.

However, in some cases (the exact number could not be reli- ably determined) subjects did not participate because they were not interested to begin with, or were in solitary confinement. Approximately 5% of subjects who appeared at each observation chose not to participate. There is good reason to believe that such men might differ on a host of dimensions from participants. No way of testing the resulting bias was available, however.

The final check on response validity of inmate responses was a social desirability scale. Five items from the Minnesota Multi- phasic Personality Inventory's Lie Scale were included in the questionnaire.[3] The scale contains items about personal foibles which are almost universal. Those who deny having them are scored as tending to falisfy answers in the direction of social

desirability. Correlations between the Lie Scale and the prin-
ciple variables in this study indicate that the analysis is not
contaminated by deliberate attempts to avoid answering truthfully.

There are further factors which endanger all survey research.
The problem of acquiescent response set was minimized by the use
of item pairs and alternating the valence of agree-disagree state-
ments. Campbell and Stanley, in their Experimental and Quasi-
experimental Designs for Research,[4] list additional threats to
the internal and external validity of various research designs.
Three of these factors offer rival hypotheses to the assertion
that observed differences in the same inmates between comparisons
are the result of incarceration. The first of these is history.
Many other events which might have contributed to change occurred
between observations besides the continued incarceration of the
experimental group. The most salient event was the unfolding of
the Watergate investigation.

In an effort to minimize the elapsed time between observations,
those who were observed last at the Reception-Guidance Center
(between April 19 and May 16) were relocated first (mean time
between observations= 11 weeks); those observed earlier (between
March 14 and April 11) were relocated last (mean time between
observations= 26 weeks). Random assignment of cases to relocation
groups would have prolonged the data-gathering stage, thus in-
creasing the number of uncontrolled historical events occurring
between observations.

It is also worth noting that a recent study of the initial
impact of Watergate on political attitudes showed that "over the

short run Watergate led to little or no net change in basic evaluative attitudes towards the political system."[5] The relative isolation of inmates from the outside world further minimizes the impact of extraneous sources of variation.

A second and more serious confounded rival hypothesis is the effect of the original observation itself on subsequent responses. Many of the questions put to the inmate sample about life in prison and about political violence could have acted as stimuli which altered expressed predispostions at the second observation, either directly or via interaction with incarceration effects. This problem is not easily dismissed. Non-reactive measures (e.g., passive participant observation) were deemed not feasible given the research setting and objectives. Selection of separate samples for the two observations would have introduced even more rival hypotheses. Repeated assurances that this was not a "test", i.e., that there were no right or wrong answers, and guarantees of anonimity and confidentiality hopefully minimized the stimulus effect of the first observation on subsequent responses.

A third rival explanation is more easily refuted. This explanation argues that those respondents who were "lost" between observations were not representative of the entire sample on one or more variables, and that their removal from the T_2 group thereby introduces a bias into the results. In the first place, comparison of "lost" cases with the T_2 group does not reveal striking contrasts. In the second place, tests for the significance of difference scores were computed only for the same subjects at each

observation. Obviously lost cases were not included in such analysis.

In sum, the two greatest threats to the validity of the present data are the following: 1) the possibility that those who chose at the first test not to participate differed on one or more variables of interest from participants, and 2) the possible reactive effect of the initial questionnaire on subsequent responses. Neither of these effects could be adequately estimated or eliminated from the research design. Both change data and the generalizability of the findings should therefore be viewed with some caution.

D. Data Analysis

The analysis of data from the experimental group consisted of three phases. The first consisted of coding, keypunching and cleaning the raw data. These tasks were performed by the Survey Research Center at the University of California, Berkeley. All other phases of the study were conducted by the principle investigator.

Once the raw data file was created, exploratory analysis was conducted of underlying trends in the data. The theoretical framework lead to conceptualization of the major dimensions of the study. But because this was an exploratory study with little prior research to build on, the choice of specific items as operational indicators of those dimensions was in many cases guided by factor analysis. A factor loading of 0.4 or higher was required

for an item to be included in a scale; most had loadings in excess of 0.7.[6]

In other cases, scales were contructed in order to replicate those in previous studies. All items were coded so that the response representing the greatest "amount" of the variable being measured received the highest score. An individual's score on the composite scale was then derived by summing his responses to all its constituent items. Only subjects who had valid scores on all constituent items were given a scale score.

The third step in the data analysis was hypothesis-testing. The statistical techniques employed varied according to the level of measurement of the variables involved: chi-square tests of cross-tabular relationships between nominal variables, analysis of variance (F tests) for relationships between interval-level dependant variables and nominal independent variables, and Pearson's correlation coefficients for relationships between interval-level variables. Student's T was used to test for the significance of differences between mean scores at T_1 and T_2.

In the table below, each composite scale is presented. The constituent items in each scale, with appropriate coding values, are listed for each scale. Scales derived from items in prior studies are so indicated. No source is given for items designed originally for this study.

TABLE 2

SCALE ITEMS, VALUES, AND SOURCES

SCALE NAME	VARIABLES

Criminal Record	Age at first arrest
	  1) over 20
	  2) 15 to 20
	  3) under 15
	
	Number of arrests
	  1) 3 or less
	  2) 4 to 6
	  3) 7 to 10
	  4) over 10
	
	Prior time served in jail or prison
	  1) less than 6 months
	  2) 6 months - 2 years
	  3) over 2 years

Personal Experience
with Violence
 	
Source: James McEvoy III,
"Political Vengeance and
Political Attitudes", in
William Crotty (ed.),
Assassinations and the
Political Order
	Have you ever been slapped?
	  1) yes
	  2) no
	
	Have you ever been choked?
	  1) yes
	  2) no
	
	Have you ever been punched or beaten?
	  1) yes
	  2) no
	
	Have you ever been threatened or cut
	with a knife?
	  1) yes
	  2) no
	
	Have you ever been threatened or shot
	with a gun?
	  1) yes
	  2) no
	
	Have you ever slapped or kicked
	another person?
	  1) yes
	  2) no
	
	Have you ever punched or beaten
	another person?
	  1) yes
	  2) no

SCALE NAME	VARIABLES
Personal Experience with Violence (con't.)	Have you ever had to defend yourself with a gun or a knife? 1) yes 2) no
Resentment of Correctional Authorities	Most of the programs for inmates in prison are just games, with no real value 1) disagree 2) agree The Adult Authority likes to give prisoners like me a hard time 1) disagree 2) agree If a prisoner stays out of trouble, the guards will treat him well 1) agree 2) disagree Most of what is taught in prison is useless on the outside 1) disagree 2) agree
Inmate Solidarity	There are no prisoners here that I really respect 1) agree 2) disagree I don't have much in common with other prisoners 1) agree 2) disagree There are no real leaders among prisoners 1) agree 2) disagree There are some inmates here who deserve a lot of respect 1) disagree 2) agree
Status Inferiority	In general, do you think things are getting better or getting worse for prisoners in America? 1) better 2) about the same 3) worse

SCALE NAME	VARIABLES

Status Inferiority (con't.)	In general, do you think life in this prison is better or worse than life in other California prisons?
	  1) better
	  2) about the same
	  3) worse

	In general, do you think life in California prisons is better or worse than life in other prisons?
	  1) better
	  2) about the same
	  3) worse

	Compared to people you grew up with, would you say you have done better or done worse?
	  1) better
	  2) about the same
	  3) worse

	Compared to most prisoners you know, would you say you have done better or done worse?
	  1) better
	  2) about the same
	  3) worse

Self-Esteem
 	
Source: Morris Rosenberg, Society and the Adolescent Self-Image, Princeton, N. J., Princeton Univ. Press, 1965
	I feel that I have a number of good qualities
	  1) disagree
	  2) agree

	All in all, I am inclined to think that I am a failure
	  1) agree
	  2) disagree

	I feel that I am a person of worth, at least on an equal plane with others
	  1) disagree
	  2) agree

	I am able to do things as well as most people
	  1) disagree
	  2) agree

	I certainly feel useless at times
	  1) agree
	  2) disagree

SCALE NAME	VARIABLES

Self-Esteem (con't.)

I feel I do not have much to be proud of
  1) agree
  2) disagree

I take a positive attitude towards myself
  1) disagree
  2) agree

At times I think I am no good at all
  1) agree
  2) disagree

On the whole, I am satisfied with myself
  1) disagree
  2) agree

I wish I could have more respect for myself
  1) agree
  2) disagree

Political Alienation

Source: Bay Area Survey II, Survey Research Center, University of California, Berkeley, 1972

Item Pairs:

A. 1) People like me have a fair say in getting the government to do the things we care about

    2) Undecided

    3) There is almost no way people like me can have an influence on the government

B. 1) I am proud of many things about our government

    2) Undecided

    3) I can't find much in our government to be proud of

C. 1) Our government leaders usually tell the truth

    2) Undecided

    3) Most of what the government leaders say can't be believed

SCALE NAME	VARIABLES

Political Alienation
(con't.)

D. 1) Although our country may be facing difficult times, I still feel that it's a good place and that I really belong here

2) Undecided

3) The way this country is going, I often feel that I really don't belong here

E. 1) The way our government works, almost every group has a say in running things

2) Undecided

3) This country is really run by a small number of men at the top who only speak for a few special groups

Internal Locus of Control

Source: Patricia Gurin, et al., "Internal-External Control in the Motivational Dynamics of Negro Youth", Journal of Social Issues, (25) 1969, pp. 29-53

If a person goes bad, it is most likely to be
1) society's fault
2) undecided
3) his own fault

I have found that the things that happen to me are
1) beyond my control
2) undecided
3) my own doing

Getting what I want
1) is mostly a matter of luck
2) undecided
3) has nothing to do with luck

Most people who don't do well in life
1) never get a chance to succeed
2) undecided
3) don't use the chances that come their way

When a person like me tries to get ahead
1) something or someone always stops him
2) undecided
3) he can make it if he tries

SCALE NAME	VARIABLES

Political Efficacy

Source: *The Quality of Life Survey*, Survey Research Center, University of California, Berkeley, 1974

How good are your chances to:

Persuade your friends to go to a political meeting
  1) poor chance
  2) fair chance
  3) good chance

Help start a new political group or party
  1) poor chance
  2) fair chance
  3) good chance

Find a way to report a public official who doesn't do his duty
  1) poor chance
  2) fair chance
  3) good chance

Convince your family or friends to vote for a party or candidate
  1) poor chance
  2) fair chance
  3) good chance

Legal Efficacy

Source: *The Quality of Life Survey*, Survey Research Center, University of California, Berkeley, 1974

How good are your chances to:

Find a lawyer to help you if you get into trouble
  1) poor chance
  2) fair chance
  3) good chance

Protect your rights in court if you are accused of a crime
  1) poor chance
  2) fair chance
  3) good chance

Protect your rights against unfair actions by the police
  1) poor chance
  2) fair chance
  3) good chance

Cut through red tape to get a public official to take care of your problem
  1) poor chance
  2) fair chance
  3) good chance

SCALE NAME

Ethnocentrism

Source: (a) Gary Marx,
Protest and Prejudice,
N. Y., Harper and Row,
1967

(b) Herbert McCloskey,
"Consensus and Ideology
in American Politics",
American Political
Science Review, (58)
1964, pp. 361-82
Prior Protest
Participation

Source: The Quality of
Life Survey, Survey
Research Center,
University of California,
Berkeley, 1974

VARIABLES

Jews stick together too much[a]

You can usually tell if a person is
Jewish just by the way he looks[a]

Just like fine race horses, some
breeds of people are just naturally
better than others[b]

It bothers me to see foreigners come
to America and do better than Ameri-
cans who were born here[b]

Have you ever done any of the
following things:

    Gone to a protest march
     1) no, never
     2) yes, once or twice
     3) yes, often

    Gone to a sit-in
     1) no, never
     2) yes, once or twice
     3) yes, often

    Gone to a peaceful rally or
    demonstration
     1) no, never
     2) yes, once or twice
     3) yes, often

    Picketted or taken part in a boy-
    cott over some political issue
     1) no, never
     2) yes, once or twice
     3) yes, often

    Gone to a protest that turned
    violent
     1) no, never
     2) yes, once or twice
     3) yes, often

SCALE NAME	VARIABLES
Approval of Political Protests	What is your opinion of the following actions:

Source: <u>The Quality of Life Survey</u>, Survey Research Center, University of California, Berkeley, 1974

Violating laws you feel are unjust
   1) never justified
   2) sometimes justified
   3) often justified

illegal but peaceful protests
   1) never justified
   2) sometimes justified
   3) often justified

Violent protests
   1) never justified
   2) sometimes justified
   3) often justified

Joining a revolutionary group to overthrow the government by force
   1) never justified
   2) sometimes justified
   3) often justified

Rejection of Non-Violent Political Tactics

Source: <u>The Quality of Life Survey</u>, Survey Research Center, University of California, Berkeley, 1974

The best way to bring about changes in society is by
   1) the election process
   2) undecided
   3) demonstrating in the streets

The best way to solve America's problems is to
   1) work within the system
   2) undecided
   3) overturn the whole society

In trying to make improvements in America, the use of violence
   1) does more harm than good
   2) undecided
   3) is probably necessary

Lie Scale

Source: W. G. Dahlstrom, et al., <u>An MMPI Handbook</u>, vol. 1, Minneapolis, Univ. of Minnesota Press, 1972

I do not like everyone I know
   1) agree
   2) disagree

I get angry sometimes
   1) agree
   2) disagree

SCALE NAME

Lie Scale
(con't.)

VARIABLES

At times I feel like swearing
1) agree
2) disagree

I do not always tell the truth
1) agree
2) disagree

NOTES

1. James McEvoy, III, "Political Vengeance and Political Atti-
    tudes: A Study of Americans' Support for Political and Social
    Violence", in William Crotty (ed.), Assassinations and the
    Political Order, N. Y., Harper Row, 1971, pp. 312-341.

2. Individual arrest folders were not made available to the
    investigator. Information was obtained from the daily popu-
    lation flow lists used by the Reception-Guidance Center.

3. W. G. Dahlstrom, et al., An MMPI Handbook, vol. 1, Minnea-
    polis, University of Minnesota Press, 1963, pp. 108-110.

4. Donald Campbell and Julian Stanley, Experimental and Quasi-
    Experimental Designs for Research, Chicago, Rand McNally,
    1963, pp. 5-7.

5. Paul Sniderman et al., "Stability of Support for the Political
    System: The Initial Impact of Watergate", American Political
    Quarterly, (3), Oct., 1975, pp. 437-457.

6. The procedure follows that spelled out in detail by David
    Armor, "Theta Reliability and Factor Scaling", in Herbert
    Costner (ed.), Sociological Methodology, San Francisco,
    Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1974. Armor advises deleting items
    with factor loadings below 0.3.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BOOKS

Gilbert Abcarian and John Soule (ed.), Social Psychology and Political Behavior, Columbus, Ohio, Charles Merrill, 1971.

American Friends Service Committee, Struggle for Justice, New York, Hill and Wang, 1971.

Albert Bandura, Aggression: A Social Learning Analysis, Englewood Cliffs, N. J., Prentice-Hall, 1973.

James Barber, The Presidential Character: Predicting Performance in the White House, Englewood Cliffs, N. J., Prentice-Hall, 1973.

Leonard Berkowitz, Aggression: A Social Psychological Analysis, New York, McGraw-Hill, 1962.

Claude Brown, Manchild in the Promised Land, New York, The Macmillan Co., 1965.

Angus Campbell et al., The Voter Decides, Evanston, Ill., Row, Peterson, 1954.

Donald Campbell and Julian Stanley, Experimental and Quasi-Experimental Designs for Research, Chicago, Rand-McNally, 1963.

Jonathan Casper, American Criminal Justice: The Defendant's Perspective, Englewood Cliffs, N. J., Prentice-Hall, 1972.

Bill Chambliss, Box-Man: A Professional Thief's Journey, New York, Harper and Row, 1972.

Donald Clemmer, The Prison Community, Boston, Christopher Publishing Co., 1940.

M. B. Clinard (ed.), Anomie and Deviant Behavior: A Discussion and Critique, New York, Free Press, 1964.

Richard Cloward and Lloyd Ohlin, Delinquency and Opportunity, New York, Free Press, 1960.

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

William Coons, Attica Diary, New York, Stein and Day, 1972.

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

W. G. Dahlstrom et al., An MMPI Handbook, vol. 1, Minneapolis, University of Minnesota Press, 1971.

Angela Davis, If They Come in the Morning: Voices of Resistance, New York, Third Press, 1971.

Emile Durkheim, The Division of Labor in Society, George Simpson (trans.), Glencoe, Ill., Free Press, 1933.

_____, Suicide: A Study in Sociology, John Spaulding and George Simpson (trans.), Glencoe, Ill., Free Press, 1951.

Martin Fishbein (ed.), Attitude Theory and Measurement, New York, Wiley and Sons, 1967.

Irving Goffman, Asylums, Garden City, New York, Doubleday and Co., 1961.

Lawrence Hazelrigg (ed.), Prison Within Society, Garden City, New York, Doubleday and Co., 1968.

Esther Heffernan, Making It in Prison: The Square, The Cool and The Life, New York, Wiley and Sons, 1972.

John Irwin, The Felon, Englewood Cliffs, N. J., Prentice-Hall, 1970.

George Jackson, Soledad Brother, New York, Coward-McCaan, 1970.

William Kornhauser, The Politics of Mass Society, Glencoe, Ill, Free Press, 1959.

Robert Lane, Political Ideology, New York, Free Press, 1962.

Semor Lipset, Political Man: The Social Bases of Politics, Garden City, N. Y., Doubleday, 1960.

Gary Marx, Protest and Prejudice, New York, Harper and Row, 1967.

Thomas Mathiesen, The Defenses of the Weak, London, Tavistok Publications, 1965.

Sam Melville, Letters From Attica, New York, William Morrow and Co., 1972.

Robert Merton, Social Theory and Social Structure, New York, Free Press, 1968.

Russell Oswald, Attica- My Story, Garden City, N. Y., Doubleday, 1972.

President's Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice, <u>The Challenge of Crime in a Free Society</u>, New York, Avon Books, 1968.

_____, <u>Task Force Report on Corrections</u>, Washington, D. C., U. S. Government Printing Office, 1967.

Leon Radzinowicz and Marvin Wolfgang (ed.), <u>Crime and Justice</u>, 3 vols., New York, Basic Books, 1971.

Jerome Skolnick, <u>Justice Without Trial</u>, New York, Wiley and Sons, 1966.

David Street <u>et al.</u>, <u>Organization for Treatment</u>, New York, Free Press, 1966.

Gresham Sykes, <u>The Society of Captives</u>, Princeton, N. J., Princeton University Press, 1958.

J. W. Thibaut and H. H. Kelley, <u>The Social Psychology of Groups</u>, New York, Wiley and Sons, 1959.

Charles R. Tittle, <u>Society of Subordinates</u>, Bloomington, Ind., Indiana University Press, 1972.

Marvin Wolfgang and Franco Ferracuti, <u>The Subculture of Violence</u>, London, Tavistok Publications, 1967.

Erik Wright, <u>The Politics of Punishment</u>, New York, Harper and Row, 1973.

ARTICLES AND MONOGRAPHS

Joel Aberbach and Jack Walker, "Political Trust and Racial Ideology", <u>American Political Science Review</u> (64) 1970, pp. 1199-1219.

Robert Agger <u>et al.</u>, "Political Cynicism: Measurement and Meaning", <u>The Journal of Politics</u> (23) 1961, pp. 477-506.

David Armor, "Theta Reliability and Factor Scaling", in Herbert Costner (ed.) <u>Sociological Methodology</u>, San Francisco, Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1974, pp. 17-50.

Esther Battle and Julian Rotter, "Children's Feelings of Personal Control as Related to Class and Ethnic Groups", <u>Journal of Personality</u> (31) 1963, pp. 482-90.

Lawrence Bennett, "The Application of Self-Esteem Measures in a Correctional Setting: II", <u>Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency</u> (9) 1972-73, pp. 1-9.

Bernard Berk, "Organizational Goals and Inmate Organization", American Journal of Sociology (72) 1966, pp. 522-34.

Bruno Bettelheim, "Individual and Mass Behavior in Extreme Situations", Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology (38) 1943, pp. 417-52.

Stephen Bing and S. Stephen Rosenfeld, "The Quality of Justice in the Lower Criminal Courts of Metropolitan Boston", Boston, Lawyers' Committee on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice, 1970.

California State Department of Corrections, "Incidents in Institutions, 1965 through 1973", Sacramento, Ca., Health and Welfare Agency, 1974.

Nathan Caplan, "The New Ghetto Man: A Review of Recent Empirical Studies", Journal of Social Issues (26) 1970, pp. 59-73.

J. P. Clark, "Acceptance of Blame and Alienation among Prisoners", American Journal of Orthopsychiatry (33) 1963, pp. 557-61.

Richard Cloward, "Illegitimate Means, Anomie, and Deviant Behavior", American Sociological Review (24) 1959, pp. 164-76.

A. K. Cohen, "The Sociology of the Deviant Act: Anomie Theory and Beyond", American Sociological Review (30) 1965, pp. 5-14.

Phillip Converse, "The Nature of Belief Systems of Mass Publics" in David Apter (ed.), Ideology and Discontent, New York, Free Press, 1968, pp. 206-61.

Thomas Crawford and Murray Naditch, "Relative Deprivation, Powerlessness, and Militancy: The Psychology of Protest", Psychiatry (33) 1970, pp. 208-23.

Leonard Doob, "The Behavior of Attitudes" Psychology Review (54) 1947, pp. 135-56.

David Easton and Jack Dennis, "The Child's Acquisition of Regime Norms: Political Efficacy", American Political Science Review (61) 1967, pp. 25-38.

Lewis Feuer, "What Is Alienation? The Career of a Concept", New Politics (1) 1962, pp. 115-28.

John Forward and Jay Williams, "Internal-External Control and Black Militancy", Journal of Social Issues (26) 1970, pp. 75-91.

Johan Galtung, "The Social Functions of a Prison" in Lawrence Hazelrigg (ed.) Prison Within Society, Garden City, N. Y., Doubleday, 1968, pp. 27-49.

William Gamson, "Political Trust and Its Ramifications" in Gilbert Abcarian and John Soule (ed.), <u>Social Psychology and Political Behavior</u>, Columbus, Ohio, Charles Merrill, 1971, pp. 40-55.

Peter Garabedian, "Social Roles and Processes of Socialization in the Prison Community", <u>Social Problems</u> (11) 1963, pp. 139-52.

Harold Garfinkle, "Conditions of Successful Degradation Ceremonies", in Lawrence Hazelrigg (ed.) <u>Prison Within Society</u>, Garden City, N. Y., Doubleday, 1968, pp. 68-77.

Donald Garrity, "The Prison as a Rehabilitation Agency", in Donald Cressey (ed.), <u>The Prison: Studies in Institutional Organization and Change</u>, New York, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1961, pp. 358-80.

Bernard Groffman and Edward Muller, "The Strange Case of Relative Gratification and Potential for Political Violence: the V-Curve Hypothesis", <u>American Political Science Review</u> (67) 1973, pp. 514-39.

Oscar Grusky, "Organizational Goals and the Behavior of Informal Leaders", <u>American Journal of Sociology</u> (65) 1959, pp. 59-67.

Patricia Gurin <u>et al</u>., "Internal-External Control and the Motivational Dynamics of Negro Youth", <u>Journal of Social Issues</u> (25) 1969, pp. 29-53.

Ted Gurr, "Psychological Factors in Civil Violence", <u>World Politics</u> (20) 1968, pp. 245-75.

Robert Hess, "The Acquisition of Feelings of Political Efficacy in Pre-Adults" in Gilbert Abcarian and John Soule (ed.), <u>Social Psychology and Political Behavior</u>, Columbus, Ohio, Charles Merriam, 1971, pp. 59-80.

Irving Horowitz and Martin Liebowitz, "Social Deviance and Political Marginality: Toward a Redefinition of the Relationship between Sociology and Politics", <u>Social Problems</u> (15) 1968, pp. 280-96.

John Irwin and Donald Cressey, "Thieves, Convicts and the Inmate Culture", <u>Social Problems</u> (10) 1962, pp. 142-55.

James Jacobs, "Stratification and Conflict Among Prison Inmates", <u>Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology</u> (66) 1975, pp. 476-82.

Igor Kon, "The Concept of Alienation in Modern Society", <u>Social Research</u> (34) 1967, pp. 506-17.

John Kregerman and Phillip Worchel, "Arbitrariness of Frustration and Aggression", <u>Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology</u> (63) 1961, pp. 183-87.

Herbert Lefcourt and Gordon Ladwig, "Alienation in Negro and White Reformatory Inmates", Journal of Social Psychology (68) 1966, pp. 153-57.

Lewis Lipsitz, "The Grievances of the Poor", in Phillip Green and Sanford Levinson (ed.), Power and Community: Dissenting Essays in Political Science, New York, Pantheon Books, 1970, pp. 144-56.

Edgar Litt, "Political Cynicism and Political Futility", The Journal of Politics (25) 1963, pp. 312-23.

Herbert McCloskey, "Consensus and Ideology in American Politics", American Political Science Review (58) 1964, pp. 361-83.

Lloyd McCorkle and Richard Korn, "Resocialization Within Walls", The Annals (293) 1954, pp. 88-98.

James McEvoy, III, "Political Vengeance and Political Attitudes: A Study of Americans' Support for Political and Social Violence", in William Crotty (ed.), Assassinations and the Political Order, New York, Harper and Row, 1971, pp. 312-41.

R. W. Meier, "Violence and Unrest in Prisons", Proceedings of the 99th Annual Congress of Corrections, Washington, D. C., American Correctional Association, 1969, pp. 61-64.

Jessica Mitford, "Kind and Usual Punishment in California", Atlantic Monthly (227) Feb., 1971, pp. 38-45.

William Morrow, "Criminality and Anti-Democratic Trends: A Study of Prison Inmates" in Adorno et al., The Authoritarian Personality, New York, Harper, 1950, pp. 817-90.

Edward Muller, "A Test of a Partial Theory of Potential for Political Violence", American Political Science Review (66) 1972, pp. 928-59.

Louis Nelson, "Violence in the Prison", Proceedings of the 99th Annual Congress of Corrections, Washington, D. C., American Correctional Association, 1969, pp. 65-68.

Jeffery Paige, "Collective Violence and the Culture of Subordination" unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Michigan, 1968.

A. Pepitone and G. Reichling, "Group Cohesiveness and the Expression of Hostility", Human Relations (8) 1955, pp. 327-37.

"Prison Gang Clout Spreads", San Jose Mercury, December 3, 1975, Sec. A, p. 1.

H. E. Ransford, "Isolation, Powerlessness and Violence: A Study of Attitudes and Participation in the Watts Riot", American Journal of Sociology (74) 1968, pp. 581-91.

Julian Rotter, "Generalized Expectancies for Internal Versus External Control of Reinforcement", Psychological Monographs (80) 1966, pp. 1-28.

Sol Rubin, "Loss and Curtailment of Rights" in Leon Radzinowics and Marvin Wolfgang (ed.), Crime and Justice vol. III, New York, Basic Books, 1971, pp. 25-40.

Frank Rundle, "The Roots of Violence at Soledad", in Erik Wright, The Politics of Punishment, New York, Harper and Row, 1973, pp. 163-172.

Clarence Schrag, "Some Foundations for a Theory of Corrections" in Donald Cressey (ed.), The Prison: Studies in Institutional Organization and Change, New York, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1961, pp. 309-57.

David Sears and John McConahay, "Racial Socialization, Comparison Levels and the Watts Riot", Journal of Social Issues (26) 1970, pp. 121-40.

Melvin Seeman, "Alienation and Social Learning in a Reformatory", American Journal of Sociology (69) 1963, pp. 270-84.

Paul Sniderman et al., "Stability of Support for the Political System: The Initial Impact of Watergate", American Political Quarterly (3) 1975, pp. 437-57.

Donald Stokes, "Popular Evaluations of Government: An Empirical Assessment" in Harland Cleveland and Harold Lasswell (ed.), Ethics and Bigness: Scientific, Academic, Religious, Political and Military, New York, Harper, 1962, pp. 61-73.

Samuel Strong, "Social Types in a Minority Group", American Journal of Sociology (48) 1943, pp. 563-64.

Jean Taylor et al., "An Analysis of Defense Counsel in the Processing of Felony Defendants in San Diego, California", Denver Law Journal (49) 1972, pp. 233-75.

T. M. Tomlinson, "Ideological Foundations for Negro Action: A Comparative Analysis of Militant and Non-Militant Views of the Los Angeles Riot", Journal of Social Issues (26) 1970, pp. 93-119.

"Unique Cop Team State's Main Tool in Fighting Gangs", San Jose Mercury, December 6, 1975, Sec. A, p. 2.

Richard Vogelman, "Prison Restrictions- Prisoner Rights", in Leon Radzinowicz and Marvin Wolfgang (ed.), Crime and Justice, vol. III, New York, Basic Books, 1971, pp. 52-67.

Patricia Wald, "Poverty and Criminal Justice" in Leon Radzinowicz and Marvin Wolfgang (ed.), Crime and Justice, vol. I, New York, Basic Books, 1971, pp. 503-14.

Richard Walters, "Implications of Laboratory Studies of Aggression for the Control and Regulation of Violence", The Annals (364) 1966, pp. 60-72.

Ernst Wenk and Rudolph Moos, "Social Climates in Prisons: An Attempt to Conceptualize and Measure Environmental Factors in Total Institutions", unpublished manuscript, 1972.

Stanton Wheeler, "Socialization in Correctional Communities", American Sociological Review (26) 1961, pp. 697-712.

Robert White, "Motivation Reconsidered: The Concept of Competence", Psychology Review (66) 1959, pp. 297-333.

Thomas Wilson, "Patterns of Management and Adaptation to Organizational Roles: A Study of Prison Inmates", American Journal of Sociology (74) 1968, pp. 146-57.

J. Milton Yinger, "Anomie, Alienation and Political Behavior" in Jeanne Knutson (ed.), Handbook of Political Psychology, San Francisco, Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1973, pp. 171-202.

Lawrence Zeitlin, "A Little Larceny Can Do a Lot for Employee Morale", Psychology Today (4) June, 1971, pp. 23-25.

END