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ABSTRACT

This study is a comparative analysis of normative consensus in a prison social system. Temporal and structural effects are analyzed according to the phases of the institutional careers of inmates, classes of social positions of subjects, and categories of norms. A comparison is made of the amount of consensus and accuracy of perception found among and between the classifications of actors. Hypotheses are couched in terms of symbolic interactionism and role theory regarding the prisonization of inmates as it relates to consensus.

The project represents an effort to study the social organization of a prison social system using normative consensus as a variable rather than as an assumed state. An interactional definition of consensus is employed rather than one of simple agreement. Three levels of spiraling interpersonal perception are included in the analysis of consensus; i.e., ego's opinion, ego's perception of alter's opinion, ego's perception of alter's perception of ego's opinion.

At a medium security, male, first offender penal institution (Louisiana Correctional and Industrial School), six categories of subjects were interviewed. Early-,
middle- and late-phase inmates, work-release inmates, staff supervisors of inmates and work-release supervisors of inmates compose the sample blocks. One hundred four statistical operations were used in the examination of 36 hypotheses formulated under seven corollaries.

The results indicate that consensus among inmates is not significantly influenced by time served, time to serve, or participation in the work-release program. The effects of positional incumbency were determined to be greater on accuracy of perception than on actual consensus. Inmate consensus tended to vary according to classifications of norms. Inmates and supervisory staff under-perceived consensus between themselves and inmates under-perceived consensus among themselves as well.

The implications of this research are fivefold. First, its findings contradict previous research on the temporal aspects regarding the process of assimilation into the inmate culture. Second, the relationship between communication, consensus and coordination is shown to be a function of the prevailing type of motivation. Third, the structural traits related to role stresses for an individual actor are also factors affecting stress between different actors. Fourth, consensus is shown to be a useful concept in the study of social structure, particularly when defined to include higher levels of social acuity. Fifth, the deleterious consequence of a prison's social structure for rehabilitation is empirically illustrated.
CHAPTER I

THE STUDY OF A PRISON SOCIETY: AN INTRODUCTION

I. PROLOGUE

An inmate at a penal institution was being tried for escaping. He pleaded "not guilty." Unfortunately, and without his knowledge, four of his fellow inmates had already pleaded "guilty" to the charge of assisting his escape. There was a lack of communication among the inmates and as a result there was no agreement regarding the appropriate behavior. This is evidenced by their conflicting overt actions. It is likely that the alleged escapee thought his cohorts would also plead "not guilty." Conversely, the accused assisters probably thought their friend had pleaded "guilty." Furthermore, the inmate can be expected to have reasoned that the others expected him to plead guilty. On the other hand, the four inmates felt that the inmate charged with escaping anticipated their denial of the act.

This is what the current study is all about; i.e., interpersonal perception of norms in a prison. The story illustrates the importance of accurate communication regarding behavioral expectations and the relevance of first, second, and third levels of normative consensus to social
activity, social organization, and social structure. Among two or more actors there may be (1) agreement or disagreement (first level of consensus); (2) understanding or misunderstanding of the agreement-disagreement (second level of consensus); (3) realization or failure to realize the understanding-misunderstanding of agreement-disagreement (third level of consensus).¹ These three levels of consensus are referred to as the levels of agreement, coorientation, and perception of coorientation, respectively.

The investigation being reported is one of first offender male felons who are incarcerated at a medium security correctional institution, members of the institutional staff, and supervisors of work-release inmates. The scope of the study includes analysis of the extent and nature of shared agreement at various levels on norms and values among and between classes of actors in the prison social system.

It has been recognized for many generations that interpersonal consensus is a necessary condition for social organization. A central task of sociology is the study of consensus in the effort to understand human behavior insofar

as that behavior is influenced by group life. Underlying man's interaction is the appraisal, understanding, and judgment of others. While this process is consistent, it is often an involuntary and unconscious one and sometimes a rational and formal one. Effective social performance, in prisons as elsewhere, depends upon the ability of an actor to correctly perceive attitudes, values, reactions, and norms of other actors, their relationship to his own ideas and to correctly judge others' understanding of himself.

The prison has historically been an interesting subject for the social scientist because it provides an organizational "place" for some unique occurrences, some of which have exhibited themselves in the course of this study. Additionally, the prison is a fit subject for sociological analysis for it is a microcosm of the larger society which has created it and which has maintained it. Contained therein is found the gammit of social processes and relationships.

---

2Louis Wirth, "Consensus and Mass Communication," American Sociological Review, 13 (1948), 2. In his presidential address before the American Sociological Society, Wirth made an urgent plea for sociological interest consensus. However, he was promoting world consensus.


II. AN OVERVIEW OF THE RESEARCH REPORT

This thesis is divided into five chapters. In this opening chapter, the investigation is introduced by stating its scope, purposes, setting, theoretical frame of reference, and general methodology.

Chapter II deals with the relationship of the "inmate life cycle" to patterns of consensus. The hypotheses to be tested in this section grew out of the basic tenets of symbolic interactionism as they apply to the idea of prisonization and what the author has termed "deprisonization."
Consensus is defined in terms of three levels of perception among and between categories of subjects. Hypotheses pertain to variations in consensus according to one's chronological proximity to the beginning and end of participation in the prison social system.

Chapter III is more specifically related to role theory as it applies to social organization. Here attention is given to consensual variations according to types of norms and role relationships in the prison context. In the hypotheses of Chapter III it is postulated that significant differences will be found in consensus across norms and between actors with differing patterns of interaction.

In Chapter IV attention is turned to the relative accuracy of normative perception at the various levels of consensus on an intra- and inter-group basis. Interactionist theory from social psychology is called upon for the
production of hypotheses which predict the direction of variations among subjects in correctly perceiving actual opinions.

III. THEORETICAL SETTING

It seems appropriate, near the beginning, to set the stage conceptually for this study of structures of consensus and norms. The purpose is to point up the interrelationship of concepts and theory in "pure" sociology and penology. In the following chapters the ideas are dealt with more intensively in their productivity of empirically testable hypotheses. For the moment, consider the implications of: (1) prisonization as a process; (2) the concept of total institution; (3) the role theory approach to social organization; and (4) the symbolic interactionist branch of sociological theory for consensus, considered as a variable of group solidarity and social integration.5

Consensus

Reviewing sociological literature of this and past generations leads to the observation that there is little consensus about consensus. According to some authors consensus has always had a high theoretical place among the concepts of sociology. They trace its development from

---

ancient social thinkers through the patriarchs of the discipline onto the current stage of theoretical discussion. The names of Khaldun, Comte, Durkheim, Tönnies, Cooley, Dewey, Thomas, Mead, and others, appear frequently in journal articles on the subject. Park and Burgess in their first text, *Introduction to the Science of Sociology*, gave consensus a central place. Yet, one must conclude that a clear and rigorous definition, conceptually or operationally, of consensus has not evolved.

Some sociology texts do not mention consensus, the word or idea. Some give it prominence. Others use a variety of terms in discussing the idea of consensus.

The most serious conflict regarding consensus revolves around whether it is a social condition to be postulated, equated with equilibrium and relegated only to the ranks of a type of functionalism, or whether consensus is to be considered a variable, a dimension and measure of many specific concepts.

The latter interpretation will be employed in the current investigation. Conceptually, consensus is defined as an infinite series of agreement and understanding between

---

6 Cf. Chapter II for a more detailed discussion of the history of the concept of consensus.

7 In Irving Louis Horowitz, "Consensus, Conflict, and Cooperation: A Sociological Analysis," *Social Forces*, 41, 42 (1963), 177-88, there appears seven different definitions of consensus.
members of a group regarding an object. Operationally, consensus exists, as a variable, to the degree that members of a group agree and understand each other in a series of spiraling interpersonal perceptions.

**Symbolic Interactionism**

The broadest, purely sociological point of reference for the study is that branch of social behaviorism termed symbolic interactionism. Here is the theoretical foundation for consensus as defined above. From it come the hypotheses of this inquiry either directly or by a logical extension through role theory and prisonization.

Social interaction is based on communication and is, therefore, symbolic. Acts of persons and groups are reciprocally influencing. Consensus is a function, in part, of verbal and non-verbal interaction and communication.

According to this theoretical orientation, role-taking is a basic social process. Role-taking is a person's anticipation of the responses of others in an on-going social situation. This demands a correct prediction of the responses of others, in other words, second-level consensus. Between coordination or role-taking and

---


communication there is consensus. The variable, consensus, influences role-taking.

Role Theory

An approach to social organization useful to this study is that of role theory. The thesis of role theory has been stated in this fashion:

Individuals in society occupy positions and their role performance in these positions is determined by social norms, demands, and rules; by the performance of others in their respective positions; by those who observe and react to the performance; and by the individual's particular capabilities and personality.¹⁰

Our concern with the normative structures in the prison social system requires the use of the concepts of role theory. For example, Bates' definition of a norm as "patterned, or commonly held behavior expectations; a learned response held in common by members of a group,"¹¹ spells out that which is the primary object of perception in the study. Two words are the key to its appropriateness: learned and common.

Prisonization and Total Institution

Prisonization refers to the process of taking on in greater or lesser degrees the folkways, mores, customs, and

---


general culture of the penitentiary. Clemmer says that everyone who enters the total institution called a penitentiary undergoes, to some extent, prisonization. In the following chapter association of consensual patterns with differential prisonization potentials will be examined.

Erving Goffman's concept of total institution is germane to the discussion of how the tenents of symbolic interactionism can be applied to prisonization and the hypothesized variations in consensus. The total character of prisons is almost always represented by the barrier to social intercourse with the outside world that is reflected in the physical plant. Goffman's enumeration of the characteristics of total institutions are beneficial to the subsequent generalizations regarding the prison's structural effects on consensus.

IV. THE RESEARCH SETTING

The Physical Setting

Louisiana Correctional and Industrial School (L.C.I.S.), located near DeQuincy, Louisiana, served as the setting for the present study. This institution is a medium security


correctional facility for male felons who are first offenders. The population is generally young, most being 25 years of age or younger. At the time the data were collected there were 480 inmates (called trainees at the institution) assigned to L.C.I.S. There are 107 employees, a ratio of 4.48 inmates to one employee.  

By Louisiana correctional standards, L.C.I.S. is an outstanding correctional institution. The buildings are adequate and the grounds well kept. The appearance of the 638-acre establishment, in a rural setting with its high chain-link and barbed-wire fences, is much like a prison.

The program emphasizes rehabilitation and treatment. A farm is operated and each inmate is assigned an institutional job. The orientation manual for employees suggests,

All of our trainees are here because they have been convicted of some crime. It is our responsibility to keep them here in our custody until they are paroled or discharged. During their stay here we must do everything possible to prepare them for return to society as acceptable, law-abiding citizens.  

Programs and activities at L.C.I.S. include vocational and academic schools, religion, recreation, social and guidance counseling. Offenders are not sentenced to L.C.I.S. but to Louisiana State Penitentiary from which those selected

---


15 From the "Employees' Handbook" of Louisiana Correctional and Industrial School, DeQuincy, Louisiana, J. D. Middlebrooks, Superintendent.
by a transfer board are moved. Ostensibly, those transferred are the inmates most likely to benefit from the program, who are acceptable security risks, and who qualify by offender class. The small number of incorrigible male juveniles, also housed at this institution, are not included in the study.

A Description of the Inmates

A statistical profile of the 122 inmates included in the sample is presented in Tables I through VII, according to the four categories of inmates relevant to the analysis to follow.

The category of inmates labeled "New Inmates" (early phase) are those who have been incarcerated for less than six months. "Old Inmates Staying" (middle phase) are those who have been confined at least two years and who have no release or parole date for at least two years. "Old Inmates Leaving" (late phase) have served two years but are anticipating leaving the prison within six months. "Work Release Inmates" are those who have been selected for participation in a program which leads to their parole and permits their employment outside the institution.

It will be noticed that age-wise the sample of inmates is young—80 per cent are 30 years old or younger.
### TABLE I

**AGE COMPOSITION OF INMATE RESPONDENTS BY SAMPLE CATEGORIES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>New Inmates</th>
<th>Old Inmates Staying</th>
<th>Old Inmates Leaving</th>
<th>Work Release Inmates</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-25</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-30</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-38</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>N=122</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table II reveals that 62.5 per cent of the inmate sample is black and 37.5 per cent is white.

### TABLE II

**RACIAL COMPOSITION OF INMATE RESPONDENTS BY SAMPLE CATEGORIES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>New Inmates</th>
<th>Old Inmates Staying</th>
<th>Old Inmates Leaving</th>
<th>Work Release Inmates</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>N=122</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
According to the inmates' responses, 51 per cent had never been married; 30 per cent were legally married. The remainder are divorced or married by common-law.

**TABLE III**

**MARITAL STATUS OF INMATE RESPONDENTS**
**BY SAMPLE CATEGORIES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inmate Category</th>
<th>New Inmates</th>
<th>Old Inmates Staying</th>
<th>Old Inmates Leaving</th>
<th>Work Release Inmates</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Legally married</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married by common-law</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>N=122</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At the time of their arrest, 50 of the 122 lived in a city larger than 100,000 population. Forty-six resided in rural areas or towns of less than 10,000 population.

**TABLE IV**

**PRE-ARREST RESIDENCE OF INMATE RESPONDENTS**
**BY SAMPLE CATEGORIES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place of Residence</th>
<th>New Inmates</th>
<th>Old Inmates Staying</th>
<th>Old Inmates Leaving</th>
<th>Work Release Inmates</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town (up to 10,000)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City (10,000-100,000)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City (100,000 up)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>N=122</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In Table V it is observed that according to ranked occupations only four inmates worked at jobs in the top four positions. The modal occupation is that of laborer.

**TABLE V**

**OCCUPATIONS OF INMATE RESPONDENTS BY SAMPLE CATEGORIES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>New Inmates</th>
<th>Old Inmates</th>
<th>Old Work Staying</th>
<th>Old Work Leaving</th>
<th>Total Inmates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salesman</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proprietor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical-Craftsman</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operative-Service</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laborer</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>41</strong></td>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
<td><strong>31</strong></td>
<td><strong>30</strong></td>
<td><strong>N=122</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regarding education, the subjects reported that five of the 122 had some college education. Eighteen did not go beyond the sixth grade. The bulk of the group completed grades between the seventh and twelfth (Table VI).

---

TABLE VI
EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT OF INMATE RESPONDENTS
BY SAMPLE CATEGORIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education</th>
<th>New Inmates</th>
<th>Old Inmates</th>
<th>Old Inmates</th>
<th>Work Release</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 - 6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 - 9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 - 12</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 - up</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>N=122</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The accuracy of reports of offenses by inmates may be questioned. Forty-five per cent indicated that the offense for which they are incarcerated was in the category of stealing. Homicidal-type offenses had brought 30 per cent to prison.

TABLE VII
CRIMINAL OFFENSES OF INMATE RESPONDENTS
BY SAMPLE CATEGORIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offense Types</th>
<th>New Inmates</th>
<th>Old Inmates</th>
<th>Old Inmates</th>
<th>Work Release</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Homicide</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stealing</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narcotics</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex related</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Battery</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forgery</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>N=122</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A Description of Prison Personnel

Of the 107 employees of L.C.I.S., 39 are included in the sample of the study. On Page 17 is presented the form that the organization of the prison staff takes and the number of positions in each department. It will be observed that 60 of the 107 employees are a part of the Security Department.

From the interviews with the personnel subjects, it was learned that none were in the age bracket into which 63 per cent of the inmates fit, i.e., 18-25. Furthermore, only 10 per cent of the employees were 30 years of age or younger while 80 per cent of the inmates were of that age category. The median age of the employees was found to be 45.

Since no Negro personnel were employed at the prison, none were included in the sample.

Educationally, the respondents revealed that three of the 39 had college degrees. Five others had attended college. Fifty-one per cent had at least a high school education, and 23 per cent completed the eighth grade or less.

Seventy-four per cent of the sample worked prior to their employment at the prison as laborers, in operations or as craftsmen. Sixty-nine per cent have worked at L.C.I.S. for at least six years.
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A Description of Work-Release Supervisors

Forty-one supervisors of work-release inmates were interviewed. These people work in industry and business from New Orleans to Lake Charles, Louisiana. Fifty-four per cent were high school graduates and 17 per cent were college graduates, while 63 per cent were 45 years or younger.

Ninety per cent live in cities. Each has had the responsibility of supervising inmates for less than six months because the work-release program is a recent innovation. Thirty-seven are white and four are Negro. Eighty per cent have never visited a prison and 73 per cent have never supervised ex-inmates before. Eighty-five per cent have no acquaintances who are ex-inmates to their knowledge.

When asked if they knew the offense for which their inmate-worker was charged, 80 per cent replied negatively.

The appraisal of work-release inmates by their supervisors was overwhelmingly positive. Ninety-eight per cent indicated that their workers were prompt, qualified for their work, and possessed a good or very good attitude toward their jobs and supervisors. Seventy-eight per cent feel that their inmates define themselves as no different from other workers.
Almost a half century ago Franklin H. Giddings said, "A true and complete description of anything must include measurements of it." Descriptions and measurements imply the need for rigorous procedures and techniques which are themselves logical, describable, and replicable. At this point a general description of the research techniques employed is presented. More detailed discussion of methodological considerations appear in connection with those sections (Chapters II, III, and IV) for which certain research procedures or problems are relevant.

Research in social science is as efficacious as the researcher is honest and skilled in the use of basic rudiments of careful and systematic inquiry. Herbert Blumer suggests three consequences of following established guiding rules and procedures of scientific research. They are the setting of proper problems, the collection of relevant data, and the making of meaningful and careful analysis. Three words make the above sentence especially important; i.e., "proper," "relevant," and "meaningful."

It has already been stated that the present research

---


represents an effort to define and describe the variations in consensus among and between prison inmates and their supervisors. The methods of research utilized are discussed under the headings of sampling procedures, data collection, and analysis of data.

Sampling Procedures

Three classes of actors from the prison social system were selected for inclusion in the study. They are prison staff members who have the responsibility of supervising inmates, work-release supervisors who employ inmates in free society, and inmates. These classes of actors were selected because the context and characteristics of their interaction make their interpersonal perception of norms especially appropriate to the hypotheses to be tested.

The correctional institution selected as the setting for the current inquiry into normative structures was chosen with the following factors in mind: accessibility to inmates, cooperation of officials, availability of a sufficient number of inmates with the desired characteristics, size of institution, and diversity of types of employees.

For work release supervisors no sampling decision had to be made. There were, at the time of data collection, 53 firms employing inmates in the program. Forty-one supervisors were interviewed.

For prison employees, 89 of the 107 were judged to have ample interaction with inmates with supervision responsibilities. For an adequate sample size, five numbers were
randomly selected, and according to the final digit of each employee's civil service number, subjects were included in the sample. Forty-one were chosen with 39 being interviewed finally.\^1\!

The final class of respondents, inmates, was categorized according to their length of incarceration, proximity to release, and participation in the work-release program. From data supplied by the Louisiana Department of Corrections, the inmates in each cluster were identified and included in the sample. There were 42 "Early-phase Inmates," that is, inmates who have been incarcerated less than six months. Forty-one were ultimately interviewed.

Inmates who met two requirements—at least two years' incarceration and anticipated release within six months—were selected for a sample block labeled "Late-phase Inmates." Thirty-two inmates were in this group and 31 were interviewed.

"Middle-phase Inmates" is the term assigned those who have been in prison more than two years and who have no release date within two years. Each of the twenty in this category was interviewed.

The fourth mutually exclusive cluster of inmates is the work releasees. They number thirty in the sample out of forty-one that were participating at the time of data collection.

\^2Two employees who were selected in the sample were not interviewed on the three scheduled interviews due to illness, vacations, and a resignation.
In summary, the six sample blocks are as follows:

A. "Early-phase Inmates"  \( N = 41 \)
B. "Late-phase Inmates"  \( N = 31 \)
C. "Middle-phase Inmates"  \( N = 20 \)
D. "Work-Release Inmates"  \( N = 30 \)
E. L.C.I.S. Supervisors  \( N = 39 \)
F. Work-Release Supervisors  \( N = 41 \)

Total  \( N = 202 \)

**Data Collection**

Data were obtained by personal and group interviews with persons in the sample blocks. The Department of Corrections, Correctional Services Division made available the places of work-releasees' employment. The majority were in New Orleans. The remainder were situated in Lake Charles, DeRidder, and DeQuincy, Louisiana. Work-releasees are employed in regular jobs but return either to the prison, the work-release center in New Orleans, or a parish jail near the place of their employment.

Work-release supervisors were interviewed individually at the work place. An appointment was made in each instance. The contact person was the individual who entered the agreement with the Department of Corrections and actually hired the inmate. In most cases it was the personnel manager. He was informed of the nature of the research and was asked permission to interview the supervisor nearest the inmate, an employee who already knew that he was an inmate. In many cases,
fellow workers and some lower-level foremen were unaware of the fact that they were working with an inmate. Care was taken not to disturb this working arrangement. These supervisors were cooperative. The only difficulty centered around the fact that in some situations the interviews were interrupted by business responsibilities of the respondents.  

Prison personnel were administered the questionnaire in small groups either at the beginning or conclusion of work shifts in the visiting room of the institution. Work-release inmates were interviewed at the place where they stayed at night. Other inmates were interviewed in groups of 10 to 20 at the prison. Authorities were helpful in "calling out" inmates for the interviews. The extent of inmate cooperation is reflected in the fact that only one had to be excused for his apparent lack of interest. Three other questionnaires had to be discounted for lack of information.  

To avert collusion by the inmates, their desks were spaced so that one could not see the answers of another.

---

20 In Appendix B can be found the list of norms used in the study. Appendix E contains the face data sheet of the questionnaire and Appendix F is a sample of the answer sheets for responses to the norms.

21 Some insight was gained into the socialization process in prison during the interviews. There was a glaring difference in the behavior of new inmates and old inmates. New "fish" do not yet know the norms by which they are to operate. The only discipline problems encountered during the interviews were among new inmates.
All inmates at the institution were interviewed in the space of twelve hours in order to keep at a minimum contamination of the population by those already interviewed. Inmate subjects were assured anonymity; their names or inmate numbers were not asked. Time was taken at the outset of the interview to talk informally with the inmates, to shake hands and meet them by name, and to explain something of the purpose of the survey. Appendix A consists of the instructions read to the interviewees.

An average of one hour was required for each interview. The interview schedule was six pages long. The final page contained relevant face data. On the first five pages respondents simply checked appropriate responses to normative statements as they were read. Appendix F is a sample of the answer sheets. There was a slight variation among the three classes of respondents. The number of norms included in the study was reduced from 60 to 35 after the pre-testing for three reasons: time required for administration, ambiguity of some statements, and the vagueness and irrelevance of others. The 35 norms to which the respondents reacted are listed in Appendix B. The respondents were first asked to give their opinions, either agreement or disagreement, without regard to what they

22The alternative to the method employed was to ask the respondent to shift mentally from one level of perception to another five times for each norm. Prior experience in similar research led to this decision.
actually did. It was put as a matter of "what ought to be." In sequence each group was asked, "Do most inmates agree?" "Do most L.C.I.S. personnel agree?" "Do most inmates think you agree?" "Do most L.C.I.S. personnel think you agree?"\footnote{Two other questions were asked of work-release inmates: Does your work-release supervisor agree and does your work-release supervisor think you agree?} By presenting all norms for each question and then repeating them for the next, a marked improvement in clarity was evident even though it was more time consuming.

**Analysis of Data**

After the data were collected, the information was coded and prepared for computer analysis. The heart of the data is the patterns of response to each of the 35 norms. Since each person was asked five questions regarding each norm, the result was 35 patterns of responses on each questionnaire. "Agree" was coded "1" and "disagree" was coded "0." Therefore, 1,1,1,1,1 indicated agreement on all five questions and 0,0,0,0,0 meant disagreement for each question. This means, of course, 32 combinations of responses are possible for each of the 35 norms. To facilitate the identification of patterns, the five-digit binary numbers were converted to two-digit decimal numbers.

At this point it was possible to obtain from the computer a print-out of frequency distributions for each of the 32 patterns for each of the 35 norms controlling for the six
categories into which the respondents fit. In this fashion it was possible to determine, by hand, the number of subjects who exhibit a particular pattern or group of patterns on a particular norm.

The descriptive use of statistics is important to the analysis of data of this inquiry. The verification portion of the analysis involves computation of Z scores using the binomial, two-sample difference of proportion, Cochran's Q and Fisher Exact Probability tests. This allows answers to such questions as: "Do a significant number of inmates agree with this norm?" "Does a particular category of inmates exhibit first-level consensus on a significant number of norms?" A more detailed discussion of analysis procedures appears in the context of their use in the following three chapters.
CHAPTER II

THE RELATION OF TEMPORAL ASPECTS OF PRISONIZATION TO CONSENSUAL PATTERNS

I. INTRODUCTION

This chapter presents a series of hypotheses on the phases of the institutional careers of first-offender male inmates and the relations of these phases to normative consensus. The justification for postulating such associations is contained in the hypotheses' derivation from the theoretical setting of the study and prior research. Methodological procedures unique to this chapter are included. The analysis of data and the research findings relevant to the hypotheses precede the final section of the chapter on theoretical implications of the findings.¹

II. THEORETICAL SETTING OF THE CHAPTER

In light of the independent variable in the hypotheses analyzed here, i.e., consensual patterns, and the independent

¹The hypotheses submitted to testing in this chapter relate only to the chronological proximity of inmates to entrance and egression. See Chapters III and IV for tests relating to normative content and typology, the nature of roles and accuracy of perception as they concern consensus in the prison.
variables, actual and anticipated durations of inmate interaction in the prison social system, the theoretical framework of the research produces certain predicted outcomes. Considered at this point are logical extensions of selected tenets anent consensus, symbolic interactionism, and prisonization.

**Consensus**

It has been observed that consensus, in the history of social thought prior to and following the formalization of sociology as a discipline, has been a matter of interest for those concerned with the collective aspects of human life. Auguste Comte, reputed by some to be the father of the concept, was certainly not the first or last to philosophically speculate about the relationship of the individual to the organic whole: society.²

A pre-sociologist, Ibn Khaldun, in the 14th century discussed the nature of the social bond. He contrasted nomadic and sedentary life, conceived as social processes, in showing the relation of physical conditions to social organization, to social cohesion, and the functional relation of cohesion to other social factors. Nomadic life with its simplicity, bravery, requisites of desert life and camel raising, was considered by Ibn Khaldun to be a type case of esprit de corps. Here was the greatest evidence of social

integration and solidarity.  

Along the way, others interested in social-psychological questions have dealt with consensus. Tarde observed consensus and sought to explain it in terms of imitation.  

LeBon's idea was that "the law of mental unity" went to work "as soon as a few individuals are gathered together."  

Society, for Durkheim, is a reality sui generis. Society expresses itself and becomes known to human consciousness through collective representations, which are, in Durkheim's words:

. . . the result of an immense cooperation which stretches out not only into space but into time as well; to make them a multitude of minds have associated, united, and combined their ideas and sentiments. . . .  

The "conscience collective," he defined as "beliefs and sentiments held in common." For him this consensual notion was central to every sociological problem.

Up to the last two decades, most attention given to consensus was of the Durkheimian variety, that is, macroscopic,  

---

3Howard Becker and Harry Elmer Barnes, Social Thought From Lore to Science (New York: Dover Publications, 1961), 266-76.  


7Ibid., 418.
equated with an assumed equilibrium and thoroughly integrated into functionalism. The 1950's and 1960's have seen consensus viewed as a variable rather than as an assumed condition and investigated in a microscopic sense. In this tradition, consensus, as defined in the current study, seeks to measure the degree to which an orientation permeates all the individual members of the group, with respect to a given object. In other words, to what extent is an attitude or opinion held by group members. This measure of agreement is referred to as the first level of consensus.

The second level of consensus involves interpersonal perception or, in the words of Bronfenbrenner "sensitivity to the generalized other" which is defined as a measure of the awareness of the social norm or the typical response of a large class or group.

In addition, consensus, to be considered a viable variable worthy of microscopic attention because of its empirical relevance to the Durkheimian concept of "collective representation," must be taken a step further. The third

---

8One of the better known such equalizing of consensus and social equilibrium is Parsons' defining of social action in terms of two functional references: (a) the maintenance of a pattern of orientation, and (b) the definition of one or more situational objects. Talcott Parsons, The Social System (Glencoe: The Free Press, 1951), 507.

level of consensus allows an indication of the awareness of the opinion held by others regarding ego's orientation to an object. Levels of consensus, i.e., higher orders of interpersonal perception, could be taken, asymptotically nearer to the hypothesized limit.$^{10}$

Thus, conceptually, consensus is defined as an infinite series of reciprocating understandings between the members of a group. Operationally, consensus is defined as the measurements of the amount of coorientation at any particular level on an intra- or inter-group basis.

**Symbolic Interactionism**

The preceding discussion of consensus as defined in the present examination obviously is predicated on the principles of social-psychological interactionist theory. In America, this pragmatically influenced schools of thought developed by William James through Cooley and Thomas to Mead. Their "social-me," "looking-glass self," "definition of the situation," and "role-taking," respectively, are illustrative of their accenting "attitude and meaning" while subjugating mass phenomena for self or personality.$^{11}$

"The solid facts of life," Cooley said, "are the
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imaginations people have of one another. In defining the "looking-glass self," he wrote,

A self-idea of this sort seems to have three principle elements: the imagination of our appearance to the other person; the imagination of our judgment of that appearance; and some sort of self-feeling, such as pride or mortification.\(^{13}\)

The significance of consensus is pointed up in Dewey's understanding of communication and Mead's definition of role-taking. Dewey does not consider the sender and receiver to be separate systems, but for communication to occur they must be joined together in a single system. For him, communication is the interpenetrating of perspectives where individuals share some of each other's point of view. Each person knows what the other is thinking.\(^{14}\)

In role-taking, Mead elaborates on how this mind reading takes place. It is the anticipation of the responses of others with whom one is interacting. This involves an infinite series of hypothesis-checking as one projects part of his experience on another, comparing the actual gestures of the other with gestures that would be expected to accompany this experience and then changing the hypothesized experience to conform more closely to the observed gestures. This symbolic interacting over time, i.e., communication, is said


\(^{13}\)Ibid., 152.

\(^{14}\)Scheff, 34-35.
to produce accurate role-taking, that is, correct interpersonal perception.15

Prisonization

When one moves into a new and different social system it may be expected that a gradual process of assimilation of the sentiments, memories, and traditions of the new group will be experienced. This oftentimes unconscious experience is that of learning enough of the culture of the new social unit to enable individuals to engage in behavior sufficiently conforming to normative standards to keep disorganization and conflict within tolerable limits. When the new social system is that of a penitentiary, the process of assimilation might be called "prisonization."16

Everyone entering the prison encounters this process in varying degrees. Clemmer suggests that the universal factors of prisonization are: acceptance of an inferior role, accumulation of facts concerning the organization of the prison; the development of somewhat new habits of eating, working, dressing, sleeping; the adoption of local language, the recognition that nothing is owed to the environment for the supplying of needs; and the eventual desire for a good job.


These universal factors of prisonization according to Clemmer, are enough in themselves to force an actor to take on the characteristics of the penal community and thus to disrupt his personality. If he is subjected to it through the years, a happy adjustment in any community becomes next to impossible.

To say it differently, a new inmate becomes aware of his low status. He is at once an anonymous figure in a subordinate group in which his number becomes more important than his name. He begins to wear the uniform, which is indicative of his subordinate group. He is often interrogated and instructed. Thus, he becomes aware that the officials are all-powerful. He becomes aware of the attitudes, weaknesses, titles, authority, and ranks of prison officials. He learns the meaning of prison slang and after a few months he changes his opinion of the necessities of life such as food, shelter, and clothing. He comes to believe that the environment should take care of him. Therefore, after he "wises up" he stops saying, "I'll do any kind of work they put me at and you won't have any trouble from me" and begins to look the situation over and express a desire for a certain kind of easy work.17

Clemmer is not as concerned with these so-called universal factors of prisonization as he is those influences which "... breed or deepen criminality and antisociality

17Ibid., 299-300.
and make the inmate characteristic of the criminalistic etiology in the prison community." He lists five determinants: 1

1. The man himself. His susceptibility to a culture which depends on the type relationships he had before imprisonment (i.e., his personality).

2. The kind and extent of relationships which an inmate has with persons outside the walls.

3. The existence of affiliation in semi-primary prison groups.

4. The chance placement in particular work gangs, cell houses, and with cellmates.

5. The degree of acceptance of dogma, the codes of the prison culture.

Clemmer does not contend that there is a high correlation between criminality and either extreme of prisonization. That is to say, an inmate may not be integrated into the prison culture, but yet he may continue to be much more criminalistic than an inmate who becomes completely prisonized.

On the basis of the five determinants listed above, Clemmer constructed schemas of the extremely prisonized inmate and the extremely unprisonized inmate. He claims that there are more prisonized than unprisonized but the vast majority appear to be prisonized on some points and not prisonized on others.

While assimilation, customarily, is a slow gradual process, prisonization is not necessarily slow. The speed of prisonization depends on the personality of the inmate, his crime, age, home, neighborhood, intelligence, the situation into which he is placed in prison, as well as other

18 Ibid., 303ff.
factors. It is often an irregular process and sometimes cyclical. The excessive number of changes in attitude and behavior which prisoners undergo makes generalizations about the process of prisonization hazardous.

A more theoretical analysis of the process centers around Goffman's concept of "total institution." Its major feature is the breakdown of barriers which separate the three spheres of life: sleep, play, and work. In prisons and similar organizations these happen at the same place with the same set of co-participants under the same authority, with an overall rational plan. Goffman points out that in a total institution the handling of many human needs by the bureaucratic organization of whole blocks of people produces certain consequences. There must be a group of personnel whose activity is surveillance and there is a split between the large managed group called "inmates" and the supervisory staff. The staff often view inmates as bitter, secretive, and untrustworthy. On the other hand, inmates define the staff as condescending, high-handed, and mean. While inmates are inclined to feel inferior, weak, blame-worthy, and guilty, the staff has a propensity to feel superior and righteous.19

Regarding consensus among and between cohorts of

superordinate and subordinate positions, Homans hypothesized, "The more frequently persons interact with one another, the more alike in some respects both their activities and their sentiments tend to become," but only, he adds when people interact as social equals and their jobs are not sharply differentiated. 20

Goffman differs with Clemmer for he says that inmates come to the penitentiary with a "presenting culture" which they have derived from the home world. The process of change experienced by the inmate is something less than acculturation or assimilation because the total institution does not substitute its own unique culture for that which has already been formed. For this reason Goffman maintained that "total institutions" do not really look for cultural victory but rather they sustain a particular kind of tension between the home world and the institutional world, and endeavor to use this as a leverage in the management of men. 21

In applying the doctrines of interactionism to prisonization, Goffman observes that when the inmate arrives at the prison he is stripped of certain social arrangements to which he is accustomed and which serve as the basis of his self-concept. Goffman says "his self is systematically mortified." Thus begin some radical changes in his moral career, namely,


21Goffman, 22.
beliefs that he has concerning himself and significant others. In free life, the individual fills several roles which he schedules and no one role blocks his performance of other roles. On the contrary, in total institutions, membership stops role scheduling and role dispossession is the result.

Admission procedures invariably contribute to this self-mortification. Being assigned a number, fingerprinted, searched, photographed, undressed, disinfected, given institutional clothing, instructed regarding rules, and assigned to quarters in a manner designed to communicate inferior status of the new inmate, also communicates the new absence of any basis for self-identification. This self-mortification, understood in the tradition of symbolic interactionism, has implications for the "social self" that persons oriented to particular expressive idioms might define based on this sort of general situation. 22

Wheeler asserted that inmates in an early phase of their institutional career conformed to staff expectations more than did those in the middle phase of their careers. He reports, also, that inmates about to be released begin to "shed the prison culture" to the extent that those in the late phase conform to staff expectations more than those in the middle phase. 23


The interrelation of interactionism, prisonization, and consensus theory in this chapter leads to the extension of Schelling's ideas regarding tacit coordination to consensus, communication, and motivation in the prison system. The basic proposition is that the necessity for coordination motivates a desire for consensus which is possible through communication. This relationship might be simply diagrammed in this way:

necessity of coordination \(\longrightarrow\) communication \(\longrightarrow\) consensus

III. APPLICABLE METHODOLOGY

Since the general methodological procedures were discussed in Chapter I, at this point the specific methods of analysis employed in this section of the study will be presented.

Criteria for classifying inmates according to the independent variable, temporal aspects of prison career, included the subjects' chronological proximity to entrance and egression. The design of the sample was such that three categories of prisoners, selected on the basis of these two criteria, were interviewed to obtain data relevant to the dependent variables, inter- and intra-category consensus at ascending levels of perception.

Some operational definitions are necessary. Agreement among subjects in a category (as in Hypothesis I of Corollaries I and II) is empirically defined as the number of norms on which a significant number of inmates are agreed, either positively or negatively.

Agreement between inmates and supervisors (Hypothesis II) is indicated by the number of norms on which both inmates and supervisors are in agreement.

Coorientation (Hypothesis III) reflects the number of norms on which a significant number of inmates are both agreed and believe others to feel the same.

Perception of coorientation among inmates (Hypothesis IV), operationally, is the number of norms on which a significant number of inmates are in agreement, believe others to feel the same, and believe others correctly perceive their opinion.

Perception of coorientation between inmates and supervisors relates to the number of norms on which there is significant inmate agreement, belief that supervisors feel the same and belief that supervisors correctly appraise their opinion (Hypothesis V).

Simple agreement about others' opinions and perceptions of opinions (Hypotheses VI-IX) is measured by the number of norms displaying significant agreement about a second or third level of perception without regard to answers at other levels.
A consensus measurement for each category at each level of perception was obtained in the following manner. Each subject was asked his opinions about 35 normative and value statements. A one-sample binomial test ($p = .5$, one-tailed) was used to determine whether a significant number of inmates in the category exhibited consensus on each statement. The number of statements on which there was significant consensus was considered a measurement of consensus at each level of perception for each category. The one-sample binomial test ($p = .5$) was again employed to determine if there was consensus on more norms than might be expected by chance under the null hypothesis.

Before testing the significance of the association between the three inmate categories of interest to this chapter, taken two at a time, according to consensus patterns, the overall association among all categories was tested for each level of perception. A non-parametric test for $K$-related samples, Cochran's $Q$, was utilized for this purpose.

\[ Z = \sqrt{2 \times \frac{X^2}{df}} - \sqrt{2} \]

It will be remembered that opinions regarding each norm were fivefold: personal opinion, inmate's opinion, supervisor's opinion, inmate's perception of ego's opinion, and supervisor's perception of ego's opinion.

The $Q$ was converted to a $Z$-score for the computation of the test statistic because of the large degrees of freedom. Cochran's $Q$ was appropriate for this test in spite of the independent nature of the samples of this study. Sidney Siegel, Nonparametric Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1956), 161-66 points out that Cochran's
TABLE VIII
SIGNIFICANT (1) OR NON-SIGNIFICANT (0) AGREEMENT ON NORMS BY SAMPLE CATEGORIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Norms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early-Phase</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 1 1 1 1 0 0 0 1 0 1 1 1 1 1 0 0 1 1 1 1 0 1 1 0 0 1 1 1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle-Phase</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 1 1 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 1 1 1 1 1 1 0 1 0 1 0 0 0 1 1 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 1 1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late-Phase</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 1 1 1 1 0 0 0 1 0 1 1 1 1 1 1 0 1 0 1 0 0 0 1 1 1 0 1 1 0 0 1 1 1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Release</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 1 1 1 1 0 0 1 0 0 1 1 1 1 1 1 0 0 1 1 0 0 1 1 1 0 0 1 0 1 1 1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L.C.I.S.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 1 0 1 0 1 0 0 0 0 1 1 1 1 0 1 0 1 1 1 1 0 0 1 1 0 0 0 0 1 1 1 1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Release</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 0 1 1 1 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 1 1 0 0 1 0 1 1 1 1 0 0 1 1 1 0 0 1 0 1 1 1 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q = 91.73 (34 df); Z = 5.24***b.

The significance of rejecting the null hypothesis is interpreted substantively to mean that very rarely would this result occur by chance. Similar tests were conducted to test the overall association between normative consensus and sample category. Significance was found in each case. (For Agreement between inmates and supervisors, Q = 151.46, Z = 9.1***; for coorientation among inmates, Q = 118.24, Z = 7.08***; for perception of coorientation among inmates, Q = 85.04, Z = 4.74***; for simple agreement about cohort opinion, Q = 103.15, Z = 6.06***; for simple agreement about cohort perception of inmate opinion, Q = 89.89, Z = 5.11***.)

bThe nomenclature employed throughout this report is as follows: p < .05 = *; p < .01 = **; p < .001 = ***. No asterisk indicates a probability of less than .05. Parentheses (*) mean that the direction is opposite that predicted.
Upon deciding that it was legitimate to test the association between two categories at a time, the following procedure was used. The consensus score for each category at each level of perception allowed use of two-sample difference of proportion tests to determine if the two samples were so different that they would not be from the same population, with the given frequency distribution, five times out of 100.

In each test conducted in this chapter, $\alpha = .05$. One-tailed tests are appropriate because direction of relationship is predicted in each case.

IV. HYPOTHESES AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

A series of propositions derived from the above conceptual context logically produce empirically testable hypotheses regarding normative consensus at various levels of perception, among inmates, between inmates and supervisors, and according to categories of inmates based on phases of institutional careers.

$Q$ may be used when the matching is based on relevant characteristics of the different subjects. Thus, the assumptions necessary for this statistical model are met by considering significant consensus "pass" and non-significant consensus "fail" and by treating the categories of subjects as "sets." In this design the categories are considered "matched" because each person responds to all 35 statements.
Hypotheses Pertaining to Duration of Incarceration

Early-phase inmates are new men who have been incarcerated less than six months and have no release date for at least two years. Middle-phase inmates are those who have been in the penitentiary for at least two years and who have no release date for at least two years. Seven propositions underlie the hypotheses and methods of the first cluster of hypotheses of this chapter.

**Proposition I:** Normative consensus among and between groups varies at each level of perception.

**Proposition II:** The degree of consensus is a function of communication or urgency for coordination.

**Proposition III:** Urgency for coordination is considered a constant for early and middle-phase inmates in that both anticipate participation in the prison social system for at least two years.

**Proposition IV:** Communication requires the sharing of perspectives through social interaction.

**Proposition V:** Inmates in the middle phase of their institutional careers have interacted with other inmates and staff more than inmates in the early phase.

**Proposition VI:** Interaction among cohorts in subordinate positions contributes to consensus and interaction between superordinates and subordinates contributes to conflict.

**Proposition VII:** Inmates as a class of actors in the prison are subordinate to staff members.

**Corollary I**

Hence, middle-phase inmates exhibit more intra-inmate and less inmate-supervisor consensus than do early-phase inmates.
Hypothesis I: Middle-phase inmates will exhibit agreement on more norms than will early-phase inmates.

TABLE IX
DATA RELEVANT TO HYPOTHESIS I OF COROLLARY I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inmate Category</th>
<th>Number of Norms</th>
<th>Significant Agreement</th>
<th>Non-significant Agreement</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Early phase</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle phase</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Z = 1.83(*)

The data in Table IX do not permit rejection of the null hypothesis because the direction of the association is opposite that which was predicted. Therefore Hypothesis I cannot be accepted.

Hypothesis II: Middle-phase inmates and supervisors will exhibit agreement on fewer norms than will early-phase inmates and supervisors.

TABLE X
DATA RELEVANT TO HYPOTHESIS II OF COROLLARY I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inmate Category</th>
<th>Number of Norms</th>
<th>Significant Agreement</th>
<th>Non-significant Agreement</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inmate-Supervisor</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervosis</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Z = .48.
While the direction of association is that which was predicted in Hypothesis II, the Z-score is not statistically significant at an acceptable level of confidence.

**Hypothesis III:** Coorientation among middle-phase inmates is greater than coorientation among early-phase inmates.

| Table XI |
|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|
| **Inmate Category** | **Number of Norms**   |                      |
|                     | **Significant**       | **Non-significant**  |
| Early phase         | 13                    | 22                   |
| Middle phase        | 9                     | 26                   |
| Total               | 22                    | 48                   |

\[ Z = 1.03. \]

It is observed that early-phase inmates exhibit more coorientation than do middle-phase inmates, though not significantly so. The research hypothesis, thus, cannot be accepted.

**Hypothesis IV:** Perception of coorientation among middle-phase inmates is greater than perception of coorientation among early-phase inmates.
TABLE XII
DATA RELEVANT TO HYPOTHESIS IV OF COROLLARY I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inmate Category</th>
<th>Number of Norms</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>Non-significant</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perception of</td>
<td>Perception of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coorientation</td>
<td>Coorientation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Among Inmates</td>
<td>Among Inmates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early phase</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle phase</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Z = 2.99(***)

There is no support for this hypothesis in the data. Recently incarcerated inmates exhibited third-level consensus on significantly more norms than did those in prison for a longer period.

Hypothesis V: Perception of coorientation between middle-phase inmates and supervisors is less than perception of coorientation between early-phase inmates and supervisors.

TABLE XIII
DATA RELEVANT TO HYPOTHESIS V OF COROLLARY I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inmate Category</th>
<th>Number of Norms</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>Non-significant</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perception of</td>
<td>Perception of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coorientation</td>
<td>Coorientation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Between Inmates</td>
<td>Between Inmates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and Supervisors</td>
<td>and Supervisors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early phase</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle phase</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Z = 0.
On no norms did inmates of either category significantly perceive coorientation with supervisors. Consequently, the hypothesis cannot be accepted.

**Hypothesis VI:** Simple agreement about cohorts' opinions is greater among middle-phase inmates than among early-phase inmates.

**TABLE XIV**

**DATA RELEVANT TO HYPOTHESIS VI OF COROLLARY I**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inmate Category</th>
<th>Number of Norms</th>
<th>Significant Agreement About Inmates' Opinions</th>
<th>Non-significant Agreement About Inmates' Opinions</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Early phase</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle phase</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ Z = 1.44. \]

Hypothesis VI is not supported by the evidence of this study. More newcomers agree about inmates' opinions than do those in prison for over a year, though not significantly more at an acceptable level of confidence.

**Hypothesis VII:** Simple agreement about supervisors' opinions is less among middle-phase inmates than among early-phase inmates.
TABLE XV
DATA RELEVANT TO HYPOTHESIS VII OF COROLLARY I

| Inmate Category | Number of Norms | | | |
|-----------------|----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
|                 | Significant Agreement | Non-significant Agreement | Total |
| Early phase     | 18              | 17              | 35              |
| Middle phase    | 14              | 21              | 35              |
| Total           | 32              | 38              | 70              |

Z = .96.

This hypothesis is not supported to an accepted degree of confidence. There was found more early-phase agreement about supervisors than was found among middle-phase inmates.

Hypothesis VIII: Simple agreement about cohorts' perception of ego's opinion is greater among middle-phase inmates than among early-phase inmates.
TABLE XVI
DATA RELEVANT TO HYPOTHESIS VIII OF COROLLARY I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inmate Category</th>
<th>Significant Agreement About Inmates' Perception of Ego's Opinion</th>
<th>Non-significant Agreement About Inmates' Perception of Ego's Opinion</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Early phase</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle phase</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Z = 2.88 (**)

Hypothesis VIII is not supported by the research. The direction of the significant association is opposite to that predicted by the hypothesis.

Hypothesis IX: Simple agreement about supervisors' perception of ego's opinion is less among middle-phase inmates than among early-phase inmates.

TABLE XVII
DATA RELEVANT TO HYPOTHESIS IX OF COROLLARY I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inmate Category</th>
<th>Significant Agreement About Supervisors' Perception of Ego's Opinion</th>
<th>Non-significant Agreement About Supervisors' Perception of Ego's Opinion</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Early phase</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle phase</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Z = 4.04***

The evidence in Table XVII supports the hypothesis.
Inmates in the middle phase of their institutional careers exhibit less consensus about supervisors' perception of them than do those in the early phase.

**Hypotheses Pertaining to Proximity to Release**

Late-phase inmates have been in prison for at least two years and are expecting to be released within six months. Middle-phase inmates, as in the preceding section, have been incarcerated at least two years but anticipate no release for at least two years. The following propositions, based on the discussion of interaction and prisonization, underlie the second cluster of hypotheses.

**Proposition I:** Normative consensus among and between groups varies at each level of perception.

**Proposition II:** The degree of consensus is a function of either communication or urgency for coordination.

**Proposition III:** Communication is considered a constant for middle- and late-phase first offenders in that both have been in prison for at least two years.

**Proposition IV:** Urgency for coordination is a function of anticipated duration of interaction and accompanying symbiotic exigencies.

**Proposition V:** Anticipation of egressing a cultural system which is a contra-culture to the one to be entered stimulates resocialization.

**Proposition VI:** Staff supervisors represent the larger culture and the inmates' cultural system is contrary to it.

**Corollary II**

Hence, middle-phase inmates exhibit more intra-inmate consensus and less inmate-supervisor consensus than do late-phase inmates.
Hypothesis I: Agreement among middle-phase inmates is greater than agreement among late-phase inmates.

TABLE XVIII
DATA RELEVANT TO HYPOTHESIS I OF COROLLARY II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inmate Category</th>
<th>Number of Norms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Significant Agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle phase</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late phase</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Z = 0.

No evidence is provided in Table XVIII for this hypothesis. There was no difference in the number of norms with significant agreement for the two categories of inmates.

Hypothesis II: Agreement between middle-phase inmates and supervisors is less than between late-phase inmates and supervisors.

TABLE XIX
DATA RELEVANT TO HYPOTHESIS II OF COROLLARY II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inmate Category</th>
<th>Number of Norms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Significant Agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle phase</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late phase</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Z = 1.68 (*).

Contrary to findings in previous research, the opposite direction of relationship was found to that suggested by Hypothesis II. As inmates prepare to leave the penitentiary,
they do not begin to agree with their supervisors.

**Hypothesis III:** Coorientation among middle-phase inmates is greater than coorientation among late-phase inmates.

**TABLE XX**

**DATA RELEVANT TO HYPOTHESIS III OF COROLLARY II**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inmate Category</th>
<th>Number of Norms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coorientation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle phase</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late phase</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ Z = 1.27. \]

**Hypothesis III cannot be accepted on the basis of this research.** The association that does exist is such that those about to leave the prison exhibit coorientation with fellow inmates on more norms than do those in the midst of their careers.

**Hypothesis IV:** Perception of coorientation among middle-phase inmates is greater than perception of coorientation among late-phase inmates.
TABLE XXI
DATA RELEVANT TO HYPOTHESIS IV OF COROLLARY II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inmate Category</th>
<th>Number of Norms</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>Non-significant</td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of</td>
<td>Perception of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coorientation</td>
<td>Coorientation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Among Inmates</td>
<td>Among Inmates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle phase</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late phase</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Z = 1.51.

Again, the anticipation of leaving the prison social system did not exhibit any influence in the direction of less feeling of intra-inmate consensus. The null hypothesis that there is no association between proximity to release and perception of coorientation among inmates cannot be rejected.

**Hypothesis V:** Perception of coorientation between middle-phase inmates and supervisors is less than perception of coorientation between late-phase inmates and supervisors.

TABLE XXII
DATA RELEVANT TO HYPOTHESIS V OF COROLLARY II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inmate Category</th>
<th>Number of Norms</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>Non-significant</td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of</td>
<td>Perception of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coorientation</td>
<td>Coorientation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Inmates</td>
<td>Between Inmates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and Supervisors</td>
<td>and Supervisors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle phase</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late phase</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Z = 0.
Hypothesis VI: Simple agreement about cohorts' opinion is greater among middle-phase inmates than among late-phase inmates.

TABLE XXIII
DATA RELEVANT TO HYPOTHESIS VI OF COROLLARY II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inmate Category</th>
<th>Significant Agreement About Inmates' Opinions</th>
<th>Non-significant Agreement About Inmates' Opinions</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Middle phase</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late phase</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Z = .96.

The null hypothesis stating that there is no difference between middle- and late-phase inmates according to agreement about inmates' opinions is not rejected. Hypothesis VI cannot stand on the basis of these findings.

Hypothesis VII: Simple agreement about supervisors' opinions is less among middle-phase inmates than among late-phase inmates.
Hypothesis VII predicts the correct direction but the amount of association is not significant at the .05 level. Those soon to leave the institution are in more agreement, it seems, regarding the opinions of supervisors.

Hypothesis VIII: Simple agreement about cohorts' perception of ego's opinion is greater among middle-phase inmates than among late-phase inmates.

On significantly more norms than middle-phase inmates,
late-phase men agreed regarding the perception their cohorts had of their opinions. Hypothesis VIII is not supported by the evidence.

**Hypothesis IX:** Simple agreement about supervisors perception of ego's opinion is less among middle-phase inmates than among late-phase inmates.

**TABLE XXVI**

**DATA RELEVANT TO HYPOTHESIS IX OF COROLLARY II**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inmate Category</th>
<th>Number of Norms</th>
<th>Significant Agreement About Supervisors' Perception of Ego's Opinion</th>
<th>Non-significant Agreement About Supervisors' Perception of Ego's Opinion</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Middle phase</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late phase</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ Z = 3.5^{***}. \]

Strong evidence is found supporting Hypothesis IX.

Late-phase inmates agree about what supervisors think of them significantly more than do middle-phase men.
V. CONCLUSION

Frequently, unexpected findings turn out to be as meaningful, if not more so, than those which were anticipated.

Synopsis of Findings

Corollary I stated that middle-phase inmates exhibit more consensus among themselves than do early-phase inmates. At no level of consensus did this relationship hold. Findings pertaining to Hypotheses I, III, IV, VI, and VIII indicate that the opposite is true, that is, early-phase inmates show more consensus at each level than do middle-phase inmates. And, it might be added, significantly more at the levels of agreement, perception of coorientation, and agreement about inmates' perception of their opinion.

Corollary I also suggested that early-phase inmates exhibit more consensus with supervisors than do middle-phase inmates. The data relevant to Hypotheses II, V, VII, and IX support the postulated association significantly only at the level of agreement about supervisors' perception of inmates' opinions. The direction of association was as hypothesized, but not significantly, for agreement and agreement about supervisors' opinions.

Corollary II maintained that middle-phase inmates exhibit more consensus than do late-phase inmates. At no level of consensus was this found to be the case. In fact, the findings germane to Hypothesis VIII indicate a significant
association to the contrary for agreement about inmates' perceptions of ego's opinion.

In Corollary II it was also predicted that late-phase inmates manifest more inmate-supervisor consensus than do middle-phase inmates. This was the case for agreement about supervisors' opinions (Hypothesis VII) and agreement about supervisors' perception of inmates' opinions (Hypothesis IX), but, not significantly for the latter.

Theoretical Implications

The 18 hypotheses of this chapter are based on the following:

1. Clemmer's theorizing about prisonization, Wheeler's verification of Clemmer's conclusions, and Wheeler's study of the resocialization to life in free society; and

2. The logical extension of the tenets of interaction theory applicable to the prison social system.

Little evidence was found to support Clemmer and Wheeler among the male first offenders. The process of prisonization is certainly not as simplistic as it has been assumed to be. To consider consensus at the different levels reveals the intricate nature of interpersonal perception among inmates and between inmates and staff. The most directly contradictory finding regarding Clemmer's thesis was that more inmate-supervisor agreement for middle-phase inmates than for early-phase inmates.

Similarly, Wheeler's conclusion is contradicted by
the evidence that middle-phase inmates demonstrate more inmate-supervisor agreement than do late-phase inmates.

Assuming, of course, that the logical derivation of hypotheses is proper and that the measurement of variables is correct, it may be implied, on the basis of these findings, that the general model of interaction is not relevant to all types of social systems. For example, in the prison system, it was not found that communication functioned to produce consensus among classes of actors and neither did the urgency of coordination tend to be associated with consensus. Thus, the scheme

\[
\text{Communication} \leftarrow \text{Consensus} \leftarrow \text{Coordination}
\]

as proposed by Schelling and amended by Newcomb is an oversimplification which is appropriate only for certain types of systems. A model of coordination is presented in Chapter V which is more inclusive and allows for conceptualizing the interaction of systems, such as the one of this study, which is characterized by a large measure of extrinsic motivation.
CHAPTER III

CONSENSUAL VARIATIONS ACCORDING TO POSITIONS, ROLES, AND NORMS IN PRISON

I. INTRODUCTION

An exploration into normative consensus is greatly facilitated by the application of concepts gleaned from the role theory approach to social organization. In the current chapter two groups of hypotheses are presented whose common element is the prediction that consensus will differ among and between actors in the prison social system from norm to norm and according to the positions and roles of the actors. In a word, this is an investigation of structural effects on consensus.

The inclusion of work-release inmates as occupants of a unique position in the prison system gives the present analysis a practical implication. The major dilemma of penology has been described as resulting from the isolation of the confined offender from socially beneficial contact with individuals outside the inmate social world and the prevention of the formulation of relationships which might redefine him as an acceptable member of the noncriminal
community.\(^1\) Work-release inmates, while still incarcerated, go into the community to work and, thereby, have occasion to interact with persons outside the prison social system. The effect of such "free-person" interaction for consensus will be explored here.

A discussion of the theoretical context of the hypotheses is followed by sections on methodology, the hypotheses and analysis of data, and theoretical and practical implications of the findings.

II. THEORETICAL SETTING OF THE CHAPTER

The hypotheses of this chapter utilize concepts which are at the core of role theory. At this point some comments are appropriate about role theory, its relation to interaction theory, and the basic concepts needed to apply role theory to the present analysis.

The Perspective of Role Theory

There is not a grand theory in role theory and it is questionable if there is one of the middle range. Since theory is generally accepted among social scientists as being characterized by a series of logically related propositions which produce empirically testable hypotheses which produce

other logically consistent propositions, role theory may be labeled a misnomer. Hypotheses about particular aspects of the subject abound, but, there remains the task of logically connecting the propositions so that they constitute a theory.

The perspective of role theory reflects a limited social determinism in that performance results from the social prescriptions and behavior of others and that idiosyncratic performances, while slight, exist within the milieu engendered by these factors. To this view is added the interactionist notion that behavior is a function of definitions and perceptions of these elements. In society individuals occupy positions and their role performance in these positions is determined by social norms, demands, and rules; by the role performance of significant others; by the perception of the reactions of others; by the individual's particular capabilities and personality; and by the social situation in which the performance occurs.

Ralph Linton, an anthropologist, is credited with stimulating interest in role theory in 1936 as he distinguished

\[\text{2Robert K. Merton, On Theoretical Sociology (New York: The Free Press, 1967), 39 serves as an illustration of a sociologist endeavoring to rescue the term "theory" from all-inclusive meaninglessness.}\]


\[\text{4Ibid., 4. Added in this statement to the suggestions of Biddle and Thomas are those of Bates' Model of Behavior Causation, Interaction, Situation, Personality, and Culture (norms).}\]
between role and status or position. He defined status as a collection of rights and duties and role as the dynamic aspect of status. He wrote,

The individual is socially assigned to a status and occupies it with relation to other statuses. When he puts the rights and duties which constitute the status into effect, he is performing a role.5

As will be seen, this conceptualization, while provocative, has been improved upon by recent theorists.

Representative of two earlier social scientists who gave attention to the concept of role are Jacob Moreno and George Herbert Mead. Mead's concept of "role-taking" was discussed in Chapter II. Moreno called attention to role-perception and role-enactment as phases through which the birth of roles proceed.6

**Basic Concepts of Role Theory**

Six concepts are lifted from role theory literature and discussed here in light of their relevance to the present analysis. The continuing efforts of F. L. Bates have produced lucid delineations of these concepts.7

---


Norm. The most fundamental concept in role theory is that of "norm." Various definitions of the term are offered by sociologists and anthropologists, but the idea common among them is expressed by the words, standards, rules, shared value orientations, and expectations. Bates' definition of norm is, "a patterned or commonly held behavior expectation: a learned response held in common by members of a group." Norms are considered, for the present purposes, to be a part of the cultural structure. The structural approach concerns prescribed rather than actual behavior. The concern of this study is not how the actors behave, but how they say they ought to act.

Norms are classified variously, the most known being Sumner's mores, folkways and laws. Morris presents nine attributes by which norms may be grouped: (1) the extent to which they are known or recognized; (2) the extent to which they are accepted as just; (3) the degree to which they are uniformly applied to all groups or categories; (4) whether they are severely or lightly sanctioned; (5) the mode and consistency of enforcement; (6) source of authority; (7) the degree to which they are internalized; (8) the mode of their transmission; and (9) the amount and kind of conformity to them.

Gibbs, like Morris, insists on a behavioral component


-Bates, 1956, 313.

in the definition of norms. He proposes 19 types of norms according to collective evaluations of the act, collective expectation of the act, and type of sanction.\textsuperscript{10}

**Role.** It has been seen that Linton defined role as the enactment of a status. Others have viewed role behaviorly. Role may be real behavior as it consists of a set of acts or role may be ideal behavior, i.e., a part of cultural structure. It is in this latter sense that role will be treated for the present study. As ideal behavior a role consists of a set of norms which is distinguishable from other clusters of norms due to their organization around one function. Bates says a role consists of "... a cluster of norms organized around a function that one person performs toward another person or object in a given social situation."\textsuperscript{11}

**Position.** Since actors in a group often are assigned a number of roles, a concept which encompasses the roles of an actor in a group is needed. Social position is such a concept and thus, it is possible to locate an actor in a social system. A social position is a set of roles all of which are assigned to the same person for performance in a given group situation.\textsuperscript{12} In a group there is one, but only


\textsuperscript{12}Ibid., 26.
one, position for each actor, even if some positions are identical.

Social Group. Norms, roles, and positions are elemental concepts to the analysis of a social system. The group is a system made up of two or more positions. Each position has at least one role-relationship with every other position in the group. Therefore, the structure of a group is viewed as a varying number of positions, each containing one or more roles that are a set of norms, joined by a web of reciprocal role relationships.

Role Relationships. In elemental groups and multi-group structures there are found different kinds of relationships. These are bilateral or reflexive, reciprocal or conjunctive, and intramural or extramural. A relationship is bilateral when two different actors fill the roles which are related. When the same actor enacts the two roles it is reflexive.

A reciprocal relationship exists when two roles are related with the design of accomplishing one function for the same social system. The term conjunctive relationship means that two roles are related through the accomplishing of two different goals for two different systems.

While technically not types of relations, extramural and intramural roles will facilitate understanding of the role relations in the prison system. Intramural roles are those whose action is limited to a given group. Extramural
roles are those which require actors

. . . to leave the boundaries of one group and enter the boundaries of another in order to secure some kind of function, goods, or service needed and return it to the first group before he can perform the role itself.\textsuperscript{13}

**Role Nonreciprocity.** Role conflict exists when two norms that apply to the same actor are inconsistent. Another form of role stress occurs when norms contained within a role assigned to one actor are inconsistent with the norms assigned to another actor with whom there is interaction. This kind of role stress is called role nonreciprocity. Behavior is called for which is either logically or morally inconsistent in light of the common goal to be achieved. An absence of consensus could lead to role nonreciprocity.\textsuperscript{14}

Bates has offered seven structural components which are related to such role stresses. They are: (1) the structural distance between roles; (2) range of reciprocity; (3) orientation with respect to group boundaries; (4) temporal span of roles; (5) permissive versus mandatory behavior; (6) perceived importance to group survival; and (7) clarity of norms.\textsuperscript{15}

The preceding concepts from the role theory approach to social organization are placed in the framework of interaction theory and used in formulating the hypotheses to be tested.

While the purpose here is not to analyze the social

\textsuperscript{13}Ibid., 44. \textsuperscript{14}Ibid., 133-34. \textsuperscript{15}Bates, 1962.
organization of the prison. Figure 2 depicts the concepts described above and may facilitate relating them to consensual structural variation.

III. APPLICABLE METHODOLOGY

The sample was designed to obtain data from subjects in the four categories according to positions in the social structure, which are: prison supervisor, prison inmate, work-release supervisor, and work-release inmate. These positional categories constitute the independent variables in the portion of analysis related to Corollary III. The dependent variable, consensus, is represented in the same manner as in Chapter II. Briefly put, the binomial test was employed to determine if significant consensus existed for actors in each social position for each norm for each level of consensus. The number of norms exhibiting such consensus was judged to be an indicator of consensus at each level for each positional category. The two-sample difference of proportion test was used to judge the significance of the association (.05 level, one-tailed test).

In the analysis for Hypothesis I which compares the position of prison inmate to the position of work-release inmate, late-phase inmates only were included in the investigation of association because of their comparable duration of incarceration and commonly shared anticipation of egress from the prison system. This reduces the influence of factors unrelated to the hypothesis.
Structure of Work-Release Group

Social Positions
I. Prison Supervisor
II. Prison Inmate
III. Work-Release Inmate
IV. Work-Release Employee
V. Work-Release Supervisor
VI. Regular Employee

Roles
IA Disciplinarian
IB Laborer
IC Rehabilitation
ID Workman
IE Boss
IF Workman

Norms
IA Inmates should treat all inmates the same.
IB Inmates should stand up under the difficulty of their jobs.
IC Inmates should save their money.
ID Workers should produce enough to earn their pay.
IE Bosses should expect the same quality of work out of all workers.
IF Workers should produce enough to earn their pay.

Social Relationships
- Bilateral Reciprocal
- Bilateral Conjunctive
- Reflexive Conjunctive
- Reflexive Reciprocal

FIGURE 2
EXAMPLES OF NORMS, ROLES, POSITIONS, AND SOCIAL RELATIONS IN PRISON
The analysis involving Corollary IV employs categories of norms as the independent variables. For each group of norms an inmate consensus measurement was obtained in a manner similar to that described above. Five norms were selected to represent each classification of norms used in the analysis. Work-release inmates and supervisors were excluded from this section of analysis because the factor of extra-institutional relations was of no concern here and extraneous influence could be expected with their inclusion. For each of the remaining three categories of inmates (early-, middle-, and late-phase), the five norms were tested for significance at each level of consensus, using the binomial test. Thus, an indicator of inmate consensus for each category of norms was obtained by summing the number of norms on which there was significant consensus in each of the three inmate sets. The smaller number of norms required use of the Fisher Exact Probability Test\textsuperscript{16} to determine if inmate consensus at the various levels was significantly different at an acceptable level of confidence (.05) for the categories of norms.

The analysis pertaining to Hypothesis V of Corollary IV is different in that the proportion of inmates who changed their opinions when circumstances are considered is compared to the proportion of supervisors influenced by circumstances.

The number of subjects who agreed on a selected norm and who indicated a different opinion on a comparable norm with circumstantial provisions was calculated. A two-sample difference of proportion test was used to determine if there was a significant difference (.05 level) in the change between inmates and prison supervisors.

IV. HYPOTHESES AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

The concepts provided by role theory may be utilized in a series of propositions to logically produce hypotheses subject to empirical verification. In the context of interaction theory, the hypotheses are grouped around two corollaries about consensus; one dealing with the social positions of the actors and another related to categories of norms.

Hypotheses Pertaining to Social Positions

Five hypotheses are submitted to testing here. Out of the above discussion a series of propositions is lifted which lead to a corollary that, in turn, sets the stage for the hypotheses.

Proposition I. Normative consensus pertains to personal perception and interpersonal perception of expected behavior.

Proposition II: Actors in a social system occupy a variety of positions.

Proposition III: Positions in a social system are composed of roles.

Proposition IV: Roles are made up of norms which pertain to appropriate and expected behavior in role relations.
Proposition V: An actor's position in the social structure influences personal perception and interpersonal perception regarding norms.

Corollary III

Hence, actors in different positions in the prison social system will not exhibit equal normative consensus on an intra-category or an inter-category basis.

Work-release inmates' interaction is characterized structurally by greater distance between roles, that is, more structural boundaries must be crossed in playing the roles of the position than of prison inmates. They possess a smaller range of reciprocality; fewer actors have to be related to. The roles of the "work-release inmate" position have more latent phases than do prison inmate roles. Work releasees are placed in a position that makes their intra-group coordination and inter-group coordination more urgent than for prison inmates. There is less extrinsic motivation for some work-release roles and with more roles, highly vulnerable to role conflict, there is to be expected a strain toward intra-group consensus. The foregoing structural traits tend to produce less role nonreciprocity which means more normative consensus when it is granted that the norms of a group exist in the minds of that group's actors.

Hypothesis I: Work-release inmates exhibit more consensus than do late-phase inmates.

The data in Table XXVII do not support the hypothesis
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Positions Compared</th>
<th>(1--) Agreement</th>
<th>(11-) Agreement About Coorientation</th>
<th>(111) Perception of Coorientation</th>
<th>(-1-) Agreement About Coorientation</th>
<th>(--1) Agreement About Perception of Coorientation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. NS.</td>
<td>Sig. NS.</td>
<td>Sig. NS.</td>
<td>Sig. NS.</td>
<td>Sig. NS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work-release Inmates</td>
<td>25 10</td>
<td>18 17</td>
<td>8 27</td>
<td>22 13</td>
<td>23 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late-phase Inmates</td>
<td>21 14</td>
<td>15 20</td>
<td>7 28</td>
<td>20 15</td>
<td>17 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z=1.01</td>
<td>Z=.7189</td>
<td>Z=.2911</td>
<td>Z=.488</td>
<td>Z=1.45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE XXVII**

DATA RELEVANT TO HYPOTHESIS I OF COROLLARY III

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Norms</th>
<th>Social Positions Compared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Work-release Inmates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Late-phase Inmates</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
even though more consensus was found at each level among work-release inmates than among late-phase inmates. The difference between the two inmate positions was not significant at an acceptable level of confidence.

In comparison to prison supervisors, work-release supervisors would be expected to exhibit more consensus because of their wider range of reciprocality and less reaction to the inmate code.

**Hypothesis II:** Work-release supervisors exhibit more consensus than do supervisors employed at the prison. See Table XXVIII.

Support for the hypothesis is found in the analysis because at each level more consensus was exhibited among work-release supervisors than among prison supervisors. The difference was significant at three of the five levels.

Between work-release inmates and supervisors there is expected more consensus than between prison inmates and supervisors as a result of less compelled behavior and the importance of coordination to the group's survival.

**Hypothesis III:** Consensus between work-release inmates and work-release supervisors is greater than the consensus between prison inmates and prison supervisors. See Table XXIX.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Positions Compared</th>
<th>Number of Norms</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1-- ) Agreement</td>
<td>(11- ) Coorientation</td>
<td>(111) Perception of Coorientation</td>
<td>(-1-) Agreement About Coorientation</td>
<td>(-1-) Agreement About Perception of Coorientation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. NS.</td>
<td>Sig. NS.</td>
<td>Sig. NS.</td>
<td>Sig. NS.</td>
<td>Sig. NS.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work-release Supervisors</td>
<td>30 5</td>
<td>28 7</td>
<td>26 9</td>
<td>30 5</td>
<td>28 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 8</td>
<td>14 21</td>
<td>11 24</td>
<td>18 17</td>
<td>22 13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z=.923</td>
<td>Z=3.42***</td>
<td>Z=3.4***</td>
<td>Z=3.09***</td>
<td>Z=1.59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE XXIX

DATA RELEVANT TO HYPOTHESIS III OF COROLLARY III

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Positions Inter-Related</th>
<th>(1--) Agreement</th>
<th>(11--) Agreement About Coorientation</th>
<th>(111) Perception of Coorientation</th>
<th>(1-) Agreement About Coorientation</th>
<th>(-1-) Agreement About Perception of Coorientation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work-release Inmate-Supervisor</td>
<td>Sig. NS. 21 14</td>
<td>Sig. NS. 17 18</td>
<td>Sig. NS. 11 24</td>
<td>Sig. NS. 15 20</td>
<td>Sig. NS. 13 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prison Inmate-Supervisor</td>
<td>Sig. NS. 20 15</td>
<td>Sig. NS. 9 26</td>
<td>Sig. NS. 6 29</td>
<td>Sig. NS. 14 21</td>
<td>Sig. NS. 13 22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Z = .243  
Z = 1.39  
Z = 1.39  
Z = .242  
Z = 0
Weak support for Hypothesis III is suggested by the data in that significant consensual difference between the two pairs was found only at the level of coorientation. It will be noted that at three other levels the direction predicted is correct while not significantly different at the .05 level.

The application of the norms across no group boundaries with little chance for latency of roles enacted between prison inmates and their supervisors and the reduced definition of urgency for the survival of work-release inmates' relations with prison supervisors should produce the relationship predicted in the following hypothesis.

**Hypothesis IV:** Consensus between prison inmates and prison supervisors is greater than the consensus between work-release inmates and prison supervisors. See Table XXX.

At each level of analysis there was no significant difference observed between work-release and prison inmate consensus with prison supervisors. The weak relationship for three levels as predicted is less than adequate to support the hypothesis.

Prison inmates, due to their subordinate roles, are expected to perceive their survival with more urgency than would prison supervisors. This fact tends to produce greater consensus among inmates.

**Hypothesis V:** Prison inmates exhibit more consensus than do prison supervisors. See Table XXXI.
### TABLE XXX

**DATA RELEVANT TO HYPOTHESIS IV OF COROLLARY III**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Positions Inter-Related</th>
<th>Number of Norms</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1--) Agreement</td>
<td>(11-) Coorientation</td>
<td>(111) Perception of Coorientation</td>
<td>(-1-) Agreement About Coorientation</td>
<td>(---1) Agreement About Perception of Coorientation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. NS.</td>
<td>Sig. NS.</td>
<td>Sig. NS.</td>
<td>Sig. NS.</td>
<td>Sig. NS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prison Inmate-Prison Supervisor</td>
<td>20 15</td>
<td>9 26</td>
<td>6 29</td>
<td>14 21</td>
<td>13 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work-release Inmate-prison Supervisor</td>
<td>18 17</td>
<td>9 26</td>
<td>4 31</td>
<td>13 22</td>
<td>13 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z = .481</td>
<td>Z = 0</td>
<td>Z = .685</td>
<td>Z = .246</td>
<td>Z = 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


### TABLE XXXI
DATA RELEVANT TO HYPOTHESIS V OF COROLLARY III

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Positions Inter-Related</th>
<th>Number of Norms</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1--) Agreement</td>
<td>(11-) Coorientation</td>
<td>(111) Perception of Coorientation</td>
<td>(-1-) Agreement About Coorientation</td>
<td>(-1-) Agreement About Perception of Coorientation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. NS.</td>
<td>Sig. NS.</td>
<td>Sig. NS.</td>
<td>Sig. NS.</td>
<td>Sig. NS.</td>
<td>Sig. NS.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prison Inmates</td>
<td>32 3</td>
<td>21 14</td>
<td>19 16</td>
<td>24 11</td>
<td>26 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prison Supervisors</td>
<td>27 8</td>
<td>14 21</td>
<td>11 24</td>
<td>18 17</td>
<td>22 13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Z=1.646*</td>
<td>Z=1.68*</td>
<td>Z=1.94*</td>
<td>Z=1.69*</td>
<td>Z=1.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Considerable evidence is found in Table XXXI which supports the hypothesis. At every level of analysis inmates exhibited more consensus than did their supervisors at the prison and significantly so at four of the levels.

Hypotheses Pertaining to Categories of Norms

All norms vary in ways other than substantively. The following five hypotheses relate to inmate consensual variation according to groups of norms. As before, the postulated associations are deductions from propositions garnered from role theory in the milieu of symbolic interactionism.

Proposition I: Normative consensus pertains to personal perception and interpersonal perception of expected behavior.

Proposition II: Behavioral expectation, i.e., norms, may be delineated according to the role they comprise, the class of actors who are the objects of role relationships, types of sanction, the subjects of the norms, and circumstantial factors.

Proposition III: Inmates enact various roles, in a multiplicity of role relationships, in varying circumstances impelled by norms which differ according to the manner in which sanctions are applied.

Corollary IV

Hence, inmate consensus varies across norms grouped according to the roles they comprise, objects and subjects of role relationships, types of sanction, and circumstantial factors.
Hypothesis I: Inmates exhibit greater consensus on norms comprising the "Inmate Worker" role than on norms comprising the "Fellow Inmate" role.

Norms which comprise the "fellow-inmate" role are:

1. An inmate should cover for another inmate who has violated a rule.

2. If an inmate has a carton of cigarettes stolen, he should wait for the chance and steal something of equal value from the one who stole his cigarettes.

3. Inmates should try to cultivate relationships with supervisors which will benefit inmates.

4. Inmates should not participate in activities with inmates of another race.

5. An inmate who sincerely desires to reenter society as a law-abiding citizen should not try to protect inmates who have violated rules.

Norms making up the "inmate-worker" role include:

1. An inmate should not produce more work than others in his work group even if he is capable of doing so.

2. An inmate should stand up under the difficulties of his job regardless of how difficult the job is.

3. Inmates should not pretend sickness to get out of work.

4. One inmate should not have authority over other inmates.

5. A worker should do nothing except that which is assigned to him.

As seen in Table XXXII, the findings offer meager support for the prognosticated difference between consensus on norms of the two inmate roles. The greatest differences were found at the levels which involve the inmates' judgment of other inmates' opinions, coorientation, and agreement about coorientation.
TABLE XXXII

DATA RELEVANT TO HYPOTHESIS I OF COROLLARY IV

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roles</th>
<th>Measures of Consensus at Ascending Levels of Perception</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1--) Agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. NS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fellow-Inmate Role</td>
<td>4 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inmate-Worker Role</td>
<td>8 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant
** Highly Significant
**Hypothesis II:** Inmates exhibit greater consensus on norms which define behavior directed toward cohorts than on norms whose behavioral objects are their superiors.

The selected norms which define inmate behavior directed toward other inmates are:

1. An inmate should not take advantage of another inmate.
2. Inmates should not inform supervisors regarding the behavior of another inmate.
3. Inmates should share any scarce goods they may obtain with other inmates.
4. One inmate should not have authority over other inmates.
5. Inmates should not steal from one another.

The norms which refer to inmate behavior toward prison supervisors are:

1. An inmate should not lie to his supervisor under any condition.
2. Inmates should always address their supervisors as Mister or Sir.
3. Inmates should try to cultivate relations with supervisors which will benefit inmates.
4. Inmates should not trust supervisors with the real truth.
5. Workers should not question the orders of their supervisors.

At the first and second levels of consensus, a significant difference was found between the two groups of norms as predicted in the hypothesis. At the other three levels there was found more consensus on inmate directed behavioral expectations but not significantly more at the .05 level of confidence (see Table XXXIII).
TABLE XXXIII
DATA RELEVANT TO HYPOTHESIS II OF COROLLARY IV

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objects of Inmate Behavior</th>
<th>Measures of Consensus at Ascending Levels of Perception</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(I--)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig.</td>
<td>NS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Inmates</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prison Supervisors</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Indicates significant difference.
**Hypothesis III:** Inmates exhibit greater consensus on norms which are "mores" than on norms which are "laws."

The norms which represent the mores of the inmate code are:

1. Inmates should not trust supervisors with the real truth.
2. Inmates should not inform supervisors regarding the behavior of another inmate.
3. An inmate should not take advantage of another inmate.
4. An inmate should stand up under the difficulties of his job regardless of how difficult the job is.
5. Inmates should try to cultivate relationships with supervisors which will benefit inmates.

Norms depicting the institutional rules include:

1. Workers should not question the orders of their supervisor.
2. An inmate should not lie to his supervisor under any condition.
3. Inmates should always be supervised when working.
4. Inmates should not pretend sickness to get out of work.
5. Inmates should not steal from one another.

Table XXXIV shows that the moderate consensual disparity found in favor of mores could be a chance occurrence. Only at the (-1-) level, would the results be expected less than five times out of a hundred by chance. The null hypothesis that there is no difference in the consensus of inmates between inmate mores and institutional rules cannot be rejected.
### TABLE XXXIV

**DATA RELEVANT TO HYPOTHESIS III OF COROLLARY IV**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Norm</th>
<th>Measures of Consensus at Ascending Levels of Perception</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1--) Agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. NS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inmate Mores</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Rules</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*
Hypothesis IV: Inmates exhibit greater consensus on norms prescribing behavior for supervisors than on norms setting forth inmate behavior.

Norms of which inmates are the subjects that are used in this analysis are:

1. An inmate should not lie to his supervisor under any condition.
2. Inmates should try to cultivate relations with supervisors which benefit inmates.
3. Inmates should not trust supervisors with the real truth.
4. Workers should not question the orders of their supervisor.
5. Inmates should share any scarce goods they may obtain with other inmates.

Among the norms prescribing supervisor behavior are:

1. A supervisor should not violate the confidence of an inmate.
2. Supervisors should not request or permit inmates to do favors for them.
3. Supervisors of inmates should treat all inmates the same.
4. Supervisors should not reprimand an inmate in the presence of other inmates.
5. Supervisors should tell inmates why decisions regarding their work are made.

The data in Table XXXV provide a strong basis for accepting the hypothesis. A significant difference was observed at each level of consensus.
TABLE XXXV
DATA RELEVANT TO HYPOTHESIS IV OF COROLLARY IV

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Norms According to Subjects</th>
<th>Measures of Consensus at Ascending Levels of Perception</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1--) Agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. NS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inmates</td>
<td>3 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors</td>
<td>15 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** ** ** ** **
Hypothesis V: Circumstances tend to exert more influence on inmates' consensus than on supervisors.

The pairs of norms included in this portion of the analysis are as follows (with the numbers as they appeared in the interviews):

Pair A: 16. Workers should not steal from one another or their employer.

35. If an inmate has a carton of cigarettes stolen, he should wait for the chance and steal something of equal value from the one who stole his cigarettes.

Pair B: 18. Supervisors of inmates should treat all inmates the same.

32. Regardless of differences of attitudes and behavior by inmates, a supervisor should show no partiality.

Pair C: 16. Workers should not steal from one another or their employer.

10. Workers who are underpaid by employers should not be punished for stealing tools from the job.

Pair D: 20. Everyone should be equal before the law.

24. Ex-inmates should be permitted to vote.

The data in Table XXXVI offer substantial support for the hypothesis that circumstances tend to influence inmates' opinions more than supervisors' opinions.
TABLE XXXVI

DATA RELEVANT TO HYPOTHESIS V OF COROLLARY IV

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pairs of Norms</th>
<th>Results of Difference of Proportion Tests for Supervisors and Inmates Whose Responses Changed with Circumstances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1--)</td>
<td>(11--)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. 16-35</td>
<td>Z = 5.97***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. 18-32</td>
<td>Z = .4727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. 16-10</td>
<td>Z = 4.78***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. 20-24</td>
<td>Z = 5.08***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
V. CONCLUSION

Synopsis of Findings

The hypotheses of Corollary III deal with the structural effects of the prison social system on consensus. The corollary states that actors in different classes of positions will not exhibit equal normative consensus among themselves or between themselves and other classes of actors.

Three of the hypotheses of Corollary III pertain to intra-category consensus. It was found that prison inmates exhibit more consensus than do prison supervisors (Hypothesis V) and that work-release supervisors also display more consensus than do the prison supervisors (Hypothesis II). No significant difference was determined when comparing consensus among work-release inmates and among prison inmates (Hypothesis I).

Two of the hypotheses of Corollary III relate to comparisons of inter-category consensus. Support was found for Hypothesis IV which predicted that consensus between prison supervisors and prison inmates would be greater than between prison supervisors and work-release inmates. Weak support was discovered for Hypothesis II which stated that consensus between work-release supervisors and work-release inmates would be greater than between prison supervisors and prison inmates. At four levels the direction was correct but a significant association was found only at the level of coorientation.
Four of the five hypotheses of Corollary IV deal with the variations in consensus among inmates according to different types of norms. The other hypothesis pertains to a comparison of inmate and supervisor consensus as it is effected by circumstances attached to norms.

On the basis of the findings the following may be concluded regarding the association of norm types to consensus:

1. There is more inmate consensus on norms which compose their "inmate-worker" role than on norms of their "fellow-inmate" role.

2. There is more inmate consensus on norms which prescribe behavior toward other inmates than on norms whose object of behavior is supervisors.

3. There is slightly more inmate consensus on "more type" norms than on "law-type" norms.

4. There is greater inmate consensus on norms prescribing supervisor behavior than on norms whose subject of behavior is inmates.

5. Circumstances influence inmate consensus more than it does supervisor consensus.

Theoretical Implications

Utilizing concepts from role theory in the analysis of consensus in the prison social system points up the relevance of considering structural effects on consensus. The discovery of significant differences in opinions and perceptions according to positions, roles, and types of norms lends empirical support to Biddle and Thomas' "doctrine of limited social determinism" which they contend is reflected in the perspective of role theory.

People do not behave in a random fashion. To some
extent one's behavior is influenced by their expectations and those of others in their group. His perception of others' expectation of him could be expected to exhibit even greater exteriority and constraint. While evidence is not overwhelming, Blau's conclusion that structural effects on behavior often supercede internalized values becomes more interesting in light of the current findings.\(^{17}\)

From the preceding analysis, it is suggested that the structural components which Bates employs in explaining the role stresses experienced by an actor may be applied to the understanding of role stresses between numbers of actors. Further research is required before predictions of consensus can be made on the basis of his structural variables, however.

It might be further implied, on the basis of the current findings, that in classifying norms, attention must be given to certain structural characteristics. This should be expected if norms are defined as components of social structure. Any typology of norms should include factors which are empirically found to be associated with normative consensus. For example, it has been found here that norms with different classes of actors as subjects and objects show more consensual variation than was found for norms classified according to type of sanction, a criteria employed in all such typologies.

CHAPTER IV

ACCURACY OF NORMATIVE PERCEPTION IN THE PRISON SOCIAL SYSTEM

I. INTRODUCTION

In the preceding chapters attention has been given to the comparison of normative opinions and perceptions of opinions among and between categories of actors in the prison social system. This has been done without regard to the degree of accuracy in judging others' opinions. In a sense, the correctness of one's perception may be considered irrelevant, insofar as his behavior is concerned, because his definition of the others' opinions is considered by him to be accurate. It should be expected, for example, that an inmate's opinion about norms and his actual behavior will be a function, in part, of his understanding of others' opinions about certain norms as well as his perception of their opinions of his normative commitment, without regard to the correctness of his understanding.

On the other hand, social organization, considered as a variable, is dependent, in larger measure than considered by most social theorists, upon the accuracy of interpersonal perception. A significant barrier to a group's achievement
of its goals can be its positional incumbents' failure to
correctly evaluate social and interactional cues in role
relationships.

Therefore, the subject of the present chapter intro­
duces another element in the normative structure of a social
system generally, and the prison system particularly.
Questions to which attention is directed are: (1) How accu­
rately are opinions perceived? (2) Where does the greatest
accuracy of perception occur relative to temporality of
actors, and the subjects and objects of the perception.

Included in the chapter are a discussion of other
investigations of social acuity, the methodology unique to
this phase of the study, the hypotheses and analysis of data
and the theoretical implications of the findings.

II. THEORETICAL SETTING AND REVIEW OF STUDIES
RELATED TO ACCURACY OF PERCEPTION

Theoretical Setting

Symbolic interactionism is a branch of a larger school
of thought, "social behaviorism," which developed as a
reaction to the mechanistic systems which emphasized large
social units. The development of a theory of social persons
was a central problem to which the school addressed itself.
Interactionists affirm the importance of "attitude" and
"meaning."¹

¹Don Martindale, The Nature and Types of Sociological
For the interactionist, it seems axiomatic that behavior is a function of experience and that experience and behavior are always in relation to someone or something outside of self. Any effort, therefore, to understand human behavior must give appropriate place to the interexperience of actors. The translation of alters' behavior into ego's experience involves the culturally-conditioned learned structures of perception. Before behavior becomes experience, it must be perceived.²

Understanding of the prison social system demands consideration of this matrix of behavior, experience, perception, and cultural interplay. The relation of socialization to perception is the subject of the present section, a topic of vital concern, practically, for an institution whose ostensible purpose includes the redirecting of human behavior.

The process of perception involves selection and interpretation. Two inmates may encounter the same behavior and one may unconsciously fail to select it for interpretation. For him this behavior does not become an experience influencing his perception. Likewise, interpretation of behavioral interaction is a function of cultural conditioning.³

Interpersonal perception refers to the judging, assessing and evaluating of others that all humans do.

³Ibid., 12.
Additionally, the process has been called by psychologists empathy, insight, clinical intuition, diagnostic competence, understanding, social sensitivity, social acuity, person cognition, and person perception. Sociologists have discussed the notion in terms of "definition of the situation," "looking glass self," "sensitivity to the generalized other," "role taking," and "the social self." Few sociologists have considered the accuracy of those imaginations, perceptions, and definitions. What sorts of factors are related to accuracy of perception and what implications does incorrect perception have for social organization?

Among those giving attention to factors related to correct interpersonal perception is Sheldon Stryker who sought to test Mead's theory and to investigate the conditions of accurate "role-taking." Only those investigators of consensus who move to the second level of perception or higher can be concerned about accuracy. Among the most significant of those who have been considered correctness of judgment important are Newcomb and Laing.

4 A number of social psychologists have given attention to the subject such as V. Bronfenbrenner, J. G. Bruner, R. Tagiuri, V. B. Cline, F. S. Chapin, T. Newcomb, and N. Cameron.


Unfortunately, Neal Gross' work on role analysis, while centering on role consensus, neglects the element of accuracy altogether.\(^7\)

Bruce Biddle and associates studied the shared inaccuracies in the role of public school teachers.\(^8\) They found that such inaccuracies pose problems for those who interact but that some stable patterns of inaccuracy may persist in some situations.

Perhaps the first to give attention to accuracy of perception was Schanck in 1932.\(^9\) He discovered shared distortions of role in an isolated community which he considered a stable phenomenon, the results of processes acting jointly on a number of individuals.

Wheeler found inaccurate perception in a 1961 study.

\(^7\)Neal Gross, Ward S. Mason, and Alexander W. McEachern, Explorations in Role Analysis: Studies of the School Superintendent Role (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1966). Role consensus is discussed by the authors with an understanding of its importance as a variable. In Chapter III can be found an excellent discussion of the place given consensus in the disciplines of anthropoloty, social psychology, and sociology.


of role conflict in correctional communities. Role conflict for Wheeler is not the discrepancy between norms applicable to one actor, but refers to the "biases in perception" between inmates and staff members.

Wheeler discovered a strong tendency on the part of both inmates and staff to overperceive conflict between the two. A model of "selective visibility" is called upon to account for the inaccuracies of perception. The more visible inmates' opinions were in greater conflict with staff opinions than those of the broader inmate society. Also, the estimate of inmate norms was closer to those of the "high visibility" group.

Gouldner's observations about "punishment-centered bureaucracy" may provide the most insight into this consistent bias in perception. Organizations, such as prisons, with this type bureaucracy, tend to direct members to the observation of rule violating behavior, with an under-emphasis on those who conform.

III. APPLICABLE METHODOLOGY

The methods employed in the analysis of inmates' and supervisors' empathic ability are more closely related to

---


the interpersonal perception methods utilized by Laing, Phillipson, and Lee than any other single method.\textsuperscript{12} Their concern was with direct, meta- and meta-metaperspectives in dyadic interaction. Smith and other psychologists and social psychologists have influenced the procedural technique discussed below.\textsuperscript{13} Several innovations are made due to the present concern with the accuracy of perception by categories of individuals of other categories of individuals.\textsuperscript{14}

In Figure 3 is indicated the sets of opinions and perceptions whose accuracy is under investigation. When the elements of consensus discussed in the preceding chapters are added to the dimension of accuracy of perception, the result is a configuration of consensus.

Perhaps the figure and the methodology of the chapter could best be explained by using an example.

On line f, Code "4" identifies an opinion; i.e., Inmates think Supervisors Think Inmates (I_S_I) agree (or disagree). In the order that they occur in the above statement, inmates are the subjects, supervisors the direct object and

\textsuperscript{12}Laing, \textit{op. cit.}, 49-72.


perception of Coorientation

**FIGURE 3**

A CONFIGURATION OF CONSENSUS
inmates the indirect object, for this particular opinion (as indicated on lines c and d). Line g shows a relationship between opinion "4" of inmates and opinion "B" of supervisors. This set of opinions is identified by "ξ." Continuing the example, opinions "B" and "4" have in common "Supervisors think Inmates Agree (or Disagree)." Opinion "B" indicates the actual opinion of supervisors about inmates. Opinion "4" represents inmates' perception of supervisors' opinions of inmates. The question in this example is, "Do inmates accurately perceive supervisors' opinions?" The score "ξ" indicates the number of norms on which (1) a significant number of supervisors thought inmates agreed (or disagreed) and (2) a significant number of inmates thought supervisors believed inmates agreed (or disagreed). Agreement does not refer to the substantive content of norms but to the similarity of response whether agree or disagree.

Statistical significance was determined by using binomial tests as before.

To illustrate a further methodological point, let us take the example another step. The interest of this chapter pertains to the relative accuracy of different kinds of inmates in judging, in this example, the opinions of their supervisors. The hypothesis that a particular difference exists is submitted to empirical testing in the form of two sample difference of proportion tests. Hypotheses to be tested which deal with inmate perception predicts direction of relationship; thus, a one-tailed test is applied. For
the hypotheses about supervisor perception, no direction is postulated, thus a two-tailed test is made. The hypotheses about the overall accuracy of inmates and supervisors' perception (Corollary V) are judged using binomial tests.

IV. HYPOTHESES AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

On the basis of Biddle, Schenck, Wheeler, and Gouldner's studies of the accuracy of interpersonal perception and theoretical considerations, the following corollaries and hypotheses may be formulated.

**Corollary V**

Inmates and supervisors exhibit intra- and inter-category inaccuracy of perception of consensus.

**Hypothesis I:** Inmates do not accurately perceive the opinions of other inmates.

**Hypothesis II:** Inmates do not accurately perceive the opinions of prison supervisors.

**Hypothesis III:** Prison supervisors do not accurately perceive the opinions of other supervisors.

**Hypothesis IV:** Prison supervisors do not accurately perceive the opinions of inmates.

The data found in Table XXXVII offers strong support for Hypothesis IV: Prison supervisors do not accurately perceive inmates' opinions at either level of perception. A high accuracy was found regarding intra-supervisor perception. In relation to Hypotheses I and II, it was found that inmates were more accurate in perceiving both supervisor and inmate opinions at the higher level of perception than at the lower.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Set of Opinions</th>
<th>Number of Norms Exhibiting Significant Similarity By Objects</th>
<th>Number of Objects' Norms Accuracy Exhibiting Significant Which are Accurately Perceived By Subjects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis I</td>
<td>Inmates</td>
<td>( \epsilon )</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inmates</td>
<td>( \delta )</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>23 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis II</td>
<td>Inmates</td>
<td>( \mu )</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supervisors</td>
<td>( \xi )</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis III</td>
<td>Supervisors</td>
<td>( \zeta )</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>25 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supervisors</td>
<td>( \lambda )</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis IV</td>
<td>Supervisors</td>
<td>( \nu )</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inmates</td>
<td>( \pi )</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( \text{a} \) See Figure 3.
Corollary VI

Inmates' accuracy of perception of inmates' opinions and supervisors' opinions varies according to the phase of their institutional careers.

Hypothesis I: Middle-phase inmates more accurately perceive inmates' opinions than do early-phase inmates.

However, the predicted superior acuity for middle-phase inmates was not found for the ε set of opinions. By way of explanation, this means that of the 32 norms on which all inmates exhibit significant agreement, early-phase inmates perceived correctly inmates' opinions on 20 while middle-phase inmates were accurate of 14 of the 32 as shown in Table XXXVIII.

Hypothesis II: Late-phase inmates more accurately perceive inmates' opinions than do middle-phase inmates.

As shown in Table XXXIX, no support for the hypothesis is found. It is, therefore, concluded that no significant difference exists between late- and middle-phase inmates concerning the accuracy of judging inmates' opinions.

Hypothesis III: Early-phase inmates more accurately perceive supervisors' opinions than do middle-phase inmates.

Hypothesis III is verified by the analysis represented in Table XL. The more thoroughly inmates are socialized into the prison system, the more inaccurate their
**TABLE XXXVIII**

DATA RELEVANT TO HYPOTHESIS I OF COROLLARY VI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inmate Category</th>
<th>Set ε Opinions</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Set θ Opinions</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Norms Perceived</td>
<td>Norms Exhibiting</td>
<td>Similarity Among</td>
<td>Norms Perceived</td>
<td>Norms Exhibiting</td>
<td>Similarity Among</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Accurately</td>
<td>Inmates</td>
<td></td>
<td>Accurately</td>
<td>Inmates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early phase</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle phase</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ Z = 1.4717 \]  \hspace{1cm}  \[ Z = 2.985^{***} \]
TABLE XXXIX
DATA RELEVANT TO HYPOTHESIS II OF COROLLARY VI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inmate Category</th>
<th>Set $\epsilon$ Opinions</th>
<th>Set $\theta$ Opinions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Norms Perceived Accurately</td>
<td>Norms Exhibiting Similarity Among Inmates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inaccurately</td>
<td>Inmates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle phase</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late phase</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$Z = .501.$  
$Z = 1.03.$
### TABLE XL

**DATA RELEVANT TO HYPOTHESIS III OF COROLLARY VI**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inmate Category</th>
<th>Set μ Opinions</th>
<th>Set ε Opinions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Norms Perceived</td>
<td>Norms Exhibiting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Accurately</td>
<td>Similarity Among</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early phase</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle phase</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ Z = 1.736* \]

\[ Z = 2.9*** \]
perception of supervisors' opinions becomes. This is expected as a consequence of the punishment-centered bureaucratic nature of the prison.

**Hypothesis IV:** Late-phase inmates more accurately perceive supervisors' opinions than do middle-phase inmates.

As inmates begin to anticipate release from the institution, it is expected that their definition of staff members begins to reduce the superordinate aspects of their relationship. Behavioral observations are selected and interpreted with less prejudice. The data presented in Table XLI reflects the results of this transition. A highly significant difference in accuracy exists at the higher level of perception, though not significant at the .05 level, late-phase inmates were also more accurate in judging supervisors' opinions for the μ set than were middle-phase men.

Several questions are of interest regarding supervisors' accuracy of perception. The following hypotheses do not predict directions of relationships. The questions to be answered by the data analysis are: Do prison supervisors or work-release supervisors more accurately perceive inmates' opinions? Is there more accurate perception between inmates and prison supervisors or between inmates and work-release supervisors? Is there more accurate perception among inmates or among prison supervisors?
| Inmate Category | Set $\mu$ Opinions | | Set $\xi$ Opinions | |
|-----------------|---------------------|------------------|---------------------|
|                 | Norms Perceived | Norms Exhibiting | Norms Perceived | Norms Exhibiting |
|                 | Accurately | Inaccurately | Similarity Among | Accurately | Inaccurately | Similarity Among |
| Middle phase    | 9          | 9          | 18                  | 2           | 12          | 14                  |
| Late phase      | 13         | 5          | 18                  | 10          | 4           | 14                  |

$Z = 1.37.$

$Z = 3.06^{***}.$
Corollary VII

Prison supervisors' accuracy of perception differs from that of work-release supervisors and inmates.

Hypothesis I: There is a significant difference between the accuracy of prison supervisors' and work-release supervisors' accuracy of perception of inmates' opinions.

In Table XLII it was found that a significant difference did exist between the two types of supervisors' accuracy of perception of inmates' opinions. Work-release supervisors were far more correct in their assessment of inmates' ideas about the norms.

Hypothesis II: There is a significant difference in the accuracy of concurrent perception between prison supervisors and inmates and in the accuracy of concurrent perception between work-release supervisors and work-release inmates.

The data of Table XLIII show strong support for the hypothesis. Work-release inmates and supervisors simultaneously define agreement with one another much more correctly than do prison supervisors and inmates.

Hypothesis III: There is a significant difference in the accuracy of inmates' perception of inmates' opinions and the accuracy of prison supervisors' perception of supervisors' opinions.

Hypothesis III is supported at the lower set of
| Supervisor Category | Set v Opinions | | | Set v Opinions | | | | | norms perceived accurately | norms perceived inaccurately | norms exhibiting similarity among inmates | norms perceived accurately | norms perceived inaccurately | norms exhibiting similarity among inmates |
|---------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| Prison Supervisors  | 15             | 17             | 32             | 11             | 17             | 28             | | | | | | | |
| Work-Release Supervisors | 26     | 6              | 32             | 20             | 8              | 28             | | | | | | | |

Z = 2.87***.  
Z = 3.2***.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Norms Exhibiting Perception of Agreement (Set &quot;B&quot; Opinion)</th>
<th>Norms Exhibiting Real Agreement (Set α Opinions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work-Release</td>
<td>Work-Release</td>
<td>21 Accurately</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors</td>
<td>Inmates</td>
<td>0 Inaccurately</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prison Supervisors</td>
<td>Prison</td>
<td>2 Accurately</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inmates</td>
<td>18 Inaccurately</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ Z = 5.8^{***} \]
opinions (γ and ζ), but not for the higher set (θ and λ). The direction, however, in both cases is the same, with intra-supervisor accuracy greater than intra-inmate correctness of perception. See Table XLIV.

V. CONCLUSION

Summary of Findings

The three corollaries of the current chapter concern the accuracy of perception among and between classes of actors according to the positions they occupy in the prison social system. The hypotheses of Corollary I deal with the overall accuracy of prison supervisors and inmates. It was found that supervisors overperceive conflict between themselves and inmates but not among themselves. It was discovered that inmates actually agree with prison supervisors and among themselves more than inmates think. This is the case for the lower level of perception; i.e., "most inmates think most inmates agree" significantly less than "most inmates agree." However, significant accuracy of inmates' perception of the higher level was observed; i.e., when "most inmates think that inmates think inmates agree" a significant proportion of the time it is in fact the case that "most inmates think inmates agree."

The hypotheses of Corollary VI relate to a comparison of categories of inmates according to the phases of their institutional careers. The dependent variable in each case is their accuracy of perception of other inmates' and
TABLE XLIV
DATA RELEVANT TO HYPOTHESIS III OF COROLLARY VII

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Subjects</th>
<th>Objects</th>
<th>Sets of Opinions</th>
<th>Norms Exhibiting Perception of Agreement</th>
<th>Sets of Opinions</th>
<th>Norms Exhibiting Perception of Agreement</th>
<th>Norms Exhibiting Agreement by Objects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inmates</td>
<td>Inmates</td>
<td>γ</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>θ</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors</td>
<td>Supervisors</td>
<td>ζ</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>λ</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ Z = 2.49^{**}. \hspace{1cm} Z = 1.07. \]
supervisors' opinions. It was found that those inmates fartherest removed temporarily from entrance and egression most accurately perceived other inmates' opinions and at the same time most incorrectly judged supervisors' opinions. Early-phase and late-phase inmates outscored middle-phase inmates in understanding supervisors' opinions. On the contrary, middle-phase inmates tended to perceive other inmates' thinking more successfully, though not in an impressive fashion.

The two-tailed tests applied to the hypotheses of Corollary VII revealed a significant difference in each case. While future investigations must explore the direction of the associations, suggestions for future hypotheses were found. For example, inmates perceive inmates' opinions less accurately than do supervisors perceive supervisors' opinions. Work-release supervisors perceive more accurately the opinions of inmates than do prison supervisors. Likewise, work-release inmates more correctly know their supervisors' opinions than do regular inmates know prison supervisors' opinions.

Theoretical Implications

On the basis of these findings, it might be implied, in light of the conceptual setting of the chapter, that in considering consensus as a variable pertinent to social organization, the element of accuracy of perception is vital. In many cases, actual opinions and perception of those
opinions are at odds. It may be further implied that the structure of the prison social system serves to generate and perpetuate misconceptions. These structural effects on accuracy of perception will be discussed further in Chapter V.

Gouldner's idea of the effect of "punishment-centered bureaucracy" on perception is amply illustrated in the prison social setting. Wheeler's findings regarding the influence of chronological proximity to beginning and ending of one's prison sentence on the inmate's definition of inmate-staff conflict is corroborated by the current investigation. The temporal factors are found to be related to inmates' perception of inmate-inmate conflict in opposite fashion, however. In other words, as there is perceived inmate-staff conflict without justification, there is perceived inmate-inmate consensus with justification.

It is important to the theoretical setting discussed here, to notice that in systems rigidly stratified into superordinate, and subordinate positions, the biases of perception are exerted upon those in the subordinate positions, and not upon the superordinates. The chief reason for this, as will be maintained in Chapter V, is the existence of another, often overlooked variable, extrinsic motivation, which is influential only on the subordinates.

At the outset of the chapter an axiom of interactionism was stated. Behavior is a function of experience. Interaction between actors becomes experience as it is
perceived by the actors. This perception (reception and interpretation) is shown in this study to be a function, at least in part, of certain structural effects. Drastic practical implications are here. The institution assigned the task by society of re-directing deviant offenders, is so structured as to guarantee that the behavior of the conforming staff will be misperceived by the nonconformers. Before behavior becomes experience, it must be perceived. It should be needless, therefore, to say that before conforming behavior becomes a beneficial experience for deviant observers, it must be perceived accurately.
The prison social system is at the same time a micro-cosm of the larger society and the setting for some unique social processes and relationships. Interpersonal perception and normative consensus are important, though often neglected, elements to the understanding of social structure. Inspiration for the present research was provided by these facts.

The purpose of the research was: (1) to investigate the extent and nature of normative consensus (a) at three levels among and between classes of actors in the prison social system, (b) according to inmate temporal proximity to entrance and anticipated egression, and (c) according to classes of norms; (2) to investigate structural effects on accuracy of perception; and (3) to examine the feasibility and fruitfulness, methodologically, of using normative consensus in the study of social structure.

The review of sociological literature has clearly revealed that, historically, social scientists have recognized
the relationship between social organization and interpersonal consensus, by whatever name it may have been called. Nevertheless, few have endeavored to utilize the concept empirically in the study of the structure of a system.

In Chapters II, III, and IV, a series of seven corollaries were deduced from the conceptual frame of reference of the study and from previous research pertaining to consensus in prison and non-prison settings. The research was designed to investigate associations with normative consensus postulated in 36 hypotheses under the seven corollaries. The analytical strategy employed required 104 statistical tests of the hypotheses at various levels of consensus. A synopsis of the analysis is found in Figure 4. Conceptualizations derived from study preliminary to the investigation produced the following propositions.

I. Middle-phase inmates exhibit more intra-inmate consensus and less inter-inmate-supervisor consensus than do early-phase inmates.

II. Middle-phase inmates exhibit more intra-inmate consensus and less inter-inmate-supervisor consensus than do late-phase inmates.

III. Actors in different classes of positions in the prison social system will not exhibit equal normative consensus on an intra-category or an inter-category basis.

IV. Inmate consensus varies across norms grouped according to the roles they comprise, objects and subjects of role relationships, types of sanction, and circumstantial factors.
CHAPTERS | COROLLARIES | SUBJECT OF COROLLARIES | CONTENT OF COROLLARIES | STATEMENT OF HYPOTHESES | FINDINGS (Res. hyp. accepted? Yes or No)
---|---|---|---|---|---
I | The relation of proximity to entrance to consensus among inmates and between inmates and prison supervisors. | Middle-phase inmates exhibit more intra-inmate consensus and less inmate-supervisor consensus than do early-phase inmates. | I. MFI agreement > EPI agreement. | I. No |
II | The relation of proximity to entrance to consensus among inmates and between inmates and prison supervisors. | Middle-phase inmates exhibit more intra-inmate consensus and less inmate-supervisor consensus than do late-phase inmates. | II. MFI-supervisor agreement < EPI-supervisor agreement. | II. No |
III | The relation in positions to consensus. | Actors in different positions in the prison social system will not exhibit equal normative consensus. | III. MFI consensus > LPI consensus. | III. No |
IV | The relation of perceptions to consensus. | Inmate consensus varies across roles they comprise, objects and subjects of their relationships, types of sanction, and circumstantial factors. | IV. MFI accuracy re inmates' opinions > EPI accuracy re inmates' opinions. | IV. No |
V | The overall accuracy of perception by inmates and prison supervisors. | Inmates and supervisors exhibit inaccurate perception of consensus among and between themselves. | V. MFI accuracy re inmates' opinions > EPI accuracy re inmates' opinions. | V. No |
VI | Inmates' accuracy of perception according to the phase of institutional career. | Inmates' accuracy of perception varies according to the phase of their institutional career. | VI. MFI accuracy re inmates' opinions > EPI accuracy re inmates' opinions. | VI. No |
VII | Supervisors' accuracy of perception. | Prison supervisors' accuracy of perception differs from that of work-release supervisors. | VII. MFI accuracy re inmates' opinions > EPI accuracy re inmates' opinions. | VII. No |

FIGURE 4
A SYNOPSIS OF THE ANALYSIS
V. Inmates and supervisors exhibit intra- and inter-category inaccuracy of perception.

VI. Inmates' accuracy of perception of inmates' opinions and supervisors' opinions varies according to the phase of their institutional careers.

VII. Prison supervisors' accuracy of perception differs from that of work-release supervisors and inmates.

So that these propositions might be tested, samples of actors in the prison social system were selected with 202 subjects being interviewed. Four classes of positions are represented in the sample blocks: prison inmates, work-release inmates, prison supervisors, and work-release supervisors. Prison inmates were selected so as to include those in early, middle, and late phases of their institutional careers. A series of opinions was elicited from the interviewees regarding each of the 35 norms and value statements. The opinions ostensibly reflect the subjects' personal attitudes, their perception of others' opinions, and their perception of others' perception of their opinions. Thus, an analysis of spiraling interpersonal perception was possible.

II. CONCLUSIONS

The findings of the current research lead to the following conclusions.

1. Intra-inmate consensus is not greater for middle-phase inmates than for early-phase inmates. A comparison of these categories of prisoners makes proximity to release a
constant and gives attention to the association of time served with consensus. Assuming that consensus is, in part, a function of communication and urgency of coordination, and that urgency of coordination is held constant by the equal proximity to release, and that with more time served there has been more communication, it might be expected, in light of the theoretical setting of the study, that middle-phase inmates would possess more consensus among themselves than would early-phase inmates. Such was not the case, however.

Likewise, the proposition that inter-inmate-supervisor consensus is greater for early-phase inmates than middle-phase inmates was not supported. Actually, those inmates incarcerated longer displayed less conflict with prison supervisors. This investigation does not support the hypotheses of Clemmer and Wheeler regarding the temporal aspects of prisonization. The theoretical implications of this conclusion are discussed below.

2. When the time for communicating was held constant and the urgency for coordination (proximity to release) considered the independent variable, consensus among inmates and between inmates and supervisory staff was not found to be as predicted. Middle-phase inmates did not exhibit more intra-inmate consensus than did late-phase inmates. Also, those anticipating release from prison did not show greater inmate-supervisor consensus than those with no impending departure. Again, this conclusion is contrary to previous findings and provocative of some theoretical explanation.
3. For some classes of positions, intra- and inter-category consensus was significantly different. Structural effects on consensus were most apparent as those incumbents in subordinate positions (inmates) exhibited more consensus among themselves than did their superordinate counterparts (supervisory staff). Work-release supervisors also depicted more consensus than did prison supervisors.

It was postulated that work release inmates, due to their interaction outside the prison, would reflect a different pattern of consensus. It was found, however, that among work-releasees and prison inmates there was no significant difference in consensus. Between prison supervisors and work-release inmates the consensus was not substantially different from the consensus between prison supervisors and regular prison inmates. Except at the level of coorientation (11-), consensus was the same between work-release inmates-work-release supervisors and prison inmates-prison supervisors.

4. When norms were grouped according to selected characteristics, it was found that intra-inmate consensus varied significantly. Norms were grouped according to the role which they comprised, subject of the behavior prescribed, object of the behavior, type of sanction applied, and the existence of circumstantial factors. It was found that inmates exhibit more consensus on norms of the "inmate worker" role than on norms of the "fellow-inmate" role. They exhibit more consensus on norms which direct behavior toward other
inmates than on norms which prescribe interaction with supervisors. Inmates' consensus is greater on norms describing appropriate behavior for supervisors than on norms which set forth inmate behavior. Slightly more consensus was found among inmates on the informal norms of the inmate code than on the formal norms for which there are institutionalized sanctions. Circumstances were observed to influence inmates' opinions more than supervisors' opinions.

5. Wheeler found that both inmates and supervisors incorrectly perceived the opinions of one another as well as the opinions of their cohorts. This study confirms Wheeler's findings only in a limited sense. Supervisory staff does misjudge inmates' opinions at both levels of judging accuracy (between first and second levels of consensus and between second and third levels). But, supervisors were not found to be inaccurate in their perception of one another's opinions at either level. Furthermore, the current research revealed that inmates were inaccurate in their perception of supervisors' and inmates' opinions only at the lower level of judgment. Wheeler dealt only with this level of accuracy. It was found here that inmates were highly accurate in perceiving what both supervisors and inmates thought inmates thought.

6. The phases of inmates' institutional careers were significantly related to accuracy of perception of supervisors' and inmates' opinions in four of eight tests. There was no significant difference between late-phase and middle-
phase inmates' accuracy of perception of inmates' opinions at either level. Middle-phase inmates were no better at judging other inmates' opinions at the lower level than were early-phase inmates. Middle-phase men were more accurate at the higher level, however. Regarding inmates' accuracy in perceiving supervisors' opinions, early-phase inmates were more correct at both levels than were middle-phase prisoners. Late-phase inmates' acuity was superior to middle-phase men only at the higher level of judgment. Again, the necessity of utilizing ascending levels of consensus in exploring the effect of prisonization and de-prisonization on normative structure is shown.

7. When the accuracy of perception by prison supervisors, work-release supervisors, and inmates was compared, a significant difference was found. While no direction was predicted, work-release supervisors were discovered to display more knowledge of inmates' opinions than did prison supervisors at both levels of judgment. Work-release supervisors were also found to be far more accurate than prison supervisors in detecting that both they and inmates were in agreement. Prison supervisors exhibited more accuracy in perceiving other supervisors' opinions than inmates were in judging other inmates' opinions. This superiority of supervisors was the case at only the lower level of judgment, however.
III. IMPLICATIONS

The implications of the present inquiry into the normative structure of the prison social system will be discussed in terms of the theoretical, methodological, and practical ramifications of the findings.

Theoretical Implications

The findings point up the need for clarification regarding the relationships between motivation, communication, consensus, and coordination. Interaction theory provides sufficient substantiation of the interdependence of consensus and communication, that is, some consensus is necessary for communication and communication is consensus producing. The interpenetration of perspectives is what Dewey, for example, considered communication to be. The urgency of coordination is said to give rise to the seeking of consensus which is made possible by communication. The assumption here is that actors in the system are intrinsically motivated either by the necessity of coordination or by socialization to the rewards of actual consensus in facilitating coordinated activity. This assumption seems invalid for prisons.

It is suggested here that deviations from the predicted outcomes in consensus among inmates and between inmates and prison supervisors occurred as the result of failure to consider the influence of extrinsic motivation. The rigid stratification and authoritarianism characteristic of the prison social system and its constant constraint to conform
with a threat of punishment makes less than adequate the models of social coordination put forth by Schelling and Newcomb.

In so social system are actors purely intrinsically motivated. In varying degrees, for example, there are always some means of social control and sanction. That which is found in the prison system is in varying degrees a part of all systems. A more general model of social coordination, therefore, is needed to depict the processes related to coordination.

In Figure 5 such a model is suggested. The current investigation indicated that the traditional model needs some adaptation to explain the effect of extrinsic motivation and the relation of the first three levels of consensus to communication, coordination, and the two types of motivation. The ideal type relationship between the four components is indicated by the lines labeled "a" (internalized desire for coordination prompts communication), "b" (role taking), "c" (accurate role taking), and "d" (pleasant results of coordination produce intrinsic motivation). Lines "s" and "g" represent that which produce extrinsic motivation, portent of sanctions and compulsory symbiosis, respectively. Non-internalized desire for coordination (h) relates extrinsic motivation to communication. Lines "e" and "f" bypass consensus, it will be noted. Opportunistic role-playing (f) leads from communication to coordination and results from the extrinsic motivation of compulsory symbiosis. Compelled
Intrinsic Motivation

Extrinsic Motivation

Communication Coordination

2nd Level Consensus Coordination

3rd Level Consensus Realization of Coordination

1st Level Consensus Agreement

Goal

Intrinsic desire for coordination
Role taking
Honest role playing
Pleasant results
Compelled role playing
Opportunistic role playing
Compulsory symbiosis
Non-internalized desire for coordination
Symbolic basis of communication
Urgency of coordination
Process of role taking
Coorientated role playing
Realized coorientated role playing
Agreed role playing
Inadequate motivation
Unsuccessful intersubjectivity
Unsuccessful role playing
Incoordination
Portent of sanction

FIGURE 5
A MODEL OF SOCIAL COORDINATION
role playing (e) stems from the extrinsic motivation of fear of sanctioning.

In the prison system, communication and the urgency of coordination did not exert their expected effect on consensus for the reasons depicted in the model.

In cases where there was no first-level consensus (agreement), there was found a significant degree of second-level consensus (coorientation) and some third-level consensus (perception of coorientation). Therefore, it is hypothesized that, even with extrinsic motivation, compelled and opportunistic role playing can loop through coorientation and ultimately "e" or "f" can track b and c through consensus and become accurate role taking and honest role playing. By the same token, over time, extrinsic motivation can be internalized, i.e., become goal oriented or intrinsically desire coordination. It should not be forgotten that these are ideal types and never is an actor purely intrinsically or extrinsically motivated.

The urgency for coordination exerts a pressure (j) toward the development of consensus. Communication depends upon an amount of consensus regarding gestures and symbols (i). Mead's series of hypotheses tested in the process of role taking is reflected in "k," which, if success is experienced, becomes "b."

Incoordination is, in fact, often the consequence of efforts at social interaction directed toward a goal. Possible spin-offs (O, P, Q, and R) at each of the four
terminals represent ways in which coordination can be thwarted. Inadequate motivation, intrinsically or extrinsically (O) precludes an effort at communication.

Unsuccessful intersubjectivity (P) may result from the inability to "take the role" of the significant others and develop the necessary consensus or it may indicate an inability, with extrinsic motivation, for any kind of "role playing" without "role taking." Even when consensus is bypassed, some interpersonal perception is necessary for compelled and opportunistic role playing.

Unsuccessful role playing (Q) may be the result of various role conflicts and types of role stresses. Even upon coordination of actors' efforts, there may be a spin-off (R) with an unsatisfactory sense of accomplishment, goal attainment, or competition for social time.

The diagram in Figure 5 reveals how much more vulnerable to instability consensual relationships are. In addition to depending on the strength of positive feelings, as contrasted to the ties of interdependence of symbiotic relationships, consensual relations have an additional point at which there can be a breakdown in the development of coordination.

Accuracy of perception was found to correspond to the degree of consensus in so far as institutional careers are concerned. The implication is that extrinsic motivation and operating as subordinates exerts a similar influence on perception. Interestingly, supervisory staff members accurately perceived their colleagues' opinions but not the
opinions of inmates. Apparently, subservience has an influence on the reading which an object emits as well as on the perception by the subordinate subject.

Serious questions are raised by the present data relative to Clemmer and Wheeler's postulated prisonization process. Intra-inmate consensus does not peak in the midst of the inmates' institutional careers, consensus with supervisors is not a "U"-shaped phenomena, and perception of inmate-supervisor conflict is not greatest at the middle phase. Prisonization, as defined by Clemmer, involves far more than that which is the subject here. But, so far as "taking on the . . . folkways, mores, customs and general culture . . ." is concerned, for first-offender males, it seems that those inmates recently incarcerated and those about to leave exhibit the greatest need for consensus and at the same time perceive the greatest conflict between themselves and the staff. Perhaps, the middle-phase inmate, with his expression of lack of consensus, reveals something of the individual security which is his in contrast to the less secure status of the early- and late-phase inmates. If such is the case, it is relevant both for penology and consensus theory. It could be that an important variable associated with consensus in any social system is the deprivation of the support provided by consensual relations either in the given system or in one's total life space.
Methodological Implications

A unique contribution of the project is its effort to investigate the opinions and interpersonal perceptions that categories of subjects have of other categories of actors in a social system. It has been shown that measures of group consensus can be obtained and compared to the stereotype perception which other groups have of them. This methodological procedure permits an inquiry into the relation between individual and group attitudes. A means is provided for exploring the joint effect of personal and group attitudes.

The use of consensus as a variable in the analysis of social structure opens the door to consideration of crucial structural characteristics which are often ignored. Systematic social research frequently employs sampling techniques which tend to make isolated individuals the object of analysis. Concurrently, indices of individual behavior and of social structure need to be utilized. It is believed that the interactionist definition of consensus used in this study is especially conducive to the analysis of structural constraints on individual behavior. The present work represents an effort to operationalize consensus when it is understood to be a series of reciprocating understandings between the members of a group, between two groups, and across a number of objects of the understanding.

Consensus needs a more rigorous definition among social scientists and a place in empirical research fitting
its place in the development of social thought. Consensus must not be postulated or assumed to exist, but must be treated as a variable, a unifying concept relating aspects of communication to a theory of social organization.

Further research is suggested by the findings and methods of this inquiry. The relation of normative and consensual structures to individual attitudes using this operational definition of consensus could be studied with profit. Laing, Phillipson, and Lee's typology of consensus could be used in a study of consensus in the prison. For individual norms types of consensus between inmates and staff could be identified. A question which has arisen during the current investigation concerns the intensity with which a given opinion is held. Ultimately, consensus studies must give attention to such elements as intensity and permanence. The present study deals with a first-offender male institution. What differences would be found in a prison for multiple offenders? What results would appear in a similar study of consensus in a non-punishment-centered bureaucracy or total institution? Further research is required to test the hypotheses suggested in the model of social coordination. It remains to be seen whether variation in extrinsic motivation, when considered as an independent variable, yields the expected alteration in consensual patterns.

Certain limitations are recognized regarding the methodology of the investigation. Care must be exercised not
to generalize beyond the universe included in the study. It should also be remembered that prison inmates were asked their opinions and while every effort was made to assure the subjects' anonymity, since there was no reason to suspect that there was any conscious effort to distort facts, the reader is nevertheless reminded of the setting for the data collection. The findings would be more meaningful if it were possible to say on which norms consensus tended to group and which inmates exhibited consensus on the same norms. Such questions are interesting and revealing but were, of necessity, judged to be beyond the scope of this report.

Practical Implications

Corrections is the label now given to the effort to apply insight from penology and the behavioral sciences in order to motivate, redirect, and equip criminally-deviant offenders for return successfully to free society. Most correctional or rehabilitative efforts occur in the setting of a total institution, a prison. The findings of this investigation illustrate the dilemma of correctional institutions. Among the purposes for which societies have prisons are the holding of deviants for the protection of society, the punishing of offenders, and the rehabilitating of criminals. The prison is so structured, in keeping with its custody purposes, as to render effects incompatible with the ostensible function of treatment.

In the present study of a prison, the stereotype
antithesis between the superior and inferior positions served to muffle communication between the rehabilitator and rehabilitatee. The rigidly bureaucratic and authoritarian system provides extrinsic motivation for practically every role enactment. The consequence is the circumvention of meaningful communication and consensual relationships.

According to symbolic interaction theory, one gets one's feelings about one's self from "significant others." Few prison inmates ever have the occasion to freely define any staff members as "significant others." The subordination and forced condescension of inmates creates for them "obligatory significant others" out of prison staff members. Such a relationship coupled with "compelled role playing" over time, assures, as a function of the social structure, the failure of the correctional institution in its task of rehabilitation. Juveniles and adults who have deviated sufficiently from the norms of society to have that society judge that they should be institutionalized generally exhibit personality deficiencies. Whether the function of inherent psychological traits or inadequate social life experiences or both, offenders' problems are multiplied when they become incumbents in a system which produces immediate artificial consensus with other deviates, inaccurate perception of cohorts' and staff's opinions and staff's inaccurate perception of their opinions, as seen in the current analysis.

The development of prisons in the history of punishment is appreciated and the relation of modern corrections
to the past is recognized. Nonetheless, it is doubtful that careful planning could have devised a system whose social structure could more efficiently guarantee abortion.
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APPENDIX
APPENDIX A

INSTRUCTIONS READ TO RESPONDENTS BEFORE AND IN THE COURSE OF THE INTERVIEW

You have been randomly selected to be part of a study of the prison social system. This research is being conducted through the Sociology Department of Louisiana State University. You will NOT be asked your name or number. NO effort will be made to identify you. This is not a test. The questions have no right answer. We simply ask that you honestly give your opinion. Your cooperation is sincerely appreciated. We hope that this study will provide some basis for improving penal conditions here and at other such institutions.

Approximately thirty minutes will be needed for this interview. About half way through we will stop for a break and a coke. You will be given answer sheets and I will read each question. (Distribute answer sheets and pencils.)

All that you have to do is check either "agree" or "disagree" after I read each statement. Your answers should indicate what "ought to be" and not necessarily that which is actually done by either you or others.

Raise your hand if you have a question at any point. If you have any trouble reading, raise your hand and we will assist you.
On answer sheet number one I want you to indicate your personal opinion regarding the statements I am going to read. No one will know what your answers are. Check either "I agree" or "I disagree" for each answer. Ready? Number one. . . .

Please tear off answer sheet number one, which you have finished, and fold it in half, top to bottom--like this--and pass it to your right.

On answer sheet number two I want you to tell me what you think most other inmates believe about the statements. Now, forget your personal opinions and think about the opinions of most other inmates. Do most other inmates agree or disagree with these statements?

Tear off answer sheet number two, fold it in half and pass it to your right.

On answer sheet number three, please tell me what you think the opinions of most of the personnel at L.C.I.S. are regarding these statements. Remember, the question now is, "Do most personnel at L.C.I.S. agree or disagree?"

Tear off answer sheet number three, fold it in half and pass it to your right.
Let's take a brief break. You are doing a good job and we appreciate your help very much.

Up to now we have thought of our opinions and the opinions of other people about these statements. Now, let us think about the opinion that others have of our opinion. Think about what most inmates consider your attitude to be. Try to forget what your attitude really is and concentrate on other inmates' opinions of what you think. Do most inmates think you agree or disagree?

Tear off answer sheet number four, fold it in half and pass it to your right.

On answer sheet number five I want you to indicate what most personnel consider your opinion to be. Do most personnel think you agree or disagree?

Tear off answer sheet number five, fold it in half and pass it to your right.

On answer sheet six please answer the following questions by either checking the most appropriate answer or by filling in the blank. If you need any help just raise your
hand. Remember that when your answers are turned in I have no way of knowing who you are. Therefore, I hope you will answer the questions to the best of your ability.

Pass answer sheet six to your right, please.

Gentlemen, this completes the interview and we again want to express our sincere gratitude to you for your assistance.

Note: With a few necessary changes, the same instructions were read to L.C.I.S. and Work Release Supervisors.
APPENDIX B

NORMS AND VALUES INCLUDED IN THE STUDY

1. An inmate should not lie to his supervisor under any condition.

2. Inmates should always address their supervisors as Mister or Sir.

3. A supervisor should not spoil the good record of an inmate who has violated a rule for the first time.

4. Supervisors should not violate the confidence of an inmate.

5. Supervisors should expect the same quality and quantity of work out of all workers.

6. Inmates should always be supervised when working.

7. An inmate should not produce more work than others in his work group even if he is capable of doing so.

8. Inmates should try to cultivate relationships with supervisors which will benefit inmates.

9. An inmate should stand up under the difficulties of his job regardless of how difficult the job is.

10. Workers who are underpaid by employees should not be punished for stealing tools from the job.

11. Supervisors should not lie to inmates.

12. Supervisors should not curse inmate workers.

13. An inmate should not take advantage of another inmate.

14. Supervisors should not request or permit inmates to do personal favors for them.

15. Inmates should not inform supervisors regarding the behavior of another inmate.
16. Workers should not steal from one another or their employer.

17. Inmates should not trust supervisors with the real truth.

18. Supervisors of inmates should treat all inmates the same.

19. Inmates should share any scarce goods they may obtain with other inmates.

20. Everyone should be equal before the law.

21. Inmates should not pretend sickness to get out of work.

22. Workers should not question the orders of their supervisor.

23. Maintaining security in a prison is more important than maintaining rehabilitation programs.

24. Ex-inmates should be permitted to vote.

25. One inmate should not have authority over other inmates.

26. Inmates should be assigned to jobs which will prepare them for a job in society rather than on the basis of the institution's needs.

27. Inmates should not participate in activities with inmates of another race.

28. A worker should do nothing except that which is assigned to him.

29. Supervisors should not reprimand an inmate in the presence of other inmates.

30. An inmate should cover for another inmate who has violated a rule.

31. The world would be happier if everyone obeyed the laws of the land, whether they agree with them or not.

32. Regardless of differences of attitude and behavior by inmates, a supervisor should show no partiality.

33. Supervisors should tell inmates why decisions regarding their work are made.

34. An inmate who sincerely desires to re-enter society as a law-abiding citizen should not try to protect inmates who have violated rules.
35. If an inmate has a carton of cigarettes stolen, he should wait for the chance and steal something of equal value from the one who stole the cigarettes.
APPENDIX C

INMATE DATA ANSWER SHEET

1. Age: ___ years.
2. Marital Status: (Check one)
   ___ Legally married
   ___ Married by common-law
   ___ Divorced
   ___ Single
3. Education: ___ years.
4. Residence: (Check one)
   ___ Rural area
   ___ Town of less than 10,000
   ___ City of 10,000 to 100,000
   ___ City of more than 100,000
5. Your occupation: _______________________
6. Father's occupation: ___________________
7. Father's education: ___ years.
8. Mother's education: ___ years.
9. Religion: _____________________________
10. Church attendance as a child: (Check one)
    ___ Almost every week  ___ About twice a year
     ___ About once a month  ___ Never or rarely
11. Family: ___ Brothers  
   ___ Sisters  

12. Race: ______________________  

13. Church attendance as an adult in society: 
   ___ Almost every week  ___ About twice a year  
   ___ About once a month  ___ Never or rarely  

14. Offense: _________________  

15. Sentence: _______________ years.  

16. Time served on this sentence: ___ years.  

17. Work assignment: ________________________________  

18. Children: ___ Sons  
   ___ Daughters  

19. Expected release: ___ (month) ___ (year)  

20. Church attendance at L.C.I.S.  
   ___ Almost every week  ___ About twice a year  
   ___ About once a month  ___ Never or rarely
APPENDIX D

INSTITUTIONAL SUPERVISORS' DATA ANSWER SHEET

1. Age: ____ years.
2. Length of employment: ____ years.
3. Education: ____ years.
4. Race: ______________________
5. Civil Service Title: _______________________________________
6. Department: _____________________________________________
7. Number of inmates supervised: _____________________________
8. Present work assignment: _________________________________
9. Childhood residence: (Check one)
   ____ Rural area
   ____ Town of less than 10,000
   ____ City of 10,000 to 100,000
   ____ City of more than 100,000
10. Previous occupation: ______________________________________
11. Religion: _________________
APPENDIX E

WORK RELEASE SUPERVISORS DATA ANSWER SHEET.

1. Age: ____ years.
2. How long have you supervised inmates? ____ months.
3. Education: ____ years.
4. Race: ____________________
5. Position: ________________
6. Company: ________________
7. Childhood residence: (Check one)
   ____ Rural area
   ____ Town of less than 10,000
   ____ City of 10,000 to 100,000
   ____ City of more than 100,000
8. Present residence: ______________________________________
9. Have you ever visited a penitentary? __
10. Have you worked inmates or ex-inmates before? __
11. Do you have any friends or acquaintances who are ex-inmates? __
12. Is the work releasee that you supervise prompt?
   ____ Yes  ____ No.
13. Does the inmate think of himself as being different from other workers?
   ____ Yes  ____ No
14. Is the inmate qualified for his present job?
   ___ Yes ___ No.

15. Is he the caliber worker which is likely to be promoted?
   ___ Yes ___ No.

16. Do you know what your work releasee did which led to his incarceration?
   ___Yes ___No.

17. How would you rate his attitude toward his job?
   ___very good ___ good ___ fair ___ poor

18. How would you rate his attitude toward his supervisor?
   ___very good ___ good ___ fair ___ poor

19. Is his overall behavior any different from workers in general?
   ___ No difference
   ___ Easier to supervise
   ___ More difficult to supervise
   ___ Loses temper more
   ___ Looks for additional work more
   ___ Curses more
   ___ Argues more
   ___ Loafs more
### APPENDIX F

#### SAMPLE OF ANSWER SHEETS

**Answer Sheet 1**
*(Please check one)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement Nos.</th>
<th>I Agree</th>
<th>I Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - 35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Answer Sheet 2**
*(Please check one)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement Nos.</th>
<th>Most Inmates Agree</th>
<th>Most Inmates Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - 35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Answer Sheet 3**
*(Please check one)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement Nos.</th>
<th>Most L.C.I.S. Personnel Who Supervise Inmates Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - 35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement Nos.</td>
<td>Most Inmates Think I Agree</td>
<td>Most Inmates Think I Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - 35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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