2006

Informal social controls and inmate attitudes in a local jail

Matthew Boswell
San Jose State University

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.sjsu.edu/etd_theses

Recommended Citation

Boswell, Matthew, "Informal social controls and inmate attitudes in a local jail" (2006). *Master's Theses*. 2940.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31979/etd.5tk9-u4sr>

https://scholarworks.sjsu.edu/etd_theses/2940

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Master's Theses and Graduate Research at SJSU ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Master's Theses by an authorized administrator of SJSU ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact scholarworks@sjsu.edu.

INFORMAL SOCIAL CONTROLS AND INMATE ATTITUDES IN A LOCAL
JAIL

A Thesis

Presented to

The Faculty of the Department of Sociology

San Jose State University

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Arts

by

Matthew Boswell

August 2006

UMI Number: 1438555

INFORMATION TO USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleed-through, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

UMI[®]

UMI Microform 1438555

Copyright 2007 by ProQuest Information and Learning Company.

All rights reserved. This microform edition is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code.

ProQuest Information and Learning Company
300 North Zeeb Road
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346

© 2006

Matthew James Boswell

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

APPROVED FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'James Lee', written over a horizontal line.

James Lee, PhD., Committee chair

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'Peter Chua', written over a horizontal line.

Peter Chua, PhD., Committee member

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'Preston Rudy', written over a horizontal line.

Preston Rudy, PhD., Committee member

APPROVED FOR THE UNIVERSITY

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'Rhea L. Williamson', followed by the date '07/21/06', written over a horizontal line.

ABSTRACT

INFORMAL SOCIAL CONTROLS AND INMATE ATTITUDES IN A LOCAL JAIL

by Matthew J. Boswell

This thesis looked at the effects of social relationships of incarcerated offenders on their attitudes. It examined the effects of ties with significant others, ties with family, and ties with friends on psychological well-being, endorsement of conventional law, and perceptions of the treatment environment. Male inmates from a jail programming unit were surveyed. Support was found for the argument of informal social control theory; healthy social ties were associated with pro-social perspectives. Perceptions of treatment environment were consistently related to all types of social relationships. Dependent variables were sensitive to the intimacy of the tie. In addition, conventional measures of marital status and contact with the sources of support were not associated with the dependent variables. This study found that levels of contact were negatively related to psychological well-being.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Several individuals deserve thanks for the guidance, help, and support that made this thesis possible. First, I wish to thank Dr. James Lee and the members of the thesis committee. The committee not only provided me with invaluable guidance and instructions, but they also gave much of their valuable time in the form of reading and reviewing the work as well as attending various meetings and discussions. Second, I must acknowledge the influence of Dr. Yoko Baba. During my time at San Jose State University she has not only presented me with opportunities to grow and learn, but also influenced the direction of my studies. Her guidance was instrumental in securing not only the data for this project but also in shaping the original ideas and thoughts that resulted in the completed thesis. Third, the programming staff at the jail facility went out of their way to accommodate the research requirements. Their patience and flexibility is appreciated. Fourth, my family has stood by me during this period as a source of support, in ways both tangible and less obvious. Finally, this thesis also reflects the guidance, instructions, and the influence of numerous friends in the local community. Any errors or oversights in this thesis are mine alone.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
INTRODUCTION	1
<i>Research Issue</i>	2
<i>Prison and Recidivism</i>	3
<i>Outside Factors</i>	4
<i>Inside Factors</i>	6
OFFENDER REINTEGRATION: SOCIAL CONTROL AND INFORMAL SOCIAL CONTROLS	11
<i>Theory</i>	11
<i>Social Control</i>	12
<i>Life Course Criminology and Informal Social Controls</i>	17
<i>Symbolic Interactionist Approaches</i>	21
<i>Summary</i>	24
<i>Empirical Studies</i>	25
<i>Social Control Theory</i>	27
<i>Informal Social Controls</i>	33
<i>Replications and Extensions</i>	33
<i>Studies of Incarcerated Offenders</i>	35
<i>Studies of Probationers</i>	36
<i>Studies in the General Population</i>	38
<i>Contact and Visitation</i>	41
<i>Hypotheses</i>	43

METHODS AND DATA	45
<i>Sample</i>	45
<i>Procedure</i>	45
<i>Descriptive Statistics</i>	47
<i>Measures</i>	49
<i>Data Manipulation</i>	49
<i>Variables</i>	49
<i>Independent Variables of Interest</i>	49
<i>Contact</i>	50
<i>Emotional Support</i>	51
<i>Dependent Variables</i>	53
<i>Psychological well-being</i>	53
<i>Support for conventional law</i>	57
<i>Perceptions of treatment</i>	58
RESULTS	63
<i>Analytical Methods</i>	63
<i>Findings</i>	63
<i>Correlations</i>	63
<i>Control Variables</i>	65
<i>Hypotheses Tests</i>	67
CONCLUSION	84
REFERENCES	88

APPENDIX A: HUMAN SUBJECTS APPROVAL	93
APPENDIX B: CONSENT FORM, ENGLISH	95
APPENDIX C: CONSENT FORM, SPANISH	97
APPENDIX D: SURVEY, ENGLISH.....	99
APPENDIX E: SURVEY, SPANISH.....	102

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE 1	Means and Standard Deviations for Control Variables	48
TABLE 2	Descriptive Statistics for Contact with Significant Other, Contact with Family, Contact with Friends, and Question Items.....	52
TABLE 3	Descriptive Statistics for Measures of Emotional Support From Significant Other, Family, and Friends	54
TABLE 4	Descriptive Statistics for Psychological Well-Being and Scale Questions.....	56
TABLE 5	Descriptive Statistics for Support for Conventional Law and Scale Questions.	59
TABLE 6	Descriptive Statistics for Perceptions of Treatment and Scale Questions.....	62
TABLE 7	Correlations of Controls, Independent Variables, and Dependent Variables.....	64
TABLE 8	Regression of Psychological Well-Being, Support for Conventional Law, and Perceptions of Treatment on Control Variables	66
TABLE 9	Regression of Psychological Well-Being on Contact With Significant Other, Emotional Support From Significant Other, and Full Model.	68
TABLE 10	Regression of Support for Conventional Law on Contact With Significant Other, Emotional Support From Significant Other, and Full Model	70
TABLE 11	Regression of Perceptions of Treatment on Contact With Significant Other, Emotional Support From Significant Other, and Full Model.....	72
TABLE 12	Regression of Psychological Well-Being on Contact With Family, Emotional Support From Family, and Full Model ...	74

TABLE 13	Regression of Support for Conventional Law on Contact With Family, Emotional Support From Family, and Full Model.....	75
TABLE 14	Regression of Perceptions of Treatment on Contact With Family, Emotional Support From Family, and Full Model.....	77
TABLE 15	Regression of Psychological Well-Being on Contact With Friends, Emotional Support From Friends, and Full Model.....	79
TABLE 16	Regression of Support for Conventional Law on Contact With Friends, Emotional Support From Friends, and Full Model.....	81
TABLE 17	Regression of Perceptions of Treatment on Contact With Friends, Emotional Support From Friends, and Full Model.....	82

INTRODUCTION

Most inmates and prisoners will eventually return to the larger society; projections show that at least 95% of all California state prisoners will be released from prison at some point (United States Department of Justice, 2003). Viewed this way, the process of re-entry starts not upon parole from prison or release from jail, but rather upon prisoner intake. Therefore the chances for parole or post-release success or failure will be influenced to some degree by the incarceration experience of the inmate (Petersilia, 2004). However, the figures for inmate recidivism do not show that the incarceration experience is associated with pro-social changes in behavior on the part of the prisoner or inmate. Instead, statistics for all offenders released from California prisons show a 1-year recidivism rate of just under 40%. By the second year this rate climbs to over 50% (California Department of Corrections, 2006). Nationwide, the numbers tell a similar story; Department of Justice figures show that a little over 60% of released prisoners are rearrested by the 3rd year post release (2003). In light of these high failure rates for those returning to society from incarceration, the issue is clear that more questions need to be asked about the processes of imprisonment as well as the processes of change and rehabilitation during incarceration. Findings on released offenders show that social ties are important in offenders “making good” (Irwin, 1970), that is successfully adjusting to society and avoiding recidivism. One avenue of research asks whether the social ties of the inmate, ties with family, friends, and spouses on the outside are able to reach inside the correctional institution and impact on inmate behavior and attitude in meaningful and

positive ways. This project asks if strong social bonds are associated with pro-social attitudes.

Research Issue

Social ties have been found to be associated with change in the criminal behaviors of offenders. Marital relationships which are characterized by such qualities as happiness and attachment between the partners are beneficial and stabilizing forces for re-entering offenders (Petersilia, 2003) and are also argued to be supporting factors in helping persistent criminals to change behavior patterns from criminal habits towards conformity (Sampson & Laub, 1993; Laub & Sampson, 2003). John Irwin makes the distinction between the outcomes for those returning offenders who have the social support of good marriages or stable employment, and the outcomes for those who are less fortunate and are missing these important social elements; the first situation is described as “making good” while the latter is simply known as “making it” (1970: 131-142). For the ex-offender who is “making good,” stable and healthy marriages provide emotional support, a place to live, financial support, and motivation to succeed. Without these important social supports from others, there is a greater risk of recidivism. This study is more concerned with some of the ways in which the foundation for “making good” is prepared and set while the offender is still incarcerated. The general research issue is whether the positive influences of marriage or relationship ties affect the attitudes of male inmates in pro-social ways.

This thesis will specifically look at the impact of informal social controls on the attitudes of male English and Spanish speaking inmates in a jail located in a major

California city. The specific set of informal social controls to be examined are the marital, family, and friendship ties of the inmate. Distinctions will be made among relationships of the same status groups; the theoretical framework for this study suggests that it is not marriage or partnership per se that changes criminal attitudes and sentiments, but instead the quality of the marriages, partnerships, or friendships that drive the processes of change. Integrative relationships rich in emotional support will be associated with pro-social behaviors. Research hypotheses will be based on the notion that stronger attachment and higher levels of social support will be associated with pro-social attitudes and behaviors. In addition, research hypotheses will also explore the impact of contact with outside social relationships and visitation on any associations between social supports, attitudes, and behaviors.

Outcome measures for this study should allow for an indication of inmate change in attitude over time. The ideal method for such a measure is a longitudinal design. However, because this project is limited to a cross-sectional research design, this thesis will look for association between the independent variables of informal social controls and the dependent variables. These dependent variables will include measures of criminal sentiments, measures of adjustment to the jail environment and setting, and psychological well-being.

Prison and Recidivism

Recidivism and positive change in offenders are related to several factors, these factors are categorized here as either inside factors associated with failure or success or outside factors associated with outcomes. Outside factors are those influences external to

the prison walls, such as family, work or other social variables. Inside factors are those processes and experiences found within the walls of the institution. Important elements of each factor will be presented below along with a brief discussion on how these impact offender recidivism or prosocial change.

Outside Factors

When released, prisoners enter communities where their chances of parole or probation failure or success depend on factors operating at two levels, the community and the individual. In addition, the interplay between personal and structural characteristics gives a measure of social disadvantage that is important in predicting post-release success or failure.

Recidivism chances are associated with the characteristics of the neighborhoods and communities that offenders return to upon their release from jail or prison. Chances of parole and probation success or failure are mitigated by community or social disorganization factors of local poverty and unemployment rates (Harer, 1994; Lynch & Sabol, 2001), local crime rates, especially drug selling (Visher & Farrell, 2005), and issues of community trust, and social networks within the neighborhood (Sampson, 2001). In addition, lack of accessibility to social services and the lack of affordable housing are associated with challenges to re-entry success and recidivism (Visher & Farrell, 2005).

Research on individual-level factors associated with recidivism presents consistent evidence for the importance of age, marital status, and ethnicity. Those who had their first arrests at younger ages are more likely to have problems following release

(Glaser, 1977; Roundtree, Edwards, & Parker, 1984; Whitehead, 1991). In addition, those released prisoners who are not married or who do not have strong ties to their families have been found to face recidivism problems (Gray, Fields, & Maxwell, 2001; Hepburn & Griffin, 2004; Morgan, 1994). Finally, ethnicity has been shown to be related to post-release success or failure with minorities facing more challenges to success than whites (Minor, Wells, & Sims, 2003).

A third set of factors describes not only the criminal behavior and history of the offender, but also the interaction between individual-level factors and the broader social structure. Together, these factors measure levels of social disadvantage that work against chances of post-release success (Albonetti & Hepburn, 1997). Both the quantity and types of prior arrests are associated with recidivism. While the number of arrests an individual has is positively related to higher chances of recidivism (Glaser, 1977; Roundtree et al., 1984), there is some ambiguity about which types of criminal histories are more prone to recidivism. Some studies show that violent crime histories are associated with greater levels of recidivism risk (Gray et al., 2001). Others argue that property crimes pose greater levels of risk for recidivism (Morgan, 1994). Those ex-offenders with lower levels of education are found to be at greater risk for recidivism (Roundtree et al., 1984), although education probably also operates through decreased job chances and unemployment (Minor et al., 2003; Morgan, 1994; Whitehead, 1991). Finally, the post-release use of illegal drugs not only has roots in, and consequences for social disadvantage, but is a very reliable predictor of recidivism as well (Minor et al., 2003; Whitehead, 1991).

Inside Factors

There are two categories of “inside factors” that relate not only misbehavior within the correctional institution but can also lead to psychological stress, anger or resentments that the inmate may carry with them upon release; these factors might ultimately relate to future re-arrest. The first category of prison factors are those that are more objective, such as prison crowding or prison gang involvement. The second category of prison factors are those that are more subjective in measurement. Here the literature suggests that experiences of victimization, prisonization, hostility, and anger, along with factors that impinge on normal emotional growth and development all relate to negative behaviors and attitudes that not only manifest inside the correctional institution but are carried outside the walls as well.

While intuition suggests that crowded prisons are more likely to be violent, research finds that this is not always the case (DiIulio, 1987). In fact, the lack of violence in crowded prisons might be due to prison management efforts at control and containment in these dangerous environments. Sometimes resources are diverted from therapeutic goals for these ends. At the very least, “cell time” offers a more efficient short-term management solution as opposed to “program time” (Johnson, 1987).

While a common measure of inmate density is a ratio of inmates to physical capacity, this indicator does not capture the psychological crowding described by Toch. He lists three forms of psychological crowding found in the correctional institution that might foster levels of stress and maladaptation. These forms of crowding are not only sensory intrusions on space, but also intrusions on anonymity which is defined as the self

being exposed to others, as well as intrusions upon the consciousness whereby one cannot filter out intrusions nor can they select stimuli to suit their own moods (1992).

Over the past 50 years, prison gangs have developed in terms of organization, composition, and behavior in California correctional institutions (Hunt, Riegel, Morales, & Waldorf, 1993; Irwin, 2005). Prison gang development has been related to two main factors, prison crowding and the intake of large numbers of minorities. While earlier types of prison gang organization were argued to be more stable and based on prisoner role types, the later types of prison gangs involved both the replication of external youth gang forms and higher levels of violence (Hunt et al., 1993; Irwin, 1980, 2005). Irwin (2005) and Hunt et al. (1993) argue that as a result of both prison crowding and the incarceration of large numbers of minorities, later period gangs differ from earlier types in terms of external appearances and unpredictability. Later gangs, since about 1980 on, have not only members who are younger than those found in previous organizational types, but also members who have brought their external gang affiliations to the prison. These include outside gangs such as Crips and Bloods, from southern California, who are engaged in violent struggles against the other (Hunt et al., 1993). In addition, group alliances and conflicts are often shifting between and among the multiple gangs themselves, the prisoner organization schema has become more complex. The end result is an unpredictable situation marked by degrees of violence that have increased over the past two decades (Hunt et al., 1993; Irwin, 1980, 2005).

Subjective measures include those incidents, events, and individual states that relate to negative outcomes but are more difficult to concretely observe and measure.

Subjective measures also tend to be individual-level factors. These subjective measures can negatively affect levels of inmate stress, misbehavior, institutionalization, and even recidivism. Some of these subjective measures, such as victimization, orientation towards authority, and prisonization are presented below.

Inmate victimization refers to processes where those with superior power and strength make visible the weakness and powerlessness of others (Toch, 1992). Prison rape has been called the extreme form of inmate victimization (Toch, 1992), although there are many different variants of prison violence. However, in the end inmate victimization affects chances for rehabilitation not only for the perpetrator but also for the victim. For the perpetrator, the violence used to victimize is often just a mask for hidden and un-addressed fear. In addition, the repetition of violence reinforces negative behavior patterns. For the victim, Toch claims that many of the “trusting and gentle youths” who once entered the institution leave as “irritable, ungovernable men” (1992: 234).

The rule-breaker mentality has implications for recidivism and misbehavior both inside and outside of the correctional institution (Johnson, 1987). Rule-breakers are those predatory inmates who often dominate other prisoners or challenge authority in the correctional institution. While incarcerated, the rule breakers view prison rules as irrelevant to their own lives. Or, the rules and regulations are felt by the inmate as being “infantilizing” and are breeders of resentment (Toch, 1992: 140). These resentments and defiance have been cited as some of the causes underlying large-scale explosions of violence in prisons and jails (Irwin, 1980).

The rule-breaker also faces challenges upon release. Negative attitudes towards prison and jail authorities and towards institutional rules are carried with the rule-breaker when he is released. This disrespect now becomes directed at social authorities and against social regulations. In this way the unchecked behavior on the inside is continued upon return to the outside (Johnson, 1987).

Prisonization is the complete socialization of an individual into an inmate subculture. Extreme cases of prisonization are seen in examples of “state raised youth” who have spent lengthy portions of their adolescence on the inside with little or no influence of other socializing experiences save those found inside the jail, prison or detention hall (Clemmer, 1958).

Clemmer (1958) argued that prisonization might challenge rehabilitation success by the teaching of more elaborate and sophisticated methods of breaking the law. Other work has looked at how prisonization is related to post-release problems and failure through self-esteem problems, negative post-release expectations, conflicts with conventional correctional therapeutic treatment programs and through poor reactions to deprivation experiences (Gillespie, 2003).

One of the most important studies on the effects of prison on inmate behavior and later chances of release success or failure was Zamble and Porporino’s (1988) work on coping in prison. While their findings challenge some of the arguments above, that prisons “make beasts out of lambs” (Toch, 1992: 234), the same arguments also leave little room for overly positive assessments of the prison experience for most inmates. On the one hand, while Zamble and Porporino found through the use of longitudinal designs

that contrary to most of the previous work “prisons do not produce permanent harm to the psychological well-being of inmates” (1998: 146) they also conclude that for the most part inmates undergo a “deep freeze” while incarcerated. This deep freeze describes how individuals who enter prison with defective or maladaptive coping or behavior patterns are more than likely to leave prison with the very same lack of skills, having missed out on crucial learning processes and experiences needed to develop mature reactions (Zamble & Porporino, 1988).

In short, the prison and jail experiences of an inmate are fraught with risks and triggers for misbehavior and misconduct. These risks might not just lead to problems with the authorities while the inmate is within the walls of the correctional institution, but also troubles with the authorities when the inmate is released into the larger society. The remainder of this study will be an attempt to understand how the social bonds that inmates share with family, spouses and significant others, or friends might mitigate against some of the challenges discussed above.

OFFENDER REINTEGRATION: SOCIAL CONTROL AND INFORMAL SOCIAL CONTROLS

Theory

This thesis fits into two themes which together compose a framework describing the social contexts and human processes relevant to offender desistance from crime. The first theme, social control theory, is a way to understand offender change by looking at the impact of the larger structures of social control on individual lives; these structures create contexts and situations that are conducive to individual, pro-social change. Social control theory will explain how ties and bonds between social groups and institutions, such as family, and the individual serve to protect the individual from the pull of criminal or delinquent tendencies. However, social control theory in its original presentation only explains what forces keep an individual from offending, not necessarily what forces bring the offender back into society. Sampson and Laub propose a theory which emphasizes the importance of adult social bonds in reintegrating offenders back into society (1993). This perspective, hereafter termed the informal social control approach, extends the premises of the original social control theory by arguing that stable and supportive social relationships with family, wives and significant others will be associated with low rates of recidivism and re-offending for convicts, prisoners, and inmates.

The second theme looks at what drives the individual-level change within the contexts of social bonds with others and with institutions. This approach is addressed by several perspectives that all draw from the symbolic interactionist theories. These theories emphasize the human agency that operates along with the bonds of control;

individuals might be shaped by the larger social structures but they are also co-creators of lines of action and behavior within those settings. Fitting within the framework of these two themes, this thesis will argue that not only does individual-level change take place within the context of social relationships, but that the specific content of the relational bonds needs to be examined.

Social Control

Social control theory relies on a specific view of human nature and the social order to build a causal argument about why some people break the law and why some people do not. The main statement of social control theory is clearly stated in Travis Hirschi's work, *The Causes of Delinquency* (1969). The argument of his work will be presented here.

Criminological theories may be categorized by how the assumptions of the theory lead to the framing of general research questions. Many other theories proceed from the position that what needs to be explained is why people break laws. Psychological theories, for example, argue that deficiencies in intelligence or personality distinguish delinquents and criminals from all others (Shoemaker, 2005). In a similar way, strain, or anomie theory argues those without access to legitimate methods of goal achievement will search for other, often illegitimate ways of succeeding (Williams & McShane, 1994). In both of these examples the theories look for factors and variables that are causes of criminal behavior.

Control theories take a different approach. Control theories look at what keeps people from committing crime. The unique underlying assumption of control theory

view is that criminal behavior is natural behavior. Therefore, instead of explaining the forces driving one into criminal behavior, control theorists explain the extraordinary efforts that society has taken to ensure that members actually conform to social rules and regulations. Social control theory is interested in what forces bind actors to the larger social order and enable individuals to “speak a certain language . . . drive a car in general obedience to traffic regulations . . . avoid(s) urination or defecation in public and in most other ways ‘go(es) along’” (Lilly, Cullen, & Ball, 1995: 75).

Control theory argues that humans are neither inherently moral nor immoral, but instead show variety in their tendencies to break the law. Individuals will break laws or commit delinquency if they see it in their best interest (Einstadter & Henry, 1995; Hirschi, 1969). If sometimes the most expeditious methods for goal attainment are in fact criminal methods, then the question to be answered is why do more people not engage in criminal activity? Obviously, there are some qualitative differences between the delinquent and the non-delinquent, between the criminal and the law-abiding member of society and the main goal of control theory is to find the social factors that are different between the law-abiding elements of society and the criminal side of society. Put in methodological terms, control theory assumes that the forces driving one to crime are a constant and therefore of little use in explaining variation in the outcome variable, crime. On the other hand, sources of conformity are assumed to have enough variation to serve as independent variables explaining why some commit crimes and why some do not. Control theory seeks to understand where the social order breaks down for the former group and where it is intact for the latter.

Social control theory forwards a consensual view of society. In this perspective, society is a composition of institutions and actors. Consensus operates on two levels, on the one hand, there are shared meanings and values within institutions (Shoemaker, 2005), on the other hand, there is also a more general level of consensus operating between and among the institutions of society (Einstadter & Henry, 1995). The former set, consensus within groups, is most important for understanding the relationship between individual actions and the social contexts within which those actions take place.

Institutions of the social order are responsible for the socialization of their members. All of the institutions, such as family, school, churches, and peer groups, have socialization functions. Large-scale institutions of socialization include work and employment, the justice system and perhaps even the greater economic and cultural structures. Despite the myriad of socialization elements, social control theorists are in agreement that the most important of these control elements are family and school (Einstadter & Henry, 1995; Hirschi, 1969; Shoemaker, 2005; Vold, Bernard, & Snipes, 2002; Williams & McShane, 1994).

The main argument of social control theory is that conforming behavior is explainable by the bonds of control between an individual and these elements of control. While earlier versions of control theory argued that these elements of control influenced personal controls, which are internal states and dispositions that in turn protected against the urges and drives to commit crime or engage in delinquent behavior (Reckless, 1961; Reiss, 1951), later social control theorists such as Hirschi argued that social control theory would explain conforming and criminal behavior through factors external to the

individual, such as the actual number of ties that a person has, rather than their internalized attitudes and norms (Lilly et al., 1995). Those individuals with higher levels of the social bond between themselves and the elements of control would in effect be protected against crime or delinquency. Consequently, those individuals who were unencumbered by bonds of control to family, school or others would be more likely become delinquent or criminal (Hirschi, 1969).

In social control theory, the social bond between the actor and the element of control is operationalized along relevant dimensions of measurable behavior and relationship characteristics. Hirschi's 1969 study *Causes of Delinquency* stands out as a foundation of control theory because of the simple elegance with which it analyzes the relationship between the social control variables and crime and delinquency in adolescents. Hirschi's operationalizations of the four social control variables which describe the strength of the bond are presented below.

Hirschi used a four-fold operationalization of the social bond between the actor and the element of control; the four dimensions consist of attachment, involvement, commitment, and belief. Later researchers working in the social control have consistently adopted similar dimensions of control (Kempf, 1993). Levels of these control variables indicated the strength of the bond between the person and the element to which they are more or less tied. Family, friends, and school are example of elements of control used by control theorists. Again, it was argued that stronger bonds would protect against any individual tendencies towards crime, deviance, or delinquency.

Attachment refers to the continuing intimacy of interaction between the individual and the element of control. While Hirschi noted that attachment was *related* to the internalization of norm, he also noted that that attachment was not to be confused with “internalization per se” (Hirschi, 1969: 18-19; Lilly et al., 1995: 99). Rather than looking at “subjective and psychological states” (Williams & McShane, 1994: 189), attachment should be a measure of the ongoing associations. For juveniles, attachment to school and attachment to family were the key bonds to society (Lilly et al., 1995). The logic of control theory argues that those with higher levels of attachment to key control elements will have a stronger social bond, and therefore less criminal or delinquent behavior than those with lower levels of this social control variable.

Commitment, Hirschi argued, was an indicator of how much an individual would have to lose if they were to engage in delinquent or criminal behavior; as such commitment measures the investment of time, energy, and even the investment of self in activities ranging from education to business or other conventional activity (Hirschi, 1969). Restated, commitment can be seen as the degree to which the individual’s self-interest has been invested in a set of given ideas (Lilly et al., 1995). The logic of this element argues that those with higher levels of commitment to conventional activities will have a stronger social bond, and therefore lower levels of criminal or delinquent behavior.

Involvement is a measure of time and energy spent on conventional and unconventional activity. It is argued that those with more involvement in such conventional activities as stable employment, recreational activity with others, sports,

hobbies and even social engagements such as community service or church activity will have a stronger social bond than those with lower levels of involvement and therefore lower levels of crime and delinquency (Hirschi, 1969; Lilly et al., 1995).

Finally, belief is a measure of the assent to society's rules. Stressing the sociological nature of this social control variable, belief is taken as an outcome of constant social reinforcement of social rules and norms (Lilly et al., 1995). Insofar as belief touches upon a respect for the common value system (McShane & Williams, 1989), ideally measured through the ongoing attachments to conventional social systems (Lilly et al., 1995), those with higher levels of belief will have a stronger social bond than those with lesser levels of belief. The former group will be protected from crime and delinquency more so than those with lesser levels of belief.

In summary, control theory provides a way of understanding the forces which bind individuals to social institutions of control and thus explains how one is able to resist temptations towards deviance and delinquency. Recent work using life course desistance approaches to informal social controls has extended the general arguments of control theory to the study of adult crime and adult desistance from crime.

Life Course Criminology and Informal Social Controls

Recent developments in criminological theory has emphasized the role of social bonds, while at the same time incorporating a life-course developmental approach which points out that the bonds of control can be associated with changes in patterns of behavior and long-term life trajectories. The developmental approach emphasizes how the bonds of control can be associated with changes in patterns of behavior, rather than the

homotypic continuity (Sampson & Laub, 1990,1993; Laub, Nagin, & Sampson, 1998; Laub and Sampson 2003) stressed in pure control approaches (Gottfredson & Hirschi, 1990). This integration of social control and developmental perspectives is known as the life course desistance approach. Following a brief introduction of the key elements of the life course approach, the main work in life course criminology that deals with offender desistance, the informal social control approach, will be presented.

Life course criminology is characterized by a focus on the “duration, timing, and ordering of major life events and their consequences for later social development” (Sampson & Laub, 1993: 8). Discarding the assumption of stability in criminal behavior over time (Gottfredson & Hirschi, 1990), this approach looks at how a life-course can be seen as a series of trajectories, which are long-term patterns of events, “pathways or lines of development over the life span, such as work life, marriage, parenthood, . . . or criminal behavior” (Sampson & Laub, 1993: 8). Life events set the individual along pathways of development; for example adult criminality might be traced back along a trajectory stemming from juvenile delinquency. Instead of the continuity assumption, however, the life course desistance approaches allow for changes from one trajectory, to a different one, such as from crime to desistance. By drawing on the life-course approach the informal social control perspective extends the original arguments of social control theory to cover not only protection from crime and delinquency but the re-integration of offenders.

One broad goal of life course criminology is to identify the salient turning points associated with these changes in trajectories. Turning points are both the juncture

between different trajectories as well as situations of events that themselves alter the trajectories of behavior. These “exogenous events” (Laub, Nagin, & Sampson, 1998) are argued to be embedded in the institutions of social control, families, schools, peers, work, marriage and community involvement, for example (Sampson & Laub, 1990).

Sampson and Laub (1990) found that job stability, commitment to conventional educational and occupational goals and attachment to spouse were turning points in the lives of youth who were once delinquents but who had later successfully desisted from crime. Later work emphasized the role of marriage as a life-course transition point. Two key findings about marriage stood out, first, marriage quality contributed to the desistance process; former delinquents who were in marriages characterized as cohesive had remarkably lower rates of offending, number of arrests, general deviance, and excessive use of alcohol than those without such social supports (Sampson & Laub, 1993; Laub et al., 1998). In addition, the effects of the “good marriage” on arrest rates were cumulative over time, the farther away from the time of marriage, the greater the statistical effect of the marital tie on criminal behavior in the expected directions (Laub et al., 1998). The major finding of the life-course desistance view was that the adult social bond of marriage functioned as an extremely powerful informal social control on the behavior of former delinquents. The independent predictive power of the adult social bond of quality marriage outweighed the contribution of other factors such as “prior drinking, wife’s deviance, IQ, childhood difficulty, tantrums, early onset of misbehavior, (and) self control” (Sampson & Laub, 1993: 203).

Despite the strength of the empirical relationships, the informal social control approach is weaker in explaining exactly how these adult social bonds affect crime and desistance. In Laub and Sampson's study (2003), five possible causal mechanisms are presented. Four of these explanations are clearly influenced by the control tradition. For example it is argued that the enduring attachments of marriage are actually an investment for the individual; as time passes the offender will desist from crime because they will not want to jeopardize the interdependent systems of obligation and restraint they have built up while in the relationship. Second, marriage might alter criminal behavior through changes in routine activities as daily choices become more structured. Third, marriage opens the door to new influences and the easing out of older ones. New friends and family can alter behavior while at the same time the influences of criminal peers might be lessened. Fourth, Laub and Sampson cite the direct social control exerted by spouses, through the imposition of obligations or the monitoring of behavior. Finally, the fifth causal mechanism is introduced, although it is not emphasized as much in Laub and Sampson's work. This alternative looks at how the offender might desist as a result of a re-construction of "self," going from criminal to husband, father or family member, that takes place within the context of marriage and family.

Even though their theory leaves some room for the impact of this identity change in the desistance process, Laub and Sampson emphasize the role of the socio-structural frameworks of control in the desistance process, noting that "criminological theories must allow for behavioral change absent identity reconstruction" (Laub & Sampson, 2003: 299), and that most offenders who find themselves on pro-social trajectories are

there as a result of “desistance by default” (Laub & Sampson, 2003: 147, 278-279) taking place within the frameworks of control. In the end, the approach returns to its roots in control theory by adopting the control variables of Hirschi (1969); offenders build up stakes in conformity and involvement in conventional institutions “by default” and as a result of “side bets,” which entail making commitments to go straight without even realizing it (Laub & Sampson, 2003: 147, 278-279).

The informal social control argument found in the life-course desistance approaches presents a convincing argument about the contexts of desistance. Some offenders are constrained from trajectories of crime by the controls exerted by marriage and family. Work on the social construction of identity and self, which is characteristic of the symbolic interactionist approach, will be discussed next in order to more fully explain how and why an offender might respond to these contexts of informal social control.

Symbolic Interactionist Approaches

As was argued above, one of the criticisms of the informal social control approach is that it downplays to role of individual agency in the desistance process. While not denying the importance of the structures of control, some argue that that there is a need to emphasize how the actors themselves “creatively and selectively appropriate elements in the environment,” including spouses and families (Giordano, Cernkovich, & Rudolph, 2002). Symbolic interactionist theories of delinquency and desistance provide a useful foundation for understanding how offenders take advantage of relationships in the desistance process. Two perspectives from the symbolic interactionist approaches will be

presented, these approaches argue that at the root of offender change are socially constructed conceptions of a new, non-criminal, self that are located within the bonds of control.

One productive line of research has examined how interactions with others, specifically role-taking, relate to delinquent behavior. Role-taking is the internalization of the control elements, consisting of “projecting oneself into the role of other persons and appraising, from their standpoint, the situation, oneself in the situation, and possible lines of action” (Matsueda, 1992). In the example of role-taking, relationships with reference groups, such as family and friends, become important factors in behavior as it is from these groups that the “other” will be derived. In the interactionist perspective, social control is actually internalized control when the individual takes into consideration the appraisals of others’ prior to action.

This approach has been used with some success to explain delinquent behavior. Matsueda (1992) and Matsueda and Heimer (1994) argue that at the root of juvenile delinquency is a conception of self that is bound up in the views and perspectives of others. Views held by parents of their children as delinquents and rule-violators had a significant impact on the views that children had of themselves; parental appraisals of the youth had significant effects on the youths’ own reflected appraisals of self (Matsueda, 1992). When the youth took the role of parents appraised themselves as delinquent, their actions followed this perception. Later work in the same vein extended the scope of relationships that were important in driving both reflected appraisals and consequent behavior to include peers as well as family. As youth saw themselves from

the point-of-view of these groups as rule-violators, so too were they more likely to engage in delinquency (Matsueda & Heimer, 1994). However, other research has found that reflected appraisals from parents were not as good predictors of identification as were reflected appraisals from peers. It was this latter set of appraisals that best predicted delinquent identification (Brownfield & Thompson, 2005).

It is argued here that the findings from the symbolic interactionist approach to delinquency have relevance for discussions on offender change and desistance from crime. Role-taking can be applied as an explanatory factor that can explain why desistance is found in the contexts of healthy marital relationships. For example, as the spouse is perceived by the offender as someone seeing him as a person worthy not only of support, but also as someone who can be relied upon, so too might the offender begin to act in accordance with these reflected appraisals and begin taking related pro-social roles. The idea of using role-taking to understand positive behavior was included in Matsueda's original study (1992); included within the actual appraisals of others held by the delinquent youth were appraisals of success. Although this measure failed to predict "successful" outcomes, Matsueda admitted that this result might be due more to methodological problems rather than to theoretical issues (1992: 1600)

In short, the symbolic interactionist perspective on the causes of delinquency provides an interesting method of appreciating the mechanisms of behavior rooted in social ties; this approach is not at all contrary to social control theory but actually extends it by arguing that effective social controls are those that have been internalized and then activated by the process of role-taking. By substituting desistance for delinquency as the

subject of study, the symbolic interactionist approach provides a plausible explanation on how emotional supports might function as contexts for offender behavior change.

In another important work looking at impact of human agency in the desistance process, Giordano et al. (2002) argue that the structural influences of social bonds should be contrasted with the work done by the desisters themselves as they make choices about behaviors and actions within those social contexts. This approach criticizes the informal social control perspective as overlooking the “up front work” done by desisters.

According to this identity shift view, the actor will appropriate situational elements such as church and religion, prison or treatment, children, spouses, and employment, but first there must be an “openness to change” in order to take advantage of these “hooks for change” (Giordano et al., 2002: 1027). In addition, the informal social control approach is criticized for not providing an explanation for those offenders who manage to change their lives even without the support elements and bonds predicted by the theory (Giordano et al., 2002).

Summary

This review has covered several theories relevant to the understanding behavior of incarcerated offenders. The strength of social bonds and relationships to others was introduced by way of social control theory (Hirschi, 1969). Life-course criminology and the informal social control approach were discussed insofar as they provide explanations of the turning points, such as marriage, in the life trajectories of offenders (Sampson & Laub, 1990, 1993; Laub & Sampson, 2003). Finally, arguments from the symbolic interactionist perspective were introduced as a way of understanding the mechanisms of

change located within the contexts of social relationships. These views addressed the importance of others (Heimer & Matsueda, 1994; Matsueda, 1992) as well as taking into consideration how the desisters might view themselves as well as considering their changing identities (Girodano et al., 2001).

The current study is located within the framework of these larger approaches. First, the main concern is with desistance from crime. In adopting the contexts of social relationships to explain any changes in offenders, this project is directly informed by life course criminology and the informal social control approach (Laub & Sampson, 2003; Sampson & Laub, 1990, 1993). However, this study is also influenced by the symbolic interactionist perspectives on crime and behavior. For example, there is agreement with Girodano et al. (2001) that incarceration might serve as a suitable hook for change in the behavior of offenders. In addition, the views of Matsueda (1992) and Matsueda and Heimer (1994) on the importance of reflected appraisals should be incorporated as possible mechanisms for change. Relationships should be seen not only as regulative controls but also as contexts; in this light the adoption of specific independent variables of interest will reflect the position of the current study within this larger body of work on offenders, relationships, and behaviors.

Empirical Studies

Social control theory as a body of work developed from Travis Hirschi's original study of northern California adolescents. Most of the empirical applications, replications or extensions of the theory have looked at samples of adolescents and juveniles. A somewhat dated article listed seventy-one empirical tests of control theory. These tests

included both peer-review articles and dissertations (Kempf, 1993). Of these studies, only four looked at the effects of social controls on adults; the number of studies increased to ten if college-aged samples were included. Peer-reviewed articles dating back to 1970, the year after Hirschi's publication, show a similar dearth of studies looking at the effect of social controls on adult crime. Of the 134 articles found under social control theory and dating back to 1970, only 12 looked at the effects of social controls on adults. In addition, there are very few empirical studies taking the social control approach and also looking at inmates or offenders. The research on informal social controls (Laub & Sampson, 2003; Sampson & Laub, 1993) is an extension of social control theory to a new population that fills this gap in the literature base. Specifically, the informal social control perspective is a special case of the role of attachments and how these bonds affect adults and adult offenders.

The conceptual line between social control theory and the informal social control perspective is unclear at times. One reason for this is the common theoretical heritage of both approaches. This common heritage leads both approaches to adopt the same variables, often making the classification of a given empirical study problematic. For the purposes of this review, studies classified as informal social control approaches will be those that follow the spirit of Sampson and Laub (1993) and Laub and Sampson (2003) in that the studies classified as informal social control pieces attempt to explain how social bonds reintegrate into society those who have histories of offending. Classifying the studies according to this conceptualization means that some empirical work will be classified as informal social control pieces even though they predate Sampson and Laub

(1993). The remainder of the studies that do not look at the re-integrative aspects of the social bond will be classified as theories of social control.

Accordingly, this presentation will be divided into two main focus areas relevant to the study of social controls in adult inmates. First, the empirical work using social control theory on adult samples will be reviewed. Second, a review of the research using the informal social control approach on adult offenders and inmates will be conducted. Finally, the literature review will conclude by describing some relevant research on the effect of visitation and contact from spouses, wives, friends, and families on inmates and how this factor impacts inmate behavior and attitude.

Social Control Theory

The empirical tests of social control theory assume that the effect of social bonds are the same for adults as they are for adolescents or juveniles. Specifically, social control theory proposes that there is a direct relationship between the strong or healthy adult social bonds and the outcome variables of crime, delinquency or deviance.

Williams and Hawkins (1989) looked at the impact of Hirschi's four social control variables (1969) on the dichotomous outcome of partner assault or non-assault in a national-level sample of male adults. There was mixed support for the relationship between the four social control variables and partner assault. Attachment, as measured by importance of social activities with others, was a significant predictor of non-assault; those with higher levels of attachment were almost three times more likely to be non-assaulters than those with lower levels (Williams & Hawkins, 1989). In addition the measure of belief emerged as a significant predictor in the expected direction. Along

with these significant findings, the effects of commitment, as measured by years in the community and years with partner, was not a significant predictor of assault. Likewise, the amount of activity with others, which was an indicator for the variable of involvement, was not a significant predictor of the dependent variable of assault.

Williams and Hawkins used a composite index for the measure of attachment. Respondents were asked to indicate the level of importance, from low to high, of social time spent with four categories of people. These categories were neighbors, friends, relatives, or their partners (Williams & Hawkins, 1989). Even though the composite of these responses was a significant predictor of assault, it is not clear if there were any differences in levels of assault between these four categories of attachment groups.

Alarid, Burton, and Cullen (2000) applied elements of social control theory to a sample of male and female newly incarcerated felons. The dependent variables were measures of crime and delinquency committed prior to incarceration. These measures included a general measure of crime and a disaggregated measure of property crime, drug crime, and violent crime. They found that social control variables had general effects on all measures of crime in the predicted directions; the relationship was direct for parental attachments and indirect for peer attachments. In addition, they found the social control variables affected males and females differently, although these effects were also in the predicted directions for both genders (Alarid et al., 2000).

The adult social bond was measured by three types of attachments: (1) Marital/partner attachment, (2) Attachment to parents, and (3) Attachment to friends. Marital/partner attachment was indicated by a dichotomous response, either not

married/unattached or married/attached. The others were measured by composite responses.

Attachment was a significant predictor for males across all types of crime. Attachment to parents and peers were significant predictors for general crime, marital/partner attachment was not significant. Attachment was only partially related to the disaggregated measures of crime as well; there was no relationship between it and drug crimes. For property crimes only peer and parental attachments were significant predictors, and attachment to parents was the only significant predictor for violent crime (Alarid et al., 2000). There are three possible explanations for these findings regarding the relative non-importance of marital attachment to the outcomes of crime and delinquency. First, the age of the sample was relatively low; males averaged about 19 years old. Second, the percentage of married males in the sample was not very high, only 35%. Finally, the measure of marital attachment was a simple dichotomy; informal social control theory will argue that marriage only has effects on delinquency and crime when marital quality is taken into effect (Alarid et al., 2000; Laub et al., 1998; Sampson & Laub, 1993).

Newcomb and Bentler (1988) included measures approximating attachment and belief in their longitudinal study of young adults. They assessed levels of social support and social conformity during the teenage years of the respondents and examined the impact of these social control variables on drug use eight years later. They found support for the social control argument. Specifically, social support had significant indirect relationships with all outcome variables in the predicted directions; problems with drugs,

psychosomatic complaints, relationship problems, emotional distress, work problems, family problems, and health problems were all negatively related with levels of social support. Social conformity was negatively related with health problems and psychosomatic complaints (Newcomb & Bentler, 1988).

Newcomb and Bentler (1988) used a measure of social support to approximate attachment. Social support was a latent construct composed of four items. These items were relationships with parents, family, adults, and peers (Newcomb & Bentler, 1988). Parental and adult attachments had the highest loadings on social support; this is consistent with over half of the young adult sample still residing with parents (Newcomb & Bentler, 1988). No measure of marital or partner attachment was included; only 17% of the total sample reported living with a spouse.

Stack, Wasserman, and Kern (2004) examined how social bonds protected against deviant acts. In a national sample of adults, they looked at the impact of attachment measures and measures of belief on viewing internet pornography. They found general support for social control theory; attachment to spouse and attachment to church were significantly related to cyber porn viewing in the predicted directions. The greater the degree of attachment, reflecting a stronger social bond, the less the chances were that the respondent had viewed pornography on the internet (Stack et al., 2004). In addition, several items were included in the study that described levels of the social control variable of belief; these items were experiences of adultery, experiences of paid sex, the respondent's number of sex partners, and the respondent's drug usage. Adultery and paid sex were related to cyber porn in the expected directions; those who engaged in these

activities were more likely to have viewed cyber porn than those who had not (Stack et al., 2004).

The social bond of attachment was measured by the marital status of the respondent. Consistent with the arguments of informal social control theory, that it is the quality of the relationship that matters rather than the status (Laub et al., 1998; Sampson & Laub, 1993). Stack et al. (2004) indicated attachment to spouse by looking at levels of happiness in the relationship. However, this measure of attachment was a dichotomous one. Additionally, they did not distinguish between those with unhappy marriages and those who are single or those who were not married but in a relationship (Stack et al. 2004).

Several findings emerge from the review presented above. First, there is consistent support for social control theory across all studies considered. Specifically, the better the quality of the social relationships for an individual, the less the chances are that individual will be involved with crime, delinquency, or deviance.

In terms of the significant social bonds associated with low levels of crime and delinquency, attachment always emerged as a salient dimension of the social bond. Regarding the direction and the outcome of the association between the social control variables and the dependent variables, high levels of attachment were related to low levels of partner violence and assault (Williams & Hawkins, 1989), low levels of crime (Alarid et al., 2000), problems with drugs, emotions, work trouble or relationship problems (Newcomb & Bentler, 1988), as well as being associated with low levels of deviance (Stack et al., 2004).

Attachment was usually a measurement of the quality of the relationship. This measurement was captured in a variety of ways. Attachment was indicated by levels of socialization with others (Williams & Hawkins, 1989), the categorical status of the relationship (Alarid et al., 2000), the quality of relationships with others, (Newcomb & Bentler, 1988), or the level of happiness in the relationship (Stack et al., 2004). With the exception of Alarid et al. (2000), all of these studies go beyond looking at the effect of dichotomous states on outcomes of crime and instead attempted to capture the element of relationship quality (Laub et al., 1998; Sampson & Laub, 1993).

Finally, attachment most often looked at the relationship between the subject and the marital partner, although other relationships were sometimes included in the study. Williams and Hawkins (1989) included attachment to friends, relatives, and neighbors but did not address differences among these groups. Alarid et al. (2000) included attachments to marital partner, parents, and peers although their findings were puzzling; attachment to marital partner was not significant while attachment to peers was indirectly related to crime.

As a buffer against temptations towards crime or delinquency, attachment is an important element of the social bond. The above literature review illustrates the relationship between high levels of marital attachment and low levels of offending. In addition, the effect of attachment on offending seems to work through relationships with family and friends, although these findings are more speculative. Finally, the most successful predictors of low offending are the qualities of the relationships, rather than just categorical or dichotomous differences in relationship status.

Informal Social Controls

Social control theory and the informal social control approach share similar assumptions regarding the effect of social relationships on behavior. However, for the purposes of this review informal social control approaches will be limited to those studies that document, or attempt to document, the change in behavior from anti-social to pro-social activities; more simply, from criminal behavior toward desistance. Several groups of studies will be presented. The first group consists of research performed by Sampson and Laub and others who closely replicate their methods and general approaches in studying offenders over the long term. The second group consists of empirical studies looking at the effect of informal social controls on two types of offenders; incarcerated inmates and probationers. Finally, studies utilizing the informal social control approach in samples coming from the general population will be presented.

Replications and Extensions

The various studies of Sampson and Laub looked at a sample of 1000 Massachusetts youth; 500 delinquents and 500 non-delinquents.¹ Longitudinal analyses looked at the effects of the independent variables, the institutions of informal social control, on measures of alcohol and/or drug use, general deviance and arrest rates. Institutions of informal control were indicated by measures of job stability, commitment, and attachment to spouses. Outcomes for the study were assessed at follow-up ages of 25 and 32 (Sampson & Laub, 1990; Laub et al., 1998).

¹ The original data came from Sheldon and Eleanor Glueck's 1950 work, *Unraveling Juvenile Delinquency*.

Sampson and Laub (1990) established relationships between adult desistance from crime and institutions of informal social controls, specifically they found social interactions with adult institutions of informal social control mitigates against adult offending. While they looked at several measures of informal social controls, including work and employment, marital factors emerged as the strongest predictors of adult desistance. Not only did they find consistent evidence that it was not the status of being married that was associated with desistance but rather the cohesiveness of the marriage, (1990), but they also found that the effects of these quality marital ties, i.e. highly cohesive, were gradual over time. There was less effect for marital ties on chronic or persistent offenders (1998).

Giordano et al. (2002) presented a longitudinal study that followed along the same general methodology as Sampson and Laub's (1993) work. They looked at 257 delinquent youths in 1982, and then conducted follow-up analyses in 1995. Their findings supported the main arguments of informal social control theory. Specifically, they were interested in how adult social control variables of attachment to spouse and attachment to children related to offending (Giordano et al., 2002). Initially, they found no relationship between the two social control variables and outcomes which measured arrest history or criminal involvement. However, exploratory analyses showed social control variables were significant predictors of adult criminal involvement in certain contexts. Specifically, they found the effect of social control elements the strongest when these relationships were accompanied by stable job and work situations. The confluence of marital happiness and stable job earnings was termed a "respectability package"

(Giordano et al., 2002: 1013), it appeared that desistance from crime was significantly related to the interactive effect of these variables.

Studies of Incarcerated Offenders

Several empirical studies looked at the effect of informal social controls on samples of incarcerated adult offenders to see how social bonds related to measures of inmate mental health and arrest history. Lindquist (2000) examined the impact of social integration on mental well-being in a sample of male and female incarcerated offenders. The hypothesis that family ties and social support would be associated with positive mental health was not supported in her study. Not only was lack of social integration not a significant predictor of depression in incarcerated males, but several of the other indicators of social support predicted mental health in the *opposite* direction than what the literature suggested. Specifically, social integration, measured by marital and parental statuses, was a predictor of hostility and anxiety; inmates who were married or who were parents had higher levels of anxiety and hostility than unmarried or childless inmates (Lindquist, 2000). Based upon these findings, Lindquist argued that we may be forced to reconceptualize our understanding of how informal social controls work by allowing for the influence of population characteristics. She suggests that the relationship between social integration and outcomes, such as mental health or pro-social changes, might not operate in the same direction or magnitudes under conditions of stigmatization or isolation as it does in the general population (Lindquist, 2000).

Horney, Osgood, and Marshall (1995) examined the impact of informal social controls in a sample of newly incarcerated male felons. They specifically asked if

changes in “local life circumstances” were determinant of changes in criminal behavior (Horney et al., 1995: 659). Included in the measures of local life circumstances were indicators of adult marital bonds and ties to significant others. They found support for the informal social control approach; when a subject began to live with his wife the odds of crime stopping were more than twice those of crime starting. The converse was true as well: those who started living with their wives were more likely to stop committing crimes to when the same individuals stopped living with their spouses.

Looking at intra-individual changes and associations, Horney et al. (1995) found that informal social controls were significantly related to types of crimes committed. Specifically, living with a wife was significantly associated with lower levels of violent crimes. On the contrary, living with a girlfriend was positively associated with general measures of crime as well as indicators of drug offenses (Horney et al., 1995).

Studies of Probationers

Along with incarcerated offenders, adult probationers are another group to which the theory of informal social controls has been applied. Outcome variables for these empirical studies include recidivism as measured by re-arrest or by probation termination or completion.

Lindquist, Smusz, and Doerner (1985) looked at the effect of social bonds in a sample of adult misdemeanor offenders who were on probation. Successful probation outcome was the dependent variable. Successful outcomes are measured by completion of the probation period without termination of probation status or probation failure. There was no support for the effects of informal social controls on outcomes; when

marital status and number of children were used as indicators of attachment there was no relationship between the social bond and probation outcomes (Lindquist et al., 1985).

The findings of the study, informal social controls not being supported, might be explained by the measures used to indicate levels of attachment. While the authors state that “attachment refers to an individual’s regard for the opinions of significant others” (Lindquist et al., 1985: 5), this variable is operationalized by simple dichotomous measures of “married/never married” and “one or more dependent/no dependents” (Lindquist et al., 1985: 7).

MacKenzie and Li (2002) asked if changes in adult social bonds were associated with corresponding changes in criminal behaviors in a sample of probationers who were just beginning their probationary sentences. Using an event calendar method similar to Horney et al. (1995), this study used monthly measures of illegal activities as an outcome variable. Six criminal offenses were accounted for: theft, burglary, forgery, robbery, assault, and drug dealing, along with a measure of drug versus non-drug offenses (MacKenzie, 1987). Measures of the adult social bond included living with a spouse and living with a significant other. They found that social bonds affected probation offenses in expected directions. Specifically, marital relationships reduced the involvement in non-drug crimes, although there was no significant relationship for any of the social bond measures and drug crimes. In addition, age interacted with those probationers who were living with spouses; the probability of re-offending was significantly greater for those probationers who were over 40 and living with their spouses.

Hepburn and Griffin (2004) looked at the impact of social bonds on successful adjustment to probation in a sample of adult probationers. These adults were hypothesized to have very low levels of integration to begin with the sample consisted of adults who had been arrested and sentenced to probation for child molestation. They argued that strong social bonds would predict successful probation adjustment. For this study, social bonds were indicated by social support from both family and friends and coded as “positive influences,” “negative influences,” or “mixed influences” (Hepburn & Griffin, 2004). Probation outcomes were indicated by probation revocation petitions and/or unsuccessful probation terminations. The study found that those probationers who had the support of their family and/or friends were more likely to successfully adjust to probation than those without these forms of informal social controls. Those with support from friends had only 42.5 percent of the risk of unsuccessful adjustment as those without support; those with family support only had 59.8 percent of the risk of those without this source of support.

Studies in the General Population

Several studies looked at the impact of informal social controls in samples of adults from the general population. For example, Lackey and Williams (1995) explored the intergenerational transmission of violence thesis using an informal social control approach. The intergenerational transmission thesis argues that “many people witnessing or victimized by violence in their family of origin subsequently use violence themselves” (Lackey & Williams, 1995: 295). Their research question asked, “(would) successful bonding experiences in adulthood differentiate persons with a violent family history who

are nonviolent from those who perpetuate violence from their partners” (Lackey & Williams, 1995: 296). Data for this study came from a national survey of adults in the general population. The adult social bond was measured by how respondents rated the importance of having special occasions and activities with their partners, and the importance of getting together with their friends and relatives, as well as measures of community involvement. This study found that as expected, adult social bonds mitigated against intimate family violence. Specifically, for those from violent backgrounds, attachments to partners, networks of friends, and family were related to never having been violent with their partner. In addition, the study found that for those men who were exposed to violence earlier in life, strong attachments to both family and friends mitigated against self-reported future intentions relating to violence against partners (1995).

In a second study, Lackey (2003) refined the earlier idea (Lackey & Williams, 1995) that social controls could explain change in the effect of a violent family of origin on later partner violence. The data for this study came from the National Youth Survey, a project more extensive than the earlier study (Lackey & Williams, 1995). In addition, the independent variables of interest were more refined than in the previous study. In the later work, they argued that the adult social bond to either wife or partner was an intervening variable between childhood violent victimization and later onset abuse of partner. They operationalized the social bond along Hirschi’s original four dimensions (1969); in other words they looked at the qualities of attachment to the relationship, involvement in the relationship, commitment to the relationship, and belief. Lackey

found some support for the argument that informal social controls in adulthood mitigates against the violent influences of earlier years. Specifically, while violence in youth had direct and positive effects on partner violence, victim experiences as a youth were significantly and negatively related to levels of relationship attachment, relationship commitment, and relationship belief. In turn, there was a significant negative relationship between levels of relationship commitment and levels of partner violence (Lackey, 2003).

Despite the strong initial findings of Laub and Sampson (Laub et al., 1998; Laub & Sampson, 2003; Sampson & Laub, 1990, 1993) on the impact of healthy marital relationships on desistance from crime, a review of empirical studies found mixed support for the argument of the informal social control approach as it applies to adults and adult offenders. This review looked at the findings from several studies examining the impact of informal social controls on crime in samples of adult offenders (Giordano et al. 2002), samples of adult probationers and inmates (Hepburn & Griffin, 2004; Horney et al., 1995; Lindquist, 2000; Lindquist et al., 1985; MacKenzie & Spencer, 2002) and in the general population (Lackey, 2003; Lackey & Williams, 1995).

Overall, there was mixed support for informal social controls. Several of the studies found no link between informal social controls and levels of desistance. Lindquist (2000) found that the relationship between marital and family relationships was actually in a direction not predicted by the theory; those inmates who were married or were parents were more likely to have higher levels of hostility or anxiety than those who were not

married or were not parents. Lindquist et al. (1985) found no effect of informal social controls on probation outcomes for adult offenders.

Several studies found mixed support for the effect of informal social controls on outcomes. Lackey (2003) found that one element of the social bond of marriage, commitment, was associated with low levels of partner violence in a sample from the general population. Likewise, MacKenzie and Li (2002) found that informal social controls were associated with desistance from non-drug crimes, but not other types.

Contact and Visitation

Intuitively it would seem that those prisoners who receive more visitation and contact from spouses, significant others, friends, and family would benefit more from supportive relationships. However, the research on visitation and inmate behavior offers only mixed support to this claim. Clemmer (1958: 225) noted that prison visits were “complex, hedonistic experiences;” the effects of visitation and contact on inmate attitudes should be tested rather than assumed.

Following intake of the offender into the correctional institution, the first few visits may be troubling for both the inmate and visitor. Repeated visits are often required before both settle into comfortable patterns. However, the inmate and the visitor might not actually find such comfortable patterns; visitation and contact might bring forth distressing memories and feelings. Clemmer notes that “letters from home or friends include thoughts which cause lonesomeness, shame, vindictiveness, feelings of being unwanted, feelings of being misunderstood and sorrow or remorse in other forms” (1958: 225). Face-to-face visits between sweethearts can be fraught with both jealousy and

doubts of honesty. Accordingly, several empirical studies were found which describe how visitation and contact impact on inmates.

Clark (2003) looked at 340 male felony inmates in two Virginia prisons. She examined the impact of visitation on institutional misbehavior infractions. Visitation was measured by the total number of face-to-face visits an inmate had received each month for one year. Outcomes were measured by institutional infractions, the total number of documented rule violations an inmate received during the sampling period. Her study failed to support the linkage between visits and outcomes; in none of the statistical models predicting inmate misbehavior was visitation a significant predictor variable.

Carlson and Cervera (1992) compared inmates who were participating in a conjugal visitation program to those who were not participants. Specifically, the authors were looking for the program effect of visitation and contact on a wide variety of outcomes including coping mechanisms and perceptions of the relationship. They found only tentative support for the linkage between visitation and positive outcomes; inmates participating in the visitation program differed only slightly from the comparison group of those not participating. Specifically, non-participants were more likely to seek support from spiritual sources than those inmates in the visitation program. In addition, inmates participating in the program were more likely to be satisfied in their relationship than non-participants.

Lindquist (2000) looked at the impact of received social support on levels of mental health in a sample of 198 male and female inmates incarcerated in a large county jail. Received social support was a composite indicator composed of three measures: the

number of visits from family or friends, the number of letters from family or friends, and the number of phone calls the inmate had made to family or friends. Mental health was measured by levels of depression, anxiety, and hostility. There was no significant relationship between the amounts of visitation or contact and mental health outcomes.

The brief review on contact and visitation shows that there is as of yet no consensus on the impact of contact and visitation on inmate outcomes, attitudinal or behavioral. More empirical work needs to be done to clarify the impact of informal social controls in incarcerated samples. By including measures of contact and visitation, this project can contribute to a better understanding of the relationship between informal social controls and outcomes in the context of visitation and contact.

Hypotheses

This thesis will test several hypotheses that are relevant to informal social control theory. These hypotheses will all address the main research question that asks how social support affects the attitudes of incarcerated offenders.

The first set of hypotheses will look at the effect of relationships with wives/significant others on outcome variables. This set of hypotheses states the direction of the relationship between social support and outcomes will be positive; high levels of social support will be associated with pro-social attitudes and outlooks.

H1A: High levels of emotional support from wife/significant other will be positively associated with high levels of psychological well being.

H2A: High levels of emotional support from wife/significant other will reduce levels of criminal sentiments.

H3A: High levels of emotional support from wife/significant other will be positively associated with optimistic perceptions of treatment programming.

The second set of hypotheses addresses the effect of social support from families on outcomes. Based on informal social control theory, this set of hypotheses states that the direction of the relationship between the two variables will be positive; high levels of social support from the family will be associated with pro-social attitudes and outlooks.

H1B: High levels of emotional support from family will be positively associated with high levels of psychological well-being.

H2B: High levels of emotional support from family will reduce levels of criminal sentiments.

H3B: High levels of emotional support from the family will be positively associated with optimistic perceptions of treatment programming.

The third set of hypotheses addresses the effects of social support from friends on outcomes. Based on informal social control theory, this set of hypotheses states that the direction of the relationship between the two variables will be positive; high levels of social support from friends will be associated with pro-social attitudes and outlooks.

H1C: High levels of emotional support from friends will be positively associated with high levels of psychological well-being.

H2C: High levels of emotional support from friends will reduce levels of criminal sentiments.

H3C: High levels of emotional support from friends will be positively associated with optimistic perceptions of treatment programming.

METHODS AND DATA

Sample

Procedure

The full sample for this study came from a county-level men's correctional institution in the Northern California area. This institution is composed of both a "downtown" jail component as well as a geographically separate and larger facility consisting of modular pod units and dormitory barracks. When all the inmates at the county system are considered, the population is about 4500, as of Spring 2006. About 80% of all inmates either have been sentenced for a felony or are awaiting felony sentencing. These facilities form an adult institution, therefore the minimum age is 18, and about one-half of the total population is between the ages of 18 and 34 with the remainder being over 34 years old.

The specific sample for this study came from a regimented treatment program at the outlying facility. On the day of administration 135, inmates were present to complete the survey. Even though official attendance records for the program were unavailable, informal conversations with program administrators confirmed that although a few inmates from the treatment programming unit might have been absent, the sample of 135 was close to 100% of all inmates currently in programming at the facility. Of the 135 surveys that were distributed, 132 usable forms were returned. The three unusable forms were less than one-half completed and were therefore excluded from any further analysis.

The programming unit was composed of both English language units and units for inmates who could not speak English, i.e. Spanish-language programming. The Spanish-

language programming unit had 26 inmates. The programming content between the two units was similar in terms of correctional rehabilitation. All correctional programming is in line with the mission statement of the county department of corrections, namely to maximize opportunities for offenders to participate in programs which reduce criminal behavior and to enhance the reintegration of the offenders into the community. As of 2002, this correctional programming included about 208 hours of classes per week. Class subjects include substance abuse recovery, General Education Diploma (GED), English as a Second Language, vocational training, parenting classes, and domestic violence prevention.

All surveys were distributed during correctional treatment classes. The investigator first introduced himself to the participants and explained the general goal of the project to the inmates. Inmates were told that they were being asked to participate in a project looking at their backgrounds as well as their opinions and attitudes on the world around them. To protect the anonymity of those who chose to not participate, inmates were given the option of returning blank forms. However, except for the three incomplete forms mentioned above, all forms were returned substantially complete.

A Spanish-language instrument was prepared for the Spanish-language programming unit. This instrument was constructed by translating the original English instrument into Spanish by a qualified consultant. An independent translator then checked this translation, no discrepancies were found. The same procedure was followed in constructing the informed consent document. To administer the Spanish instrument the services of correctional treatment instructors were used. Specifically, information

and instructions were first given in English by the investigator and then repeated in Spanish by the correctional treatment instructor.

All surveys were administered on the same day in the Spring of 2006. At no time during the administration were any correctional officers, uniformed officials, or other sworn employees of any correctional agencies present. All program staff present, to include those leading the class sessions and those who translated to the Spanish language inmates, were either civilian instructors or civilian case workers employed by the county.

Descriptive Statistics

Table 1 presents the univariate statistics for all control variables. Means, standard deviations, and frequencies for the final sample are presented. The average age for all inmates was just over 30 years old. Hispanics were the largest proportion of the sample (54.4%) followed by white inmates (24.0%). Inmates reporting African-American, Asian, and American Indian ethnic status were 7.2%, 4.0%, and 1.6% of the sample, respectively. Inmates who identified themselves as belonging to other, unlisted, ethnic groups were 8.8% of the sample.

Inmates were asked about their highest level of education. About 30% of the sample reported that they had not graduated high school or earned an equivalency diploma. About 40% of the inmates had earned either a high school diploma or their GED. Approximately 30% reported some college-level education.

Inmates were asked for their relationship status at the time of the arrest that resulted in their current incarceration. Most of the inmates (41.7%) reported that they were single, never married. About 33% of the inmates reported that they were married,

Table 1

Means and Standard Deviations for Control Variables

Variables	
Age <i>M</i> (SD)	30.26 (8.82)
Race/Ethnicity (%)	
White	24.0
Black	7.2
Hispanic	54.4
Asian	4.0
American Indian	1.6
Other	8.8
Education (%)	
8 years or less	6.2
Less than high school	24.0
GED	20.9
High school graduate	18.6
Some college or technical school	24.8
AA degree	3.9
BA or BS	1.6
Relationship status (%)	
First marriage	16.7
Remarried	2.3
Divorced	7.6
Married, currently separated	6.8
Single, never married	41.7
Living with partner	24.2
Widowed	0.8
Have children (%)	53.0
Number of arrests <i>M</i> (SD)	3.75 (1.67)
Current arrest (%)	
Crime against person, violent	9.8
Crime against person, theft	3.3
Property crime	9.8
Drug/alcohol offense	67.5
Other	9.8
Length of incarceration <i>M</i> (SD)	104.73 (68.76)
<i>N</i> = 132	

although some of them were on their first marriage and some were remarried. In the group of married inmates, 6.8% reported they were currently separated from their spouses. A small portion of the sample, 7.6% was currently divorced. 24.2% reported they had been living with their partners at the time of their arrest. Additionally, 53% of the inmates reported they had at least one child.

Inmates were asked about their criminal backgrounds. The average number of incarcerations, including the current one, was 3.75 times. Inmates were asked about their current offense, those with more than one charge were instructed to indicate the “most serious” offense. As for the current offense, the most prevalent charges were drug and alcohol offenses (67.5%).

Measures

Data Manipulation

Initial analyses showed that missing values on certain scale variables caused a reduction in the total number of cases available for statistical analysis. Accordingly, mean substitution was employed to maximize the number of cases available for analysis. The exact procedure for mean substitution will be presented as it applies to each variable introduced below.

Variables

Independent Variables of Interest

Two sets of independent variables of interest were created, measures of the level of contact and measures of the level of emotional support. Each of these measures was

specified according to the source of the contact or the source of the emotional support, from significant other, from family, or from friends.

Contact. For each source three survey questions assessed the level of contact. For contact with significant other, inmates were asked to indicate if their spouse/partner has visited them, if their spouse/partner has written them, and if their spouse/partner has telephoned them. Likert scales were used to indicate levels of contact with choices of “Very Often” “Often” “Sometimes” “Seldom” “Never” and “N/A.” This exact procedure was followed for contact with family and contact with friends.

There were no missing data for the contact questions. However, there was an issue with inmates who marked “N/A,” indicating that they did not have a specific source of contact, i.e., not married. For the purposes of this study “N/A” and “Never” were coded so that they both indicated no contact with the specific source. The alternative choice was to withdraw the “N/A” responses from the sample. Coding the “N/A” responses as “Never” was justified on the grounds that the following analysis were sensitive to absolute levels of contact; for example an inmate who is unmarried or without a partner would mark “N/A” for all contact items pertaining to significant other. An inmate who is married but has no contact with his wife would mark “Never.” Both of these inmates would be affected by no interaction with an outside source, regardless of the possibility for that contact.

The remaining scale items were coded so that higher values were indicative of higher levels of contact. The three scale items were then summed to create an aggregate measure of contact unique to each specific source. Means and standard deviations for

each of the questions from the three sources of contact (significant other, family, and friends) are presented in Table 2. Table 2 also presents the mean, standard deviation and Cronbach's alpha for each constructed variable.

Emotional support. Emotional support was the second independent variable of interest. Just as with contact, this study was concerned with emotional support from three sources, significant other, family, and friends. Emotional support from each of these sources was measured by the Perceived Social Support scale (PSS) (Zimet et al. 1988). The PSS uses four questions to construct a variable of emotional support for each of the categories.

Regarding the suitability of the PSS, factor analyses show the PSS to be internally reliable (Zimet et al., 1988). Empirical applications of the PSS show that it is significantly correlated with levels of anxiety and depression; high levels of support were associated with lower levels of each of these states (Zimet et al., 1988). This thesis assumes that high levels of emotional support as measured by the PSS will indicate healthy and strong social bonds and will therefore be associated with pro-social levels of the outcome variables.

To assess the level of social support, inmates were asked four questions for each source of support. For example, for emotional support from significant other inmates responded to the following questions: "There is a special person around when I am in need," "There is a special person with whom I can share my joys and sorrows," "There is a special person in my life who cares about my feelings," and "I have a special person

Table 2

*Descriptive Statistics for Contact with Significant Other, Contact with Family,
Contact with Friends, and Question Items*

Variable (Question)	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	alpha
Contact with significant other	7.61	4.25	.837
“My spouse or partner has visited me”	2.81	1.79	
“My spouse or partner has written me”	2.36	1.48	
“I have had telephone conversations with my spouse/partner”	2.44	1.62	
Contact with family	8.37	3.62	.723
“My family has visited me”	3.07	1.71	
“My family has written me”	2.77	1.42	
“I have had telephone conversations with my family”	2.53	1.36	
Contact with friends	11.36	4.12	.874
“My friends have visited me”	4.03	1.57	
“My friends have written me”	3.61	1.54	
“I have had telephone conversations with my friends”	3.73	1.49	
<i>N</i> = 132			

who is a real source of comfort to me.” The specific content of the questions varied slightly between the different sources. All questions are presented in Table 3. Inmates indicated agreement or disagreement to the questions by using 5-point Likert scales. All responses were coded so that higher values indicated greater levels of emotional support. 18 responses had missing data for the emotional support in the form of “N/A” responses. Consistent with the treatment of “N/A” responses in other independent variables, these items were coded as “0.” Table 3 presents means and standard deviations for the questions on each of the sources of support.

Dependent Variables

Three different dependent variables were considered in this study. Using such a range of outcomes captured a broad set of inmate attitudes and perceptions. To cover a large spectrum, variables looking at general psychological health, criminal sentiments, and perceptions of the incarceration and treatment environment were used. These variables are introduced below.

Psychological well-being. The first measure, Psychological Well-Being (PWB), looked at the inmate’s perception of self. This variable is concerned with the precursors to prisonization, the assimilation to the dominant values and norms of the correctional institution (Clemmer 1958). Prisonization might also be related to inmate misconduct and it is also argued that social support from sources located outside of the institution plays a role in staving off both psychological distress and prisonization.

Table 3

Descriptive Statistics for Measures of Emotional Support From Significant Other, Family, and Friends

Variable (Question)	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	alpha
Emotional support from significant other	14.84	5.21	.876
"There is a special person around when I am in need"	3.64	1.52	
"There is a special person with whom I can share my joys and sorrows"	3.71	1.43	
"There is a special person in my life who cares about my feelings"	3.79	1.61	
"I have a special person who is a real source of comfort to me"	3.71	1.54	
Emotional support from family	14.75	4.93	.876
"My family really tries to help me"	3.95	1.45	
"I get the emotional help and support I need from my family"	3.52	1.51	
"I can talk about my problems with my family"	3.55	1.42	
"My family is willing to help me make decisions"	3.74	1.39	
Emotional support from friends	11.65	5.14	.874
"I can count on my friends when things go wrong"	2.65	1.48	
"I have friends with whom I can share my joys and sorrows"	3.26	1.42	
"I can talk about my problems with my friends"	3.26	1.42	
"My friends really try to help me"	2.70	1.47	
<i>N</i> = 132			

To measure PWB, seven questions were taken from Wooldredge's study (1999) of inmate prison experiences. His study supported the linkage between psychological well-being and prisonization. Inmates with low participation in prison programs, inmates who were assault victims, those with little visitation, and those with lengthy sentences all had significantly higher levels of poor mental health. Marriage, on the other hand, was not significantly related to psychological well-being in his study.

PWB is a suitable outcome measure for theories of social control; strong social or emotional supports are argued to buffer against the experiences of prisonization. It is assumed that those inmates with healthy relationships will also have higher levels of PWB than those inmates without such supportive relationships. Therefore, inmates who have the buffers of social support will be better protected against the psychological pains of incarceration and will ultimately be able to avoid institutionalization.

Inmates used 5 item Likert scales to indicate levels of agreement or disagreement with question items. Items were coded on a 5-point scale so that healthy levels of PWB had high values. Table 4 presents the specific questions and descriptive statistics for the measure of PWB. Out of the sample of 132 inmates, 11 surveys were missing responses for some of the PWB subscales. None of the cases was missing more than one-half of the subscale items. Mean substitution was used for these missing values; for each specific case with missing responses, the average value for the completed subscale items was substituted for the missing value in that particular case. In this fashion, the substituted means reflected responses common to the individual rather than common to the sample.

Table 4

Descriptive Statistics for Psychological Well-Being and Scale Questions

Variable (Question)	<i>M</i>	SD	alpha
Psychological well-being	23.72	6.02	.848
"It is hard for me to relate to others"	3.42	1.15	
"I often feel depressed"	3.14	1.24	
"I feel angry at the people around me quite often"	3.60	1.14	
"I often have problems dealing with stress"	3.21	1.19	
"I often feel tense"	3.15	1.19	
"I often feel neglected"	3.48	1.14	
"No one seems to care about me"	3.69	1.23	

N = 132

Support for conventional law. The second measure, Support for Conventional Law (SCL), looked at the inmate's endorsement of both the justice system and the legal foundations of society. It is assumed that there is a relationship between the social integration of the inmate and their views on the legal system and structures in such a way that higher integration leads to support for the existing legal structures. This assumption is consistent with Hirschi's idea of belief in the normative structure of society as a suitable buffer against criminal behavior (1969).

Support for conventional law was measured by the criminal sentiments scale. The criminal sentiments scale was developed by Gendreau et al. (1979) to assess criminal attitudes in correctional samples. The original scale used 41 items to measure three subscales, (1) Law, Courts, and Police; (2) Tolerance for Law Violations; and (3) Identification with Criminal Others. Some support was found for using the criminal sentiments scale as a measure of recidivism prediction. The scale was shown to predict recidivism in sample of probationers and parolees (cited in Mills and Kroner, 1998). Other studies found the scale to successfully distinguish between the number of previous incarcerations and types of previous offenses.

Portions of the criminal sentiments scale were used in this study to form the dependent variable of SCL. In Kroner and Mills' (1998) validations several of the questions on the original scale were infrequently endorsed; thus reducing the overall set of questions. Questions for this study were representative of two factors found within the remaining survey items. The first factor is labeled contempt for criminal justice personnel and is composed of 13 items. The second factor, disrespect for conventional

law, was also composed of 13 items in the original instrument. Because of space limitations on the size of the current instrument, only portions of each factor were included. Items included were those that made conceptual sense and also those that had acceptable loadings on the factors in the original validations.

Inmates used 5 item Likert scales to indicate levels of agreement or disagreement with question items. Items were coded on a 5-point scale so that pro-social levels of SCL had high values. Table 5 presents the specific questions and descriptive statistics for the measure of SCL. Out of the sample of 132 inmates, 12 surveys were missing responses for some of the SCL subscales. None of these cases was missing over one-half of the subscale items. Mean substitution was used for these missing values; for each specific case with missing responses, the average value for the completed subscale items was substituted for the missing value in that particular case. In this fashion, the substituted means were a more accurate reflection of the characteristics of the individual, rather than being characteristics of the group.

Perceptions of treatment. The third variable looks at how positive and optimistic the inmate is regarding his immediate surroundings and further, it considers how he might be taking advantage of any rehabilitation options presented to him. This variable is consistent with the idea that desistance is associated with cognitive changes as well as using “hooks for change” to catalyze choices (Giordano et al., 2002).

Table 5

Descriptive Statistics for Support for Conventional Law and Scale Questions

Variable (Question)	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	alpha
Support for conventional law	34.33	7.34	.764
“People should obey the law, no matter what”	3.90	1.26	
“It is our duty to obey all laws”	4.07	1.20	
“There is never a cause for breaking the law”	3.35	1.28	
“The law does not benefit the common person”	3.32	1.36	
“A hungry person has the right to steal”	3.61	1.35	
“A cop is friend to people in need”	3.58	1.25	
“Sometimes a person has to break the law”	3.16	1.31	
“Most successful people break the law to get ahead”	3.35	1.33	
“It is alright to evade the law, if you don’t break it”	3.36	1.23	
“If they knew they would not get caught, most people would break the law”	2.57	1.33	
<hr/> <i>N</i> = 132			

Perceptions of treatment (PT) was measured by the Environmental Perceptions Scale (Stohr et al., 2002a; Stohr et al., 2002b). This scale was developed to better understand how inmates in substance abuse programming units view the various dimensions of their incarceration and treatment. Dimensions of treatment covered in the original survey included program content and delivery, perceptions of treatment leaders, perceptions of the therapeutic atmosphere, perceptions of communication, as well as the quality of services. The scale was found to be valid across several different correctional settings and institutions (Stohr et al., 2002a; Stohr et al., 2002b).

Empirical applications of the Environmental Perceptions Questionnaire show not all inmates experience and view programming in the same way. One of the most interesting findings to emerge was the fact that inmates with the most severe levels of criminal background were also those who valued the program the most (Stohr et al., 2002b); however this finding did not apply to drug users (Stohr et al., 2002a).

Included in the instrument for this project are several questions from the Environmental Perceptions Questionnaire. A limited set of the original items was chosen because of space limitations on the survey instrument. Items were chosen for their conceptual relevance. For the selected items, higher levels of program participation, higher levels of program content, better views of the jail environment and optimistic views on personal growth and change are all signs of inmates using their incarceration period as a “hook for change” (Giordano et al., 2002) and possible precursors to pro-social change.

Inmates used five-item Likert scales to indicate levels of agreement or disagreement with question items. Items were coded on a five-point scale so that healthy levels of PT had high values. Table 6 presents the specific questions and descriptive statistics for the measure of PT. Out of the sample of 132 inmates, 19 surveys were missing responses for some of the PT subscales. None of these cases was missing over one-half of the subscale items. Mean substitution was used for these missing values; for each specific case with missing responses, the average value for the completed subscale items was substituted for the missing value in that particular case. In this fashion, the substituted means were a more accurate reflection of the characteristics of the individual, rather than being characteristics of the group.

Table 6

Descriptive Statistics for Perceptions of Treatment and Scale Questions

Variable (Question)	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	alpha
Perceptions of treatment	23.27	5.01	.814
“This period of incarceration has generally been positive for me”	3.95	1.27	
“Since I have been incarcerated, my needs have been met”	3.35	1.23	
“Compared to other inmates, I participated more in treatment classes”	3.69	1.16	
“I have learned many useful things about myself as a result of this incarceration”	4.21	1.08	
“My incarceration has pointed out barriers I put up to avoid changing in a positive way”	4.09	1.11	
“Individuals who complete programming are more likely to avoid criminal thinking errors”	3.96	1.09	
<i>N</i> = 132			

RESULTS

Analytical Methods

A series of multiple regressions were performed in order to examine the effects of the control variables, the contact variables and the measures of emotional support on the dependent variables. First, the dependent variables were regressed on the control variables. Second, a series of models were constructed to test for the impact of the independent variables of interest on each dependent variable. Model 1 tested the effects of contact on outcomes. Model 2 examined the impact of emotional support on the dependent variables. Model 3 looked at the simultaneous effects of all variables on the specific dependent variable. Finally, Model 4 included a check of the effects of mean substitution on the other independent variables. Listwise deletion of cases resulted in 119 useable cases for all analyses.

Findings

Correlations

Table 7 presents the results of bivariate correlations between all variables. Of particular concern are the correlations between the dependent variables and the two independent variables of interest, contact, and emotional support. Support for conventional law was the only variable significantly correlated with contact from any of the three sources, significant others ($r = .236, p < .05$), family ($r = .207, p < .05$), and friends ($r = .296, p < .01$) were positively correlated with support for the law. Looking at the correlation between emotional support and the dependent variables, a clear pattern

Table 7

Correlations of Controls, Independent Variables, and Dependent Variables
(*N* = 119)

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
1. Age																
2. Education	.023															
3. Ethnicity (1=White)	.022	.185*														
4. Arrests	.280**	-.058	.192*													
5. Drugs (1=Drug Offense)	.000	.090	.000	-.156												
6. Incarceration Time	.005	-.075	-.120	.169	.078											
7. Married (1=Married)	.011	-.029	.032	-.077	.026	.101										
8. Parent (1=Parent)	-.321**	.073	-.007	-.135	.044	-.179	-.405**									
9. Sig Other Contact	.239**	-.031	.166	.259**	-.001	.039	-.039	-.252**								
10. Family Contact	.027	.059	.194*	.089	-.082	-.049	-.082	-.022	.438**							
11. Friend Contact	-.055	.076	.194*	.164	-.051	-.026	.016	.027	.297**	.395**						
12. ES Significant Other	-.132	.158	.060	.079	-.146	-.122	.104	-.066	-.059	-.047	.085					
13. ES Family	-.218*	.191*	-.033	-.031	-.034	-.009	.034	.168	-.040	-.041	.137	.537**				
14. ES Friends	-.253**	.088	.013	.014	-.064	-.055	-.135	.253**	-.201**	-.073	.063	.422**	.360*			
15. PWB	.184	.051	-.097	.154	.123	-.002	-.091	.020	-.145	-.034	-.056	.224*	.139	.146		
16. SCL	.067	.187*	.029	.100	.092	-.065	.079	-.052	.236**	.207*	.296**	.318**	.280**	.047	.325**	
17. EPT	-.086	.154	-.034	.153	-.131	.034	.008	.020	.084	.093	.171	.499	.393	.255**	.140	.463**

p* < .05, *p* < .01

emerged between the intimacy of the relationship and the dependent variables; the more intimate relationships were correlated with a greater number of outcomes. For example, while emotional support from significant other was significantly correlated with psychological well-being ($r = .224, p < .05$), support for conventional law ($r = .318, p < .01$), and perceptions of treatment ($r = .499, p < .01$), support from friends was only related with one outcome- perceptions of treatment ($r = .255, p < .01$). Family support was correlated to only two of the dependent variables, support for conventional law ($r = .280, p < .01$) and perceptions of treatment ($r = .393, p < .01$). All relationships between emotional supports and outcomes were in directions predicted by the hypotheses, higher levels of the former being associated with higher levels of the latter.

Control Variables

The control models were identically constructed, all control variables were entered simultaneously into regression equations for each of the dependent variables. Table 8 presents these findings. There were no significant predictor variables for psychological well-being. Education, however, emerged as a significant predictor for both support for conventional law and perceptions of treatment; an increase in education led to higher degrees of support for conventional law and to more optimistic perceptions of treatment. In addition, there was some evidence for the effect of criminal history on perceptions of treatment; the greater the number of arrests an inmate had, the more optimistic were their perceptions of the treatment environment.

Table 8

Regression of Psychological Well-Being, Support for Conventional Law, and Perceptions of Treatment on Control Variables (N = 119)

Variables	Dependent Variable		
	Psychological well-being	Support for conventional law	Perceptions of treatment
	b (SE)	b (SE)	b (SE)
Age	.107 (.070)	.008 (.084)	-.096 (.058)
Education	.266 (.393)	.971* (.474)	.721* (.327)
Ethnicity (White = 1)	-2.116 (1.354)	-.892 (1.636)	-1.289 (1.129)
Arrest number	.630 (.359)	.663 (.434)	.615* (.300)
Drug offense (Drug = 1)	1.880 (1.188)	1.617 (1.435)	-1.224 (.990)
Incarceration time	-.004 (.008)	-.011 (.010)	.000 (.007)
Married (Married = 1)	-.784 (1.581)	1.763 (1.910)	.187 (1.318)
Parent (Parent = 1)	.654 (1.325)	-.406 (1.601)	-.613 (1.104)
Constant	16.047** (3.860)	28.993** (4.663)	23.002** (3.218)
R ²	.097	.076	.098

* $p < .01$, ** $p < .05$

Hypothesis Tests

A series of multiple regression analyses were performed for each hypothesis. The hypotheses are presented below followed by the results of the corresponding analyses.

H1A: High levels of emotional support from wife/significant other will be positively associated with high levels of psychological well-being.

Based on the regression analysis, the research hypothesis is supported. Levels of emotional support predict levels of psychological well-being in the expected direction with higher levels of support being associated with healthier levels of psychological well-being. Table 9 presents these results. In addition, contact with significant other is a significant predictor, however direction of the relationship between contact and the dependent variable is negative; higher levels of contact are associated with lower levels of psychological well-being. These findings are consistent across all models for both of the independent variables of interest.

Age, arrest number, and drug offense are significantly related to psychological well-being as well. However, none of these variables has significant correlations with psychological well-being (Table 7). Considering r values, it appears that these variables are actually suppressing error variance found in the relationship between the contact variable and the dependent variable; contact was significantly correlated with age ($r = .239$) and arrest number ($r = .259$). It appears also that drug offenses are significant as a result of the variable's relationship with number of arrests ($r = -.156$).

While both contact from significant other and emotional support from significant other are significant predictors of psychological well-being, a comparison of the absolute

Table 9

*Regression of Psychological Well-Being on Contact, Emotional Support From Wife/**Significant Other, and Full Model (N = 119)*

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4
Variables	b (SE)	b (SE)	b (SE)	b (SE)
Control Variables				
Age	.124 [†] (.069)	.150* (.068)	.164* (.068)	.174* (.068)
Education	.229 (.386)	.039 (.385)	.014 (.379)	.016 (.376)
Ethnicity (White = 1)	-1.671 (1.342)	-2.025 (1.304)	-1.621 (1.295)	-1.826 (1.294)
Arrest number	.759* (.357)	.472 (.350)	.597 [†] (.349)	.641 [†] (.348)
Drug offense (Drug = 1)	2.002 [†] (1.166)	2.343* (1.153)	2.434* (1.134)	2.631* (1.134)
Incarceration time	-.004 (.008)	.000 (.008)	.000 (.008)	.001 (.008)
Married (Married = 1)	-1.255 (1.565)	-1.231 (1.529)	-1.642 (1.515)	-1.434 (1.512)
Parent (Parent = 1)	-.029 (1.333)	1.050 (1.282)	.407 (1.294)	.519 (1.288)
Contact w/Significant other	-.322* (.140)		-.295* (.135)	-.310* (.135)
ES Significant Other		.333** (.107)	.318** (.105)	.301** (.105)
Missing data				-1.995 (1.300)
Constant	18.481** (3.931)	10.058** (4.183)	12.561** (4.270)	12.534** (4.243)
R ²	.139 [†]	.171*	.206**	.223**

[†]p < .10, *p < .05, **p < .01

values for the standardized regression coefficients (β) when both were entered in the model, (contact $\beta = -.205$, emotional support $\beta = .277$), shows that the latter has a stronger effect on the dependent variable than the former.

H2A: High levels of emotional support from wife/significant other will be positively associated with high levels of support for conventional law.

Based on the regression analysis, the research hypothesis is supported. Levels of emotional support predict levels of support for conventional law in the expected direction with higher levels of support being associated with more endorsement for conventional law. Table 10 presents these results. In addition, high levels of contact are also associated with high levels of support for the law. These findings are consistent across all of the models. A comparison of the standardized regression coefficients for each (β) when both were entered into the model (contact $\beta = .271$, emotional support $\beta = .326$) shows that the latter have a stronger effect on the dependent variable than the former.

As for the covariates, education was significantly related to support for conventional law, however this relationship disappeared once the emotional support variable entered the equation. This finding reflects that there is some degree of shared variance between education and emotional support. Drug offense is significant as well, but again this is due to the high degree of correlation with the variable of contact with significant other.

Table 10

*Regression of Support for Conventional Law on Contact, Emotional Support**From Wife/Significant Other, and Full Model (N = 119)*

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4
Variables	b (SE)	b (SE)	b (SE)	b (SE)
Control Variables				
Age	-.015 (.083)	.063 (.082)	.041 (.080)	.056 (.079)
Education	1.021* (.463)	.682 (.463)	.720 (.448)	.723 (.442)
Ethnicity (White = 1)	-1.484 (1.613)	-.777 (1.568)	-1.413 (1.532)	-1.733 (1.518)
Arrest number	.491 (.429)	.462 (.421)	.264 (.412)	.333 (.408)
Drug offense (Drug = 1)	1.454 (1.402)	2.204 (1.386)	2.060 (1.342)	2.369* (1.331)
Incarceration time	-.011 (.010)	-.006 (.010)	-.005 (.009)	-.004 (.009)
Married (Married = 1)	2.389 (1.880)	1.197 (1.839)	1.845 (1.792)	2.170 (1.774)
Parent (Parent = 1)	.502 (1.602)	.097 (1.541)	1.113 (1.531)	1.289 (1.512)
Contact w/Significant other	.428* (.168)		.466** (.160)	.443** (.158)
ES Significant Other		.422** (.128)	.446** (.124)	.420** (.123)
Missing data				-3.118* (1.526)
Constant	25.755** (4.725)	21.395** (5.031)	17.445** (5.052)	17.403** (4.979)
R ²	.128*	.160*	.221	.250

* $p < .10$, ** $p < .05$, *** $p < .01$

Finally, even though the missing data variable in Model 4 was significant, a comparison with a model which included unsubstituted data (not shown) did not alter the significant predictor variables or their relationships with the dependent variable.

H3A: High levels of emotional support from wife/significant other will be positively associated with optimistic perceptions of treatment programming.

The research hypothesis is supported based on the evidence found in the regression analysis; levels of emotional support predict levels of perceptions of treatment in the expected direction. Those inmates with higher levels of perceived emotional support have more optimistic perceptions of treatment programming. The emotional support variable predicted a modest amount of variance in perceptions of treatment, 30.6% in Model 4. With regards to contact with significant other, levels of contact are not significant predictors of perceptions of treatment in any of the models. Table 11 presents these results.

While the control variables of age, education, and arrest number are significant predictors of perceptions of treatment in Model 1, these significant relationships disappear when the emotional support variable is entered into the equation. While the missing data indicator in Model 4 approached significance, a comparison with a model which included unsubstituted data (not shown) did not alter the significant predictor variables or their relationships with the dependent variable.

Table 11

*Regression of Perceptions of Treatment on Contact, Emotional Support From**Wife/Significant Other, and Full Model (N = 119)*

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4
Variables	b (SE)	b (SE)	b (SE)	b (SE)
Control Variables				
Age	-.103 [†] (.058)	-.038 (.053)	-.045 (.053)	-.036 (.052)
Education	.734* (.328)	.412 (.297)	.425 (.295)	.427 (.292)
Ethnicity (White = 1)	-1.448 (1.141)	-1.166 (1.004)	-1.376 (1.010)	-1.577 (1.002)
Arrest number	.569 [†] (.303)	.401 (.269)	.336 (.272)	.379 (.269)
Drug offense (Drug = 1)	-1.267 (.991)	-.597 (.888)	-.645 (.884)	-.451 (.879)
Incarceration time	.000 (.007)	.005 (.006)	.005 (.006)	.006 (.006)
Married (Married = 1)	.355 (1.330)	-.417 (1.178)	-.204 (1.181)	.000 (1.171)
Parent (Parent = 1)	-.370 (1.133)	-.077 (.988)	.258 (1.009)	.369 (.998)
Contact w/Significant other	.115 (.119)		.154 (.105)	.139 (.104)
ES Significant Other		.450** (.082)	.458** (.082)	.442** (.081)
Missing data				-1.958 [†] (1.007)
Constant	22.133** (3.342)	14.859** (3.223)	13.593** (3.329)	13.566** (3.287)
R ²	.106	.293**	.306**	.330**

[†]p < .10, *p < .05, **p < .01

H1B: High levels of emotional support from family will be positively associated with high levels of psychological well-being.

Based upon the results of the regression analysis the research hypothesis is tentatively supported. Table 12 presents these results. Levels of emotional support from family are marginally associated with psychological well-being in the expected directions; those with higher levels of support also have healthier levels of psychological well-being. The emotional support variable predicted just over 12% of the variance in psychological well-being. However, emotional support is only significant at the .10 level. As for contact with family, this variable was not a significant predictor of psychological well-being in any of the models.

Age, arrest number, and drug offenses emerged as significant predictors of psychological well-being. However, these variables seem to be following a similar pattern of suppression as was seen in the findings for Hypothesis 1A (above).

H2B: High levels of emotional support from family will be positively associated with high levels of support for conventional law.

Based on the regression analysis, the research hypothesis was supported. Levels of emotional support from family predict levels of support for conventional law in the expected direction with higher levels of support being associated with more endorsement for conventional law. Table 13 presents these results. In addition, high levels of contact with family are associated with high levels of support for the law; those inmates with greater levels of contact also have high degrees of support for the law. These findings are

Table 12

*Regression of Psychological Well-Being on Contact with Family, Emotional Support From Family,
and Full Model (N = 119)*

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4
Variables	b (SE)	b (SE)	b (SE)	b (SE)
Control Variables				
Age	.107 (.070)	.131 [†] (.070)	.131 [†] (.070)	.141* (.070)
Education	.270 (.395)	.106 (.397)	.109 (.400)	.107 (.397)
Ethnicity (White = 1)	-2.058 (1.381)	-1.905 (1.343)	-1.862 (1.369)	-2.098 (1.370)
Arrest number	.633 [†] (.361)	.584 (.356)	.587 (.358)	.619 [†] (.356)
Drug offense (Drug = 1)	1.859 (1.196)	1.998 [†] (1.176)	1.982 [†] (1.184)	2.201 [†] (1.186)
Incarceration time	-.004 (.008)	-.004 (.008)	-.004 (.008)	-.003 (.008)
Married (Married = 1)	-.822 (1.596)	-1.095 (1.572)	-1.122 (1.586)	-.897 (1.583)
Parent (Parent = 1)	.636 (1.333)	.331 (1.321)	.318 (1.329)	.499 (1.326)
Contact w/Family	-.038 (.158)		-.029 (.157)	-.029 (.156)
ES Family		.218 [†] (.116)	.217 [†] (.116)	.210 [†] (.116)
Missing data				-2.066 (1.356)
Constant	16.382** (4.117)	13.255** (4.093)	13.515** (4.350)	13.159** (4.329)
R ²	.098	.126 [†]	.126	.145 [†]

[†]p < .10, *p < .05, **p < .01

Table 13

Regression of Support for Conventional Law on Contact with Family, Emotional Support From

Family, and Full Model (N = 119)

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4
Variables	b (SE)	b (SE)	b (SE)	b (SE)
Control Variables				
Age	.010 (.083)	.055 (.083)	.057 (.081)	.076 (.079)
Education	.935* (.466)	.666 (.468)	.620 (.458)	.616 (.448)
Ethnicity (White = 1)	-1.549 (1.629)	-.491 (1.583)	-1.166 (1.569)	-1.588 (1.545)
Arrest number	.632 (.426)	.577 (.420)	.542 (.410)	.600 (.402)
Drug offense (Drug = 1)	1.852 (1.411)	1.842 (1.386)	2.093 (1.357)	2.485 [†] (1.337)
Incarceration time	-.010 (.010)	-.011 (.010)	-.011 (.009)	-.009 (.009)
Married (Married = 1)	2.186 (1.882)	1.173 (1.853)	1.598 (1.817)	2.000 (1.785)
Parent (Parent = 1)	-.202 (1.572)	-1.021 (1.557)	-.824 (1.522)	-.500 (1.495)
Contact w/Family	.432* (.187)		.451* (.179)	.451* (.175)
ES Family		.415** (.136)	.426** (.133)	.412** (.130)
Missing data				-3.700* (1.529)
Constant	25.210** (4.857)	23.686** (4.824)	19.595** (4.983)	18.956** (4.882)
R ²	.120	.149*	.196**	.237**

[†]p < .10, *p < .05, **p < .01

consistent across all of the models. A comparison of the standardized regression coefficients for each (β) when both were entered into the model (contact $\beta = .224$, emotional support $\beta = .293$) shows that the latter has a stronger effect on the dependent variable than the former.

Education has a significant relationship with support for conventional law, but this relationship disappeared once emotional support from family was entered into the relationship. An examination of the correlation between education and support for conventional law shows that the two are indeed significantly correlated ($r = .187$); higher levels of education are associated with more support for the law. However, education drops out of the regression analysis for statistical reasons, mainly due to the high correlation between education and emotional support from family ($r = .191$). These findings mean that even though education does contribute to levels of support, most of this contribution is shared with the contribution from emotional support from the family. The effects of education on the dependent variable, independent from any other variable, are insignificant.

H3B: High levels of emotional support from family will be positively associated with optimistic perceptions of treatment programming.

Based upon the results of regression analyses the research hypothesis is supported. Table 14 presents these results. The effects of emotional support from family are consistent across all models. Inmates with greater levels of perceived emotional support have more optimistic perceptions of treatment. Contact, on the other hand, is not a significant predictor of perceptions of treatment.

Table 14

Regression of Perceptions of Treatment on Contact with Family, Emotional Support From Family, and Full Model (N = 119)

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4
Variables	b (SE)	b (SE)	b (SE)	b (SE)
Control Variables				
Age	-.096 (.058)	-.055 (.055)	-.054 (.055)	-.042 (.054)
Education	.711* (.328)	.446 (.313)	.432 (.313)	.430 (.308)
Ethnicity (White = 1)	-1.468 (1.147)	-.928 (1.059)	-1.129 (1.074)	-1.403 (1.061)
Arrest number	.607* (.300)	.537* (.281)	.527* (.281)	.565* (.276)
Drug offense (Drug = 1)	-1.160 (.993)	-1.021 (.927)	-.947 (.929)	-.693 (.918)
Incarceration time	.000 (.007)	.000 (.007)	.000 (.006)	.001 (.006)
Married (Married = 1)	.302 (1.326)	-.345 (1.240)	-.218 (1.244)	.043 (1.226)
Parent (Parent = 1)	-.558 (1.107)	-1.167 (1.042)	-1.108 (1.042)	-.898 (1.027)
Contact w/Family	.117 (.131)		.134 (.123)	.134 (.120)
ES Family		.374** (.091)	.377** (.091)	.368** (.090)
Missing data				-2.398* (1.050)
Constant	21.973** (3.420)	18.224** (3.228)	17.005** (3.412)	16.592** (3.352)
R ²	.105	.218**	.227**	.263**

* $p < .10$, * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

Arrest number is also a significant predictor of perceptions of treatment; those inmates with more arrests have more optimistic perceptions of treatment. This finding is also consistent across all models. The two variables of arrest number and emotional support from the family together predicted just over 20% of the variance in perceptions of treatment. A comparison of the standardized regression coefficients for each (β) when both were entered into the model (arrest number $\beta = .178$, emotional support $\beta = .371$) shows that the latter had a stronger effect on the dependent variable than the former.

While the missing data indicator in Model 4 approached significance, a comparison with a model which included unsubstituted data (not shown) did not alter the significant predictor variables or their relationships with the dependent variable.

H1C: High levels of emotional support from friends will be positively associated with high levels of psychological well-being.

Based upon the results of regression analyses the research hypothesis is supported. Table 15 presents these results. The effects of emotional support from friends are consistent across all models. Inmates with greater levels of perceived emotional support from friends have healthier levels of psychological well-being. Contact, on the other hand, was not a significant predictor of psychological well-being. Between 12% and 13% of the variance in the dependent variable was explained by emotional support from friends.

As for the control variables, age, arrest number, and drug offenses emerged as significant predictor of psychological well-being. However, these variables are following a similar pattern of suppression as was seen in the findings for Hypothesis 1A (above).

Table 15

Regression of Psychological Well-Being on Contact With Friends, Emotional Support From Friends, and Full Model (N = 119)

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4
Variables	b (SE)	b (SE)	b (SE)	b (SE)
Control Variables				
Age	.103 (.070)	.137* (.070)	.133* (.071)	.141* (.071)
Education	.279 (.395)	.193 (.389)	.207 (.391)	.202 (.390)
Ethnicity (W=1)	-2.011 (1.372)	-2.064 (1.337)	-1.949 (1.354)	-2.184 (1.363)
Arrest number	.661* (.365)	.562 (.356)	.595 (.362)	.617 (.361)
Drug offense (D=1)	1.861 (1.192)	2.025* (1.174)	2.005 (1.178)	2.187* (1.184)
Incarceration time	-.004 (.008)	-.003 (.008)	-.003 (.008)	-.002 (.008)
Married (M=1)	-.751 (1.588)	-.636 (1.562)	-.598 (1.568)	-.443 (1.569)
Parent (P=1)	.671 (1.330)	.274 (1.322)	.290 (1.326)	.463 (1.329)
Contact w/Friends	-.074 (.137)		-.081 (.136)	-.054 (.137)
ES Friends		.227* (.115)	.229* (.115)	.207* (.116)
Missing data				-1.749 (1.384)
Constant	16.789** (4.113)	13.437** (4.031)	14.230** (4.258)	13.829** (4.258)
R ²	.100	.129*	.131	.144*

* $p < .10$, ** $p < .05$, *** $p < .01$

H2C: High levels of emotional support from friends will be positively associated with support for conventional law.

Based upon the results of the analysis the research hypothesis was not supported, Table 16 presents these results. Emotional support from friends was not a significant predictor of support for conventional law. On the other hand, contact with friends did predict levels of support for the law; this relationship was consistent across all of the models. Those with higher levels of contact with friends had higher levels of support.

Education had effects on the dependent variable just as in the other regressions using support for conventional law. These effects were independent of the effects of contact with friends; all variables in Model 3 predicted about 15% of the variance in the dependent variable. A comparison of the standardized regression coefficients for each (β) when both were entered into the model, (education $\beta = .171$, contact with friends $\beta = .288$), shows that the latter had a stronger effect on the dependent variable than the former.

While the missing data indicator in Model 4 was significant, a comparison with a model which included unsubstituted data (not shown) did not alter the significant predictor variables or their relationships with the dependent variable.

H3C: High levels of emotional support from friends will be positively associated with optimistic perceptions of treatment programming.

Based upon the results of regression analyses the research hypothesis is supported. Table 17 presents these results. The effects of emotional support from friends are consistent across all models. Inmates with greater levels of perceived emotional

Table 16

Regression of Support for Conventional Law on Contact With Friends, Emotional Support From Friends, and Full Model (N = 119)

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4
Variables	b (SE)	b (SE)	b (SE)	b (SE)
Control Variables				
Age	.033 (.081)	.020 (.086)	.042 (.083)	.063 (.081)
Education	.882 [†] (.457)	.944 [†] (.478)	.859 [†] (.461)	.847 [†] (.445)
Ethnicity (W=1)	-1.607 (1.588)	-.873 (1.641)	-1.587 (1.594)	-2.220 (1.553)
Arrest number	.448 (.423)	.638 (.438)	.427 (.426)	.485 (.412)
Drug offense (D=1)	1.746 (1.380)	1.671 (1.442)	1.792 (1.387)	2.281 [†] (1.349)
Incarceration time	-.010 (.010)	-.011 (.010)	-.010 (.010)	-.008 (.009)
Married (M=1)	1.532 (1.838)	1.818 (1.918)	1.581 (1.846)	1.999 (1.787)
Parent (P=1)	-.526 (1.539)	-.547 (1.622)	-.648 (1.561)	-.182 (1.514)
Contact w/Friends	.504** (.159)		.502** (.160)	.572** (.156)
ES Friends		.084 (.141)	.073 (.135)	.015 (.132)
Missing data				-4.712** (1.577)
Constant	23.912** (4.761)	28.025** (4.949)	23.092** (5.012)	22.014** (4.851)
R ²	.154*	.079	.156*	.221**

[†]p < .10, *p < .05, **p < .01

Table 17

*Regression of Perceptions of Treatment on Contact With Friends, Emotional Support From**Friends, and Full Model (N = 119)*

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4
Variables	b (SE)	b (SE)	b (SE)	b (SE)
Control Variables				
Age	-.088 (.058)	-.065 (.058)	-.058 (.058)	-.047 (.057)
Education	.691* (.326)	.646* (.322)	.618 [†] (.321)	.612 [†] (.314)
Ethnicity (W=1)	-1.530 (1.134)	-1.236 (1.104)	-1.467 (1.110)	-1.810 (1.099)
Arrest number	.543 [†] (.302)	.546 [†] (.294)	.477 (.297)	.509 [†] (.291)
Drug offense (D=1)	-1.180 (.985)	-1.076 (.970)	-1.037 (.965)	-.772 (.954)
Incarceration time	.000 (.007)	.000 (.007)	.001 (.007)	.002 (.007)
Married (M=1)	.109 (1.312)	.339 (1.291)	.262 (1.285)	.488 (1.265)
Parent (P=1)	-.654 (1.099)	-1.002 (1.092)	-1.035 (1.086)	-.783 (1.071)
Contact w/Friends	.169 (.114)		.162 (.111)	.200 [†] (.110)
ES Friends		.232* (.095)	.229* (.094)	.197* (.093)
Missing data				-2.548* (1.116)
Constant	21.294 (3.399)	20.332 (3.330)	18.735 (3.489)	18.152* (3.432)
R ²	.116	.145*	.162*	.201*

[†] $p < .10$, * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

support have more optimistic perceptions of treatment. Contact with friends, on the other hand, is not a significant predictor of perceptions of treatment.

Both education and arrest number are significant predictors of perceptions of treatment across all models, independent of the effects of other variables. Those inmates with higher levels of education have more optimistic perceptions of treatment while those inmates with more arrests also have more optimistic perceptions of treatment. A comparison of the standardized regression coefficients (β) for all independent variables when all were entered into the model, (education $\beta = .178$, arrest number $\beta = .371$, emotional support from friends $\beta = .228$), shows that emotional support has the strongest effect on the dependent variable. All together, about 15% of the variance in the dependent variable is explained by the predictors. Finally, the model with unsubstituted data did not have emotional support from friends as a significant predictor of perceptions of treatment.

CONCLUSION

This thesis looked at the effects of social ties on inmate attitudes in a local jail. The general research question asked if social forces from outside of the jail could penetrate into the institution to affect the perspectives of inmates. The narrower research issues looked at how both emotional support from the relationships as well as contact with those on the outside influenced attitudes. Emotional support and contact were considered with regards to specific sources, these sources were the significant others, family, and friends of the inmates.

This thesis was based on social control theory and the informal social control approach to offender change. In general, the findings of this research were consistent with the predictions of the theoretical approaches; there were associations between how the inmates perceived their relationships and the quality of their attitudes. In addition, there were associations between the frequency of contact and perceptions.

Informal social control theory predicted that “good quality ties” would predict outcomes. This was supported by the results; emotional support was a more consistent predictor of attitude than the measure of contact. In only two analytical tests was emotional support not clearly related to a specific outcome. Emotional support from family was only marginally related to psychological well-being. There was no relationship between emotional support from friends and support for conventional law. On the other hand, contact with others was even less consistent in its relationship with outcomes; it was not related to perceptions of treatment at all, and neither contact with family nor contact with friends had any relationship with psychological well-being. In

addition, contact with intimate others was negatively related to psychological well-being; those inmates with greater levels of contact with their significant others were more psychologically distressed than those without.

Work in the informal social control tradition also predicted that relationship status matters, that protective social ties are more salient for married offenders rather than for those inmates who are merely in relationships. However, the evidence found in this study does not support such a claim. In this sample there was no direct effect of marital status on outcomes. Of course this finding might be unique to the characteristics of the specific sample rather than the general population.

There are some implications for offender rehabilitation that follow from the evidence uncovered in this study. First, this study reinforces the idea that inmates continue to be influenced by social forces from outside the walls of the institution. The effects of perceived emotional support were always independent of any level of contact with the sources of emotional support. This study supports the idea that correctional institutions do not cut the inmate off from society, but rather that the inmate continues to be influenced by forces operating outside of the institutional walls. A second implication follows, insofar as attitude and relationships are linked, as this study has shown, successful rehabilitation should look at the position of the individual within their relationships and use these relationships to support the rehabilitative process.

There were several limitations to this study. First, because all of the data was taken from one institution, care should be taken when generalizing these results to different settings. This is even more important when comparing these results to prisons,

which will differ qualitatively from jails. This concern is important considering the characteristics of the sample as well; the data came from offenders who were mainly incarcerated for drug offenses. It is not known how well these findings might describe samples with different criminal backgrounds. One method to mitigate against both of these concerns is to conduct similar research across a variety of institutional settings and increasing the variability in the sample as much as possible.

Despite the rather consistent relationships that were found between emotional support and the outcomes, there was still much variation in the dependent variables that was unexplained in the analyses. Future research should explore other factors that have effects on the attitudes of inmates.

In addition, future work should attempt to use official records of not only criminal background but also institutional indicators of behavior and misbehavior. Further, future research should work to clarify the relationships between the independent variables of interest. For example, it could be the case that contact and emotional support interact with each other in influencing attitude. Likewise, when inmates consider support from family, it is not clear if they were perceiving support from family of birth or family of marriage. In addition, although the impact of children on outcomes was addressed, the effect of parenting roles was not developed in this research.

Finally, issues of causality should be addressed. This study was based on a cross-sectional research design. While several claims about association between the variables were made, no claims can be made about the ordering of the relationships between the dependent and independent variables. To mitigate this issue future work should be built

on longitudinal research designs which track change in behavior, and any associations with other variables, over time.

The importance of informal social controls in the desistance process has been forwarded in the course of a large body of work. This thesis has extended the ideas of informal social controls into the context of the correctional institution. While this thesis found evidence supporting the main arguments of the theory, this study also found evidence which raises important questions for future research on the effects of social relationships on offender change.

REFERENCES

- Alarid, L. F., Burton, V. S. J., & Cullen, F. T. (2000). Gender and Crime Among Felony Offenders: Assessing the Generality of Social Control and Differential Association Theories. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 37(2), 171-199.
- Albonetti, C. A., & Hepburn, J. R. (1997). Probation Revocation: A Proportional Hazards Model of the Conditioning Effects of Social Disadvantage. *Social Problems*, 44(1), 124-137.
- California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation. (2006). *Recidivism Rates*. Retrieved July 15, 2006, from <http://www.corr.ca.gov/ReportsResearch/OffenderInfoServices/Annual/RECID2/RECID2d2003.pdf>
- Clemmer, D. (1958). *The Prison Community*. New York: Rinehart & Company, Inc.
- Dillulio, J. J. (1987). *Governing Prisons*. New York: Free Press.
- Einstadter, W., & Henry, S. (1995). *Criminological Theory: An Analysis of Its Underlying Assumptions*. Fort Worth, TX: Harcourt Brace College Publishers.
- Gillespie, W. (2003). *Prisonization: Individual and Institutional Factors Affecting Inmate Conduct*. New York: LFB Scholarly Publishing.
- Giordano, P. C., Cernkovich, S. A., & Rudolph, J. L. (2002). Gender, Crime, and Desistance: Toward a Theory of Cognitive Transformation. *American Journal of Sociology*, 107(4), 990-1064.
- Glaser, D. (1977). *The Effectiveness of a Prison and Parole System*. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill.
- Gray, M. K., Fields, M., & Maxwell, S. R. (2001). Examining Probation Violations: Who, What, and When. *Crime & Delinquency*, 47(4), 537-557.
- Harer, M. D. (1994). *Recidivism Among Federal Prisoners*. Washington D.C.: Federal Bureau of Prisons.
- Hepburn, J. R., & Griffin, M. L. (2004). The Effect of Social Bonds on Successful Adjustment to Probation: An Event History Analysis. *Criminal Justice Review*, 29(1), 46-75.
- Hirschi, T. (1969). *Causes of Delinquency*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

- Horney, J., Osgood, D. W., & Marshall, I. H. (1995). Criminal Careers in the Short-Term: Intra-Individual Variability in Crime and its Relation to Local Life Circumstances. *American Sociological Review*, 60, 655-673.
- Hunt, G., Riegel, S., Morales, T., & Waldorf, D. (1993). Changes in Prison Culture: Prison Gangs and the Case of the "Pepsi Generation". *Social Problems*, 40(3), 398-405.
- Irwin, J. (1980). *Prisons in Turmoil*. Boston: Little, Brown and Company.
- Irwin, J. (2005). *The Warehouse Prison: Disposal of the New Dangerous Class*. Los Angeles: Roxbury.
- Irwin, J., & Cressey, D. R. (1962). Thieves, Convicts and the Inmate Culture. *Social Problems*, 10(2), 142-155.
- Johnson, R. (1987). *Hard Time: Understanding and Reforming the Prison*. Pacific Grove: Brooks/Cole.
- Kempf, K. L. (1993). The Empirical Status of Hirschi's Control Theory. In F. Adler & W. S. Laufer (Eds.), *New Directions in Criminological Theory*. New Brunswick: Transaction.
- Lackey, C. (2003). Violent Family Heritage, the Transition to Adulthood, and Later Partner Violence. *Journal of Family Issues*, 24(1), 74-98.
- Lackey, C., & Williams, K. R. (1995). Social Bonding and the Cessation of Partner Violence Across Generations. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 57, 295-305.
- Laub, J. H., Nagin, D. S., & Sampson, R. J. (1998). Trajectories of Change in Criminal Offending: Good Marriages and the Desistance Process. *American Sociological Review*, 63(2), 225-238.
- Laub, J. H., & Sampson, R. J. (2003). *Shared Beginnings, Divergent Lives: Delinquent Boys to Age 70*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Lilly, J. R., Cullen, F. T., & Ball, R. A. (1995). *Criminological Theory: Contexts and Consequences*. Thousand Oaks, California: SAGE.
- Lindquist, C. (2000). Social Integration and Mental Well-Being Among Jail Inmates. *Sociological Forum*, 15(3), 431-455.

- Lindquist, C. A., Smusz, T. D., & Doerner, W. (1985). Causes of Conformity: An Application of Control Theory to Adult Misdemeanant Probationers. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 29(1), 1-13.
- Lynch, J. P., & Sabol, W. J. (2001). *Prisoner Re-Entry in Perspective*. Washington D.C.: Urban Institute.
- MacKenzie, D. L. (1987). Age and Adjustment to Prison: Interactions with Attitudes and Anxiety. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 14(4), 427-447.
- MacKenzie, D. L., & Li, S. D. (2002). The Impact of Formal and Informal Social Controls on the Criminal Activities of Probationers. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 39(3), 243-276.
- Matsueda, R. (1992). Reflected Appraisals, Parental Labeling, and Delinquency: Specifying a Symbolic Interactionist Theory. *American Journal of Sociology*, 97(6), 1577-1611.
- McShane, M., & Williams, F. P. I. (1989). Old and Ornerly: The Disciplinary Experiences of Elderly Prisoners. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*.
- Minor, K. I., Wells, J. B., & Sims, C. (2003). Recidivism Among Federal Probationers: Predicting Sentence Violations. *Federal Probation*, 67(1), 31-36.
- Morgan, K. D. (1994). Factors Associated With Probation Outcome. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 22(4), 341-353.
- Newcomb, M. D., & Bentler, P. M. (1988). Impact of Adolescent Drug Use and Social Support on Problems of Young Adults: A Longitudinal Study. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 97(1), 64-75.
- Petersilia, J. (2003). *When Prisoners Come Home*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Petersilia, J. (2004). What Works in Prisoner Reentry? *Federal Probation*, 68(2), 4-7.
- Reckless, W. C. (1961). A New Theory of Delinquency and Crime. *Federal Probation*, 25, 42-46.
- Reiss, A. J. J. (1951). Delinquency as the Failure of Personal and Social Controls. *American Sociological Review*, 16(2), 196-207.

- Roundtree, G. A., Edwards, D. W., & Parker, J. B. (1984). A Study of the Personal Characteristics of Probationers as Related to Recidivism. *Journal of Offender Counseling, Services & Rehabilitation*, 8(3), 53-61.
- Sampson, R. J. (2001). How Do Communities Undergird or Undermine Human Development? In A. Booth & A. Crouter (Eds.), *Does It Take a Village? Community Effects on Children, Adolescents and Families* (pp. 3-30). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Sampson, R. J., & Laub, J. H. (1990). Crime and Deviance Over the Life Course: The Salience of Adult Social Bonds. *American Sociological Review*, 55, 609-627.
- Sampson, R. J., & Laub, J. H. (1993). *Crime in the Making: Pathways and Turning Points Through Life*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- Shoemaker, D. (2005). *Theories of Delinquency* (Fifth Edition ed.). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Stack, S., Wasserman, I., & Kern, R. (2004). Adult Social Bonds and Use of Internet Pornography. *Social Science Quarterly*, 85(1), 75-88.
- Toch, H. (1992). *Living in Prison: The Ecology of Survival* (Revised Edition ed.). Washington D.C.: American Psychological Association.
- United States Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics. (2003). *Reentry Trends in the U.S.* Retrieved July 15, 2001, from <http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/bjs/pub/pdf/reentry.pdf>
- Visher, C., & Farrell, J. (2005). *Chicago Communities and Prisoner Reentry*. Washington D.C.: Urban Institute.
- Vold, G. B., Bernard, T. J., & Snipes, J. B. (2002). *Theoretical Criminology*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Whitehead, J. T. (1991). The Effectiveness of Felony Probation: Results From an Eastern State. *Justice Quarterly*, 8(4), 525-543.
- Williams, F. P. I., & McShane, M. (1994). *Criminological Theory* (2nd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
- Williams, K. R., & Hawkins, R. (1989). Controlling Male Aggression in Intimate Relationships. *Law & Society Review*, 23(4), 591-612.

Zamble, E., & Porporino, F. J. (1988). *Coping, Behavior and Adaptation in Prison Inmates*. New York: Springer-Verlag.

APPENDIX A: HUMAN SUBJECTS APPROVAL

San José State
UNIVERSITY

**Office of the Provost
Associate Vice President
Graduate Studies & Research**

One Washington Square
San José, CA 95192-0025
Voice: 408-924-2427
Fax: 408-924-2477

E-mail: gradstudies@sjsu.edu
<http://www.sjsu.edu>

To: Matthew Boswell
1778 Davis Street #6
San Jose, CA 95126

From: Pam Stacks *Pam Stacks*
AVP, Graduate Studies & Research

Date: December 22, 2005

The Human Subjects-Institutional Review Board has approved your request to use human subjects in the study entitled:

"The Effects of Informal Social Controls on Incarcerated Offenders."

This approval is contingent upon the subjects participating in your research project being appropriately protected from risk. This includes the protection of the anonymity of the subjects' identity when they participate in your research project, and with regard to all data that may be collected from the subjects. The approval includes continued monitoring of your research by the Board to assure that the subjects are being adequately and properly protected from such risks. If at any time a subject becomes injured or complains of injury, you must notify Pam Stacks, Ph.D. immediately. Injury includes but is not limited to bodily harm, psychological trauma, and release of potentially damaging personal information. This approval for the human subjects portion of your project is in effect for one year, and data collection beyond December 22, 2006 requires an extension request.

Please also be advised that all subjects need to be fully informed and aware that their participation in your research project is voluntary, and that he or she may withdraw from the project at any time. Further, a subject's participation, refusal to participate, or withdrawal will not affect any services that the subject is receiving or will receive at the institution in which the research is being conducted.

If you have any questions, please contact me at (408) 924-2480.

Cc: James Lee

The California State University:
Chancellor's Office
Bakersfield, Channel Islands, Chico,
Dominguez Hills, East Bay, Fresno,
Fullerton, Humboldt, Long Beach,
Los Angeles, Maritime Academy,
Monterey Bay, Northridge, Pomona,
Sacramento, San Bernardino, San Diego,
San Francisco, San José, San Luis Obispo,
San Marcos, Sonoma, Stanislaus

APPENDIX B: CONSENT FORM, ENGLISH

Department of Sociology
College of Social Sciences
One Washington Square
San José, CA 95192-0122
Voice: 408-924-5320
Fax: 408-924-5322
E-mail: socio@email.sjsu.edu

Agreement to Participate in Research

Responsible Investigators: Matthew Boswell
Title of Protocol: The Effects of Informal Social Controls on Incarcerated Inmates

1. The purpose of this research project is to examine some of your background characteristics along with certain attitudes and opinions about yourself and the world around you. There are no "right" or "wrong" answers in this survey. Please answer as truthfully as you can. This research project is also being conducted in order for me to complete my masters degree at the Department of Sociology at San Jose State University.
2. You will be asked to complete a self-administered survey. This survey will be distributed to you during your class periods.
3. Participation in this projects carries the risk of loss of privacy and the risk of emotional discomfort. The risk of privacy loss will be mitigated by the use of **anonymous surveys** to protect individual identities. The risk of emotional discomfort comes from the sensitive nature of some of the questions regarding family background and activities. As a participant, you may elect to stop the process at any time.
4. There are no direct benefits coming from participation in this project.
5. Although the results of this survey may be published, no information that could identify you will be included.
6. There will be no compensation from the researcher for participation in this project.
7. Questions about this research project may be addressed to Matthew Boswell (408) 296-5774. Complaints about the research may be presented to Yoko Baba, PhD., Chair, Sociology, San Jose State University (408) 924-5320. Questions about research subjects' rights or research-related injury may be presented to Pamela Stacks, PhD., Associate Vice President, Graduate Studies and Research, San Jose State University, at (408) 924-2480.
8. No service of any kind, to which you are otherwise entitled, will be lost or jeopardized if you choose to "not participate" in the study.
9. Your consent is being given voluntarily. You may refuse to participate in the entire study of any part of the study. If you decide to participate in the study, you are free to withdraw at any time without any negative effect on your relations with Santa Clara County Department of Corrections or with any other participating institutions or agencies.
10. At the time you sign this consent form, you will receive a copy of it for your records, signed and dated by the investigator.

The signature of a participant on this document indicates agreement to participate in the study.

The signature of a researcher on this document indicates agreement to include the above named subject in the research and attestation that the subject has been fully informed of his or her rights.

The California State University:
Chancellor's Office
Bakersfield, Channel Islands, Chico,
Dominate Hills, Fresno, Fullerton,
Hayward, Humboldt, Long Beach,
Los Angeles, Maritime Academy,
Monterey Bay, Northridge, Pomona,
Sacramento, San Bernardino, San Diego,
San Francisco, San Jose, San Luis Obispo,
San Marcos, Sonoma, Stanislaus

Signature _____ Date _____

Investigator's signature _____ Date _____

APPENDIX C: CONSENT FORM SPANISH

**San José State
UNIVERSITY**

**Department of Sociology
College of Social Sciences**

One Washington Square
San Jose, CA 95192-0122
Voice: 408-924-5320
Fax: 408-924-5322
E-mail: socio@mail.sjsu.edu

Acuerdo para Participar en Investigación

Investigadores responsables: Matthew Boswell

Título de Protocolo: Los Efectos de Controles Sociales Informales sobre Presos Encarcelados

1. El propósito de este proyecto es para examinar algunos de sus características fondos junto con ciertas actitudes y opiniones acerca de usted mismo y acerca del mundo alrededor de usted. No hay respuestas "correctas" o "incorrectas" en esta inspección. Por favor de contestar lo mas verdaderamente posible. Este proyecto de investigación se lleva a cabo también para que yo pueda completar mi máster en el Departamento de la Sociología en la Universidad de San Jose.
2. Usted será pedido que complete una inspección auto administrada. Esta inspección será distribuida a usted durante sus periodos de clase.
3. La participación en este proyecto lleva el riesgo de la pérdida de la privacidad y el riesgo de la molestia emocional. El riesgo de la pérdida de la privacidad será mitigado por el uso de inspecciones anónimas para proteger las identidades individuales. El riesgo de la molestia emocional viene de la naturaleza sensible de algunos de las preguntas con respecto al fondo de la familia y actividades. Como un participante, usted puede elegir a parar el proceso en cualquier tiempo.
4. No hay beneficios directos que vienen de la participación en este proyecto.
5. Aunque los resultados de esta inspección se puedan publicar, ninguna información que podría identificarlo se incluirá.
6. No habrá compensación del investigador para la participación en este proyecto.
7. Las preguntas acerca de este proyecto de investigación pueden ser dirigidas a Matthew Boswell (408) 296-5774. Las quejas acerca de la investigación pueden ser presentadas a Yoko Baba, PhD., Chair, Sociology, San Jose State University (408) 924-5320. Preguntas acerca de los derechos de sujetos o relacionadas a encuestas de investigación pueden ser presentada a Pamela Stacks, PhD., Associate Vice President, Graduate Studies and Research, San Jose State University, at (408) 924-2480.
8. Ningún servicio de cualquier tipo, a que usted de otro modo es permitido, será perdido o será arriesgado si usted escoge a "no participa" en el estudio.
9. Su consentimiento se da voluntariamente. Usted puede negarse a participar en el estudio entero de cualquier parte del estudio. Si usted decide tomar parte en el estudio, usted es libre para retirarse a cualquier tiempo sin algún efecto negativo en sus relaciones con el Departamento de Condado de Santa Clara de Correcciones o con cualquier otras instituciones que participan o las agencias.
10. En el tiempo que usted firma esta forma del consentimiento, usted recibirá una copia de ello para sus registros, firmado y fechado por el investigador.

La firma de un participante en este documento indica el acuerdo para tomar parte en el estudio.

La firma de un investigador en este documento indica el acuerdo para incluir al sujeto denominado encima en la investigación y la confirmación que el sujeto se ha informado completamente de sus derechos.

The California State University:
Chancellor's Office
Bakersfield, Calumet Islands, Chico,
Conquistador Hills, Fresno, Fullerton,
Hayward, Humboldt, Long Beach,
Los Angeles, Maritime Academy,
Monterey Bay, Northridge, Pomona,
Sacramento, San Bernardino, San Diego,
San Francisco, San Jose, San Luis Obispo,
San Marcos, Sonoma, Stanislaus

Firma	Fecha
<hr/>	
Firma del investigador	Fecha
<hr/>	

APPENDIX D: SURVEY, ENGLISH

1. What is your age? _____
2. How long have you been in programming? _____
3. How long have you been incarcerated THIS TIME? _____

4. Are you (CIRCLE the ONE that best describes you)
a. First Marriage e. Single, never married
b. Remarried f. Living with partner
c. Divorced g. Widowed
d. Married but separated

5. 6 months prior to your current arrest you were:
a. First Marriage e. Single, never married
b. Remarried f. Living with partner
c. Divorced g. Widowed
d. Married but separated

6. Amount of education (please CIRCLE the highest grade COMPLETED)
a. 8 years or less e. Some college or technical school
b. Less than High School f. Associate's Degree (AA)
c. High School Graduate(no GED) g. Bachelor's Degree (BA/BS)
d. GED (not high School Graduate) h. Master's Degree or higher

7. What was THIS ARREST for? (select ONE)
a. Crime against person, no theft (violence, assault, DV, etc.)
b. Crime against a person (Theft, etc.)
c. Property Crime (Burglary etc.)
d. Drugs or Alcohol (Use, Sale, Possession, DUI/DWI, etc)
e. Other

8. INCLUDING THIS ARREST, how many times have you been arrested?

1 2 3 4 5 6 or more

9. What is your RACE/ETHNIC group?
a. White
b. Black (African-American)
c. Asian
d. Hispanic/Latino
e. American Indian
f. Other

10. Do you have a child or children?
Yes No

USING THE CHOICES GIVEN, PLEASE CIRCLE THE ANSWER THAT DESCRIBES YOUR SITUATION

1 = Strongly Disagree (SD) 2 = Disagree (D) 3 = Neutral (N) 4 = Agree (A) 5 = Strongly Agree (SA) 6 = N/A

	SD	D	N	A	SA	N/A
11. There is a special person who is around when I am in need	1	2	3	4	5	6
12. There is a special person with whom I can share my joys and sorrows	1	2	3	4	5	6
13. My family really tries to help me	1	2	3	4	5	6
14. I get the emotional help and support I need from my family	1	2	3	4	5	6
15. I can count on my friends when things go wrong	1	2	3	4	5	6
16. I can talk about my problems with my family	1	2	3	4	5	6
17. I have friends with whom I can share my joys and sorrows	1	2	3	4	5	6
18. There is a special person in my life who cares about my feelings	1	2	3	4	5	6
19. My family is willing to help me make decisions	1	2	3	4	5	6
20. I can talk about my problems with my friends	1	2	3	4	5	6
21. My friends really try to help me	1	2	3	4	5	6
22. I have a special person who is a real source of comfort to me	1	2	3	4	5	6

USING THE CHOICES GIVEN ON THE RIGHT, PLEASE ANSWER THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS ABOUT THE TIME SINCE YOU HAVE BEEN INCARCERATED:

1 = Very Often 2 = Often 3 = Sometimes 4 = Seldom 5 = Never 6 = N/A

	V	O	S	M	N	N/A
23. My spouse/partner has visited me	1	2	3	4	5	6
24. My spouse/partner has written me	1	2	3	4	5	6
25. I have had telephone conversations with my spouse/partner	1	2	3	4	5	6
26. I enjoy communicating with my spouse/partner	1	2	3	4	5	6

1 = Very Often 2 = Often 3 = Sometimes 4 = Seldom 5 = Never 6 = N/A

	V	O	S	M	N	N/A
27. My kid(s) have visited me	1	2	3	4	5	6
28. My kid(s) have written me	1	2	3	4	5	6
29. I have telephone conversations with my kid(s)	1	2	3	4	5	6
30. I enjoy communicating with my kid(s)	1	2	3	4	5	6
31. My family has visited me	1	2	3	4	5	6
32. My family has written me	1	2	3	4	5	6

	V	O	S	M	N	N/A
33. I have telephone conversations with my family	1	2	3	4	5	6
34. I enjoy communicating with my family	1	2	3	4	5	6
35. My friends have visited me	1	2	3	4	5	6
36. My friends have written me	1	2	3	4	5	6
37. I have telephone conversations with my friends	1	2	3	4	5	6
38. I enjoy communicating with my friends	1	2	3	4	5	6

USING THE CHOICES GIVEN, PLEASE CIRCLE YOUR OPINION OF THE FOLLOWING STATEMENTS:

1 = Strongly Disagree (SD) 2 = Disagree (D) 3 = Neutral (N) 4 = Agree (A) 5 = Strongly Agree (SA)

	SD	D	N	A	SA
39. This period of incarceration has generally been positive for me	1	2	3	4	5
40. Since I have been incarcerated, my needs have been met	1	2	3	4	5
41. It is hard for me to relate to others	1	2	3	4	5
42. I often feel depressed	1	2	3	4	5
43. I feel angry at the people around me quite often	1	2	3	4	5

	SD	D	N	A	SA
44. I have problems dealing with stress	1	2	3	4	5
45. I often feel tense	1	2	3	4	5
46. I often feel neglected	1	2	3	4	5
47. No one seems to care about me	1	2	3	4	5
48. People should obey the law, no matter what	1	2	3	4	5

	SD	D	N	A	SA
49. It is our duty to obey all laws	1	2	3	4	5
50. There is never a cause for breaking the law	1	2	3	4	5
51. The law does not benefit the common person	1	2	3	4	5
52. A hungry person has the right to steal	1	2	3	4	5
53. A cop is a friend to people in need	1	2	3	4	5

	SD	D	N	A	SA
54. Compared to other inmates, I participated more in treatment classes	1	2	3	4	5
55. I have learned many useful things about myself as a result of this incarceration	1	2	3	4	5
56. My incarceration has pointed out barriers I put up to avoid changing in a positive way	1	2	3	4	5
57. Individuals who complete programming are more likely to avoid criminal thinking errors	1	2	3	4	5

	SD	D	N	A	SA
58. Sometimes a person has to break the law	1	2	3	4	5
59. Most successful people break the law to get ahead	1	2	3	4	5
60. It is alright to evade the law, if you don't break it	1	2	3	4	5
61. If they knew they would not get caught, most people would break the law	1	2	3	4	5

APPENDIX E: SURVEY, SPANISH

1. ¿Que es su edad? _____
2. ¿Cuanto tiempo usted ha consistido en la programación? _____
3. ¿Cuanto tiempo ha estado usted encarcelado? _____

4. Es usted (indique UNO que le describe lo más MEJOR)
 - a. Primer matrimonio
 - b. Volvió a casarse
 - c. Divorciado
 - d. Casado pero separado
 - e. Soltero, nunca se caso
 - f. Viviendo con pareja
 - g. Viudo

5. 6 meses antes de su detención usted era:
 - d. Primer matrimonio
 - e. Soltero, nunca se caso
 - f. Volvió a casarse
 - g. Viviendo con pareja
 - f. Divorciado
 - g. Viudo
 - d. Casado pero separado

7. ¿Para que era ESTA DETENCIÓN? (Escoja UNO)
 - a. Crimen contra persona, ningún robo (violencia, asalto, violencia doméstica, etc.)
 - b. Crimen contra persona, robo
 - c. Crimen de Propiedad (robo etc.)
 - d. Drogas o alcohol (Uso, Venta, Posesión, Conducir bajo influencia/DWI)
 - e. Otro

8. INCLUYENDO ESTA DETENCIÓN, ¿cuántas veces lo han arrestado?

1 2 3 4 5 6 o mas

9. ¿Usted tiene un niño o niños?

Si No

6. Cantidad de educación (indique por favor la respuesta que mejor describe el grado más alto TERMINADO)
 - g. 8 años o menos
 - h. Menos que secundaria
 - i. Graduado De la Secundaria (no GED)
 - d. GED (no Graduado De la Secundaria)
 - e. Cierta universidad o grado técnico
 - f. Grado de Asociados
 - g. Licenciatura
 - h. Grado de Mastría o más arriba

Usando las opciones dadas, circunde por favor su opinión de las declaraciones siguientes:

1 = No Coincidir Fuertemente	4 = Coincidir
2 = No Coincidir	5 = Coincidir Fuertemente
3 = Neutro	6 = N/A

11. Hay una persona especial que esta alrededor cuando estoy en necesidad	1 2 3 4 5	N/A
12. Hay una persona especial con quien puedo compartir mis alegrías y dolor	1 2 3 4 5	6
13. Mi familia realmente intenta ayudarme	1 2 3 4 5	6
14. Consigo la ayuda emocional y apoyo que necesito de mi familia	1 2 3 4 5	6
15. Puedo contar con mis amigos cuando las cosas van mal	1 2 3 4 5	6
16. Puedo hablar acerca mis problemas con mi familia	1 2 3 4 5	6
17. Tengo amigos con quienes puedo compartir mis alegrías y penas	1 2 3 4 5	6
18. Hay una persona especial en mi vida que tiene interes en mis sentimientos	1 2 3 4 5	6
19. Mi familia está dispuesta a ayudarme a tomar decisions	1 2 3 4 5	6
20. Puedo hablar de mis problemas con mis amigos	1 2 3 4 5	6
21. Mi amigos intentan realmente ayudarme	1 2 3 4 5	6
22. Tengo una persona especial que es una fuente verdadera de la comodidad a mi	1 2 3 4 5	6

Usando las opciones dadas a la derecha, por favor de contestar las siguientes preguntas sobre el tiempo desde que usted estuvo encarcelado:

1 = Muy A Menudo	2 = A Menudo	3 = A Veces	4 = Raramente	5 = Nunca	6 = N/A

23. Mi cónyuga/pareja me ha visitado	1 2 3 4 5	N/A
24. Mi cónyuga/pareja me ha escrito	1 2 3 4 5	6
25. He tenido conversaciones por teléfono con mi cónyuga/pareja	1 2 3 4 5	6
26. Gozo comunicar con mi cónyuga/pareja	1 2 3 4 5	6

1 = Muy A Menudo 2 = A Menudo 3 = A Veces 4 = Raramente 5 = Nunca 6 = N/A						N/A
27. Mi niño(s) me ha visitado	1	2	3	4	5	6
28. Mi niño(s) me ha escrito	1	2	3	4	5	6
29. He tenido conversaciones por teléfono con mi niño(s)	1	2	3	4	5	6
30. Gozo comunicar con mi niño(s)	1	2	3	4	5	6
31. Mi familia me ha visitado	1	2	3	4	5	6
32. Mi familia me ha escrito	1	2	3	4	5	6
33. He tenido conversaciones por teléfono con mi familia	1	2	3	4	5	6
34. Gozo comunicar con mi familia	1	2	3	4	5	6
35. Mis amigos me han visitado	1	2	3	4	5	6
36. Mis amigos me han escrito	1	2	3	4	5	6
37. He tenido conversaciones por teléfono con mis amigos	1	2	3	4	5	6
38. Gozo comunicar con mis amigos	1	2	3	4	5	6

Usando las opciones dadas, circunde por favor su opinion de las declaraciones siguientes:

1 = No Coincidir Fuertemente	4 = Coincidir
2 = No Coincidir	5 = Coincidir Fuertemente
3 = Neutro	6 = N/A
39. Este periodo del encarcelamiento ha sido generalmente positivo	1 2 3 4 5
40. Desde que estado encarcelado, se han satisfecho mis necesidades	1 2 3 4 5
41. Es duro que yo relacione con otros	1 2 3 4 5
42. Me siento deprimido a menudo	1 2 3 4 5
43. Me siento enojado con la gente alrededor de mi bastante a menudo	1 2 3 4 5
44. Tengo problemas ocupandome de la tension	1 2 3 4 5
45. Me siento a menudo tenso	1 2 3 4 5
46. Me siento a menudo descuidado	1 2 3 4 5
47. Nadie parece cuidar sobre mi	1 2 3 4 5
48. La gente debe obedecer la ley, no importa qué	1 2 3 4 5
49. Es nuestro deber obedecer todas las leyes	1 2 3 4 5
50. Nunca hay una causa para romper la ley	1 2 3 4 5
51. La ley no beneficia a la persona común	1 2 3 4 5
52. Una persona hambrienta tiene el derecho de robar	1 2 3 4 5
53. Un poli es un amigo a gente en necesidad	1 2 3 4 5
54. Comparado a otros presos, participé más en clases del tratamiento	1 2 3 4 5
55. He aprendido muchas cosas útiles sobre mi como resultado de mi encarcelamiento	1 2 3 4 5
56. Mi encarcelamiento ha precisado las barreras que puse hasta evito de cambiar de una manera positiva	1 2 3 4 5
57. Los individuos que terminan la programación son más probables evitar errores de pensamiento criminales	1 2 3 4 5
58. Una persona tiene que romper a veces la ley	1 2 3 4 5
59. La mayoría de la gente triunfadora rompe la ley para tener éxito	1 2 3 4 5
60. Debe bien evadir la ley, si usted no la rompe	1 2 3 4 5
61. Si supieran no conseguirían cogidos, la mayoría de la gente romperían la ley	1 2 3 4 5