

Spring 1977

## Theoretical Perspectives on Prisonization: A Comparison of the Importation and Deprivation Models

Charles W. Thomas

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarlycommons.law.northwestern.edu/jclc>

 Part of the [Criminal Law Commons](#), [Criminology Commons](#), and the [Criminology and Criminal Justice Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Charles W. Thomas, Theoretical Perspectives on Prisonization: A Comparison of the Importation and Deprivation Models, 68 J. Crim. L. & Criminology 135 (1977)

This Criminology is brought to you for free and open access by Northwestern University School of Law Scholarly Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology by an authorized editor of Northwestern University School of Law Scholarly Commons.

## THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVES ON PRISONIZATION: A COMPARISON OF THE IMPORTATION AND DEPRIVATION MODELS\*

CHARLES W. THOMAS\*\*

Criminological research has identified at least three general types of variables which influence adaptations to and, presumably, the consequences of confinement: (1) preprison socialization and experience; (2) characteristics of the prison organization and the problems it creates for inmates; and (3) extraprisson influences associated with the quality of contacts which inmates maintain with the larger society and their expectations about postrelease life-chances. The preponderance of research, however, has concentrated on adaptations to confinement in the type of coercive organization that prisons typically represent. These studies show that the probability of assimilation into a subcultural system that is oppositional to the prison organization and its goals increases when a custodially-oriented organizational structure is adopted. Under such conditions, the saliency of what Sykes<sup>1</sup> has termed the "pains of imprisonment," the impact of structurally-generated alienation, the influence of sentence length and other related factors have been linked to high levels of prisonization.<sup>2</sup> An equally important

though smaller series of studies have shown that the general socialization experiences which inmates have prior to confinement, the degree and duration of their involvement with criminal value systems prior to confinement, and the numerous attitudinal and behavioral patterns that these experiences and involvements stimulate serve as predictors of the types of adaptations the inmates will make to prison life.<sup>3</sup> The

---

*the Functional and Important Models of the Inmate System*, 21 Soc. Prob. 410 (1974); Berk, *Organizational Goals and Inmate Organization*, 71 Am. J. Soc. 522 (1966); Clemmer, *Observations on Imprisonment as a Source of Criminality*, 41 J. CRIM. L.C. & P.S. 311 (1951); Cline, *The Determinants of Normative Patterns in Correctional Institutions*, in 2 SCANDANAVIAN STUDIES IN CRIMINOLOGY 173 (N. Christian ed. 1968); Garabedian, *Social Roles and Processes of Socialization in the Prison Community*, 11 Soc. Prob. 139 (1963); Grusky, *Organizational Goals and the Behavior of Informal Leaders*, 65 Am. J. Soc. 59 (1959); Thomas, *Theoretical Perspectives on Alienation in the Prison Society*, 18 Pac. Soc. Rev. 483 (1975); Thomas & Poole, *The Consequences of Incompatible Goal Structures in Correctional Settings*, 3 INT'L J. CRIMINOLOGY AND PENOLOGY 27 (1975); Wellford, *Factors Associated with Adoption of the Inmate Code*, 58 J. CRIM. L.C. & P.S. 197 (1967); Wheeler, *Socialization in Correctional Communities*, 26 Am. Soc. Rev. 697 (1961); Wilson, *Patterns of Management and Adaptation to Organizational Roles*, 74 Am. J. Soc. 146 (1968); Zald, *Patterns of Management and Adaptations to Organizational Roles*, 68 Am. J. Soc. 335 (1962); R. AKER, N. HAYNER & W. GRUNINGER, *PRISONIZATION IN FIVE COUNTRIES: TYPE OF PRISON AND INMATE CHARACTERISTICS* (1975) (unpublished manuscript at University of Iowa); C. Schrag, *Social Types in a Prison Community* (1944) (unpublished M.A. thesis at University of Washington).

<sup>3</sup>D. CLEMMER (1940), *supra* note 2; R. GIALLOMBARDO, *SOCIETY OF WOMEN* (1966); Wellford, *supra* note 2; J. IRWIN, *THE FELON* (1970); D. WARD & G. KASSEBAUM, *WOMEN'S PRISON* (1965); Clemmer (1951), *supra* note 2; Edwards, *Inmate Adaptations and Socialization in the Prison*, 4 Soc. 213 (1970); Irwin & Cressey, *Thieves, Convicts, and the Inmate Culture*, 10 Soc. Prob. 142 (1962); Schrag, *Some Foundations for a Theory of Correction*, in *THE PRISON: STUDIES IN INSTITUTIONAL ORGANIZATION AND CHANGE* 309 (D. Cressey ed. 1961); Schwartz, *Pre-Institutional vs. Situational Influence in a Correctional Community*, 62 J. CRIM. L.C. & P.S. 532 (1971); Thomas, *Prisonization or Resocialization? A Study of External Factors which Influ-*

\* This is a revision of a paper presented to the Society for the Study of Social Problems convention, San Francisco, California, 1975. The author is grateful for the assistance provided by Robin J. Cage, Bowling Green State University, in the analysis presented in this paper and for the critical comments on earlier drafts from Ronald L. Akers, University of Iowa. During the preparation of the manuscript the author was supported by a grant from the National Institute for Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, #76-NI-99-0050. This financial support was, however, unrelated to this study and does not necessarily indicate the concurrence of NIJJDP in any of the statements or conclusions presented here.

\*\* Professor of Sociology, Bowling Green State University.

<sup>1</sup> G. SYKES, *SOCIETY OF CAPTIVES* (1958).

<sup>2</sup> See D. CLEMMER, *THE PRISON COMMUNITY* (1940); D. GLASER, *THE EFFECTIVENESS OF A PRISON AND PAROLE SYSTEM* (1964); T. MATHIESEN, *ACROSS THE BOUNDARIES OF ORGANIZATION* (1971); D. STREET, R. VINTER & C. FERROW, *ORGANIZATION FOR TREATMENT* (1966); C. TITTLE, *SOCIETY OF SUBORDINATES* (1972); Akers, Hayner & Gruninger, *Homosexual and Drug Behavior in Prison: A Test of*

relevance of factors not directly associated with the immediate problems and pressures of confinement has been further demonstrated by a third general type of research that has linked extraprison variables to patterns of prison adjustment. This body of literature has supported the contention that prisonization is less pronounced when a significant level of contact with the larger society is maintained during periods of confinement, when the inmates' evaluations of their probable postprison life-chances are positive, and when the inmate is nearing the point of his release.<sup>4</sup>

Generally speaking, these studies have advanced our knowledge about determinants of assimilation into the inmate society. In so doing, however, researchers have become preoccupied with research and theory on the structure of the inmate subculture and with factors that promote high levels of assimilation into that normative system. Only a handful of studies have addressed themselves to the actual or probable short- and long-term consequences of confinement.<sup>5</sup> Further, only slight attention has been devoted to an evaluation of the relative importance of preprison, extraprison, and prison-specific influences.<sup>6</sup> The development of more adequate criminological theory in this area of research and the movement toward the construction of a rational correctional policy, however, are premised on our ability better to understand the relative importance of variables

that have been linked to both prisonization and its consequences.

This study will address three issues which are closely related to the problems noted above. First, based on an analysis of data obtained from inmates in a custodially-oriented medium security facility for young adult offenders, the analysis will assess the relative importance of preprison, extraprison, and prison-specific predictors of prisonization. Second, the analysis will provide an evaluation of the usefulness of these variables and prisonization as predictors of two important consequences of confinement identified in previous research.<sup>7</sup> Finally, several recent studies have shown that substantial numbers of inmates report drug use before and/or after confinement,<sup>8</sup> and that drug users represent a category of inmates whose responses to confinement differ significantly from that of non-users.<sup>9</sup> Therefore, the analysis will also examine both the consequences of confinement for categories of inmates who vary in their experience with drugs and the relative ability of the independent variables under examination to predict these consequences.

#### THEORETICAL CONSIDERATIONS

Theoretical work in this segment of criminology continues to lag far behind the increasingly sophisticated body of empirical research. Still, at least two conceptual models have evolved to account for adaptations to confinement. Reviews of each are readily available elsewhere, so there is no need to examine them in detail here.<sup>10</sup> Suffice it to say that they differ primarily in their level of concern with the three clusters of variables described earlier.

Generally speaking, the "deprivation model," which is most closely associated with the work of

---

ence *The Impact of Confinement*, 10 J. RES. CRIME & DELINQUENCY 13 (1973); Thomas, *supra* note 2; Thomas & Foster, *The Importation Model Perspective on Inmate Social Role: An Empirical Test*, 14 Soc. Q. 226 (1973); Thomas & Foster, *Prisonization in the Inmate Contraculture*, 20 Soc. Prob. 229 (1972).

<sup>4</sup> D. GLASSER, *supra* note 2; Garabedian, *supra* note 2; Wellford, *supra* note 2; Thomas & Foster (1973), *supra* note 3; Thomas & Foster (1972), *supra* note 3; Wheeler, *supra* note 2.

<sup>5</sup> D. GLASSER, *supra* note 2; G. KASSEBAUM, D. WARD & D. WILNER, PRISON TREATMENT AND PAROLE SURVIVAL (1971); Garrity, *The Prison as a Rehabilitation Agency*, in THE PRISON: STUDIES IN INSTITUTIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AND CHANGE 358 (D. Cressey ed. 1961); Thomas, *Toward a More Inclusive Model of the Inmate Contraculture*, 8 CRIMINOLOGY 251 (1970); Thomas & Foster (1972), *supra* note 3; Thomas & Poole, *supra* note 2; R. AKERS, N. HAYNER & W. GRUNINGER (1975), *supra* note 2; D. GARRITY, *The Effect of Sentence on Parole Adjustment and Estimation of Optimum Sentence* (1958) (unpublished doctoral dissertation at University of Washington).

<sup>6</sup> Thomas, *supra* note 2.

<sup>7</sup> Thomas & Foster (1972), *supra* note 3; Thomas & Poole, *supra* note 2.

<sup>8</sup> Akers, Hayner & Gruninger (1974), *supra* note 2; Thomas & Cage, *Correlates of Prison Drug Use: An Evaluation of Two Conceptual Models*, —CRIMINOLOGY— (1977); R. AKERS, N. HAYNER & W. GRUNINGER (1975), *supra* note 2.

<sup>9</sup> Thomas & Cage, *supra* note 8.

<sup>10</sup> See e.g., C. TITTLE, *supra* note 2; C. THOMAS & D. PETERSEN, PRISON ORGANIZATIONS AND INMATE SUBCULTURE (1977); Cline, *supra* note 2; Petersen & Thomas, *Review of Relevant Research on Correctional Rehabilitation*, in FUNDAMENTALS OF CRIMINAL BEHAVIOR AND CORRECTIONAL SYSTEMS 135 (J. Gull & R. Hardy eds. 1973); Thomas, *supra* note 5.

Sykes,<sup>11</sup> Sykes and Messinger,<sup>12</sup> and Goffman,<sup>13</sup> focuses its attention on the influence of prison-specific variables. The assumption is that the depersonalizing and stigmatizing effects of legal processing and induction into the prison, coupled with the alienative effects of the coercive power exercised by prison officials in their attempts to maintain social control within the prison, minimize the relevance of other types of variables.

Advocates of the "importation model" have strongly criticized this rather narrow, closed-system perspective.<sup>14</sup> Only through a careful examination of preprison socialization and experience, they argue, can either the type of inmate normative system or variations in the degree of assimilation into that system be properly understood. The numerous studies already cited on the effect of preprison and extraprisson variables rather clearly demonstrate the empirical basis for such contentions. Indeed, the recognition of the growing number of studies which attest to the importance of all three sets of variables has been the primary stimulus for the development of a third theoretical perspective. This integrated model stresses the need for any general theory to incorporate applicable elements of both organizational and criminological theory in such a way as to provide a properly balanced treatment of all three basic sets of influences.<sup>15</sup> Further, as Akers, Hayner, and Gruninger<sup>16</sup> concluded in their crossnational analysis of prisonization, the major problem that must now be confronted is the role played by each general type of variable when the two basic theoretical paradigms are integrated.

<sup>11</sup> G. SYKES, *supra* note 1.

<sup>12</sup> Sykes & Messinger, *The Inmate Social System*, in *THEORETICAL STUDIES IN SOCIAL ORGANIZATION OF THE PRISON 5* (Conference Group on Correctional Organization ed. 1960).

<sup>13</sup> Goffman, *On the Characteristics of Total Institutions: The Inmate World*, in *THE PRISON: STUDIES IN INSTITUTIONAL ORGANIZATION AND CHANGE* (D. Cressey ed. 1961).

<sup>14</sup> J. IRWIN, *supra* note 3; C. THOMAS & D. PETERSEN, *supra* note 10; Cline, *supra* note 2; Irwin & Cressey *supra* note 3; Thomas, *supra* note 5; Wellford, *supra* note 2.

<sup>15</sup> Cf. C. TITTLE, *supra* note 2; C. THOMAS & D. PETERSEN, *supra* note 10; Thomas, *supra* note 5; Wellford, *supra* note 2.

<sup>16</sup> R. AKERS, N. HAYNER & W. GRUNINGER (1975), *supra* note 2.

## RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The analysis presented in this paper is based on data obtained from a sample of 273 felons who were confined in a medium security, custodially-oriented facility for young adult offenders located in a southeastern state. Anonymous questionnaires were administered to groups of from twenty-five to fifty inmates in 1973. Unfortunately, those who were contacted do not constitute a random sample of the inmate population of slightly more than 600.<sup>17</sup> On the other hand, it should be emphasized that the purpose of this study was not to estimate population parameters from the sample statistics provided by the data that were obtained. Further, interviews with both inmates and staff revealed no systematic opposition to participation in the study. These two factors, in conjunction with the fact that almost one-half of the inmates in the institution were involved in the study, greatly diminishes the likelihood that the non-random nature of the sample should be taken as a serious limitation of the study.

The manner in which the major independent and dependent variables were operationalized in this research is described below. More detailed information on appropriate measures of central tendency and dispersion are included with the intercorrelation matrix which is presented in Table 1.

*Alienation.* The adoption of a custodially-oriented organizational structure as a means of attaining and maintaining social control within the prison has been linked to the production of high levels of alienation among inmates,<sup>18</sup> and the association between alienation and the consequences of confinement has been demonstrated in recent empirical research.<sup>19</sup> Perhaps the most relevant aspect of alienation in this area of research is powerlessness. To the extent

<sup>17</sup> There is no way of determining the exact nature of any sampling biases that may be present. An inspection of the frequency distributions on such variables as age, race, type of offense, and sentence length, however, does not reveal any significant departures from what would have been expected had a random sample been possible. Further, the consideration variations obtained on responses to the attitude items employed certainly do not reveal the kind of homogeneity of attitudes that might be anticipated if particular types of inmates had been either over or underrepresented.

<sup>18</sup> Thomas & Zingraff, *Organizational Structure as a Determination of Prisonization: An Analysis of the Consequences of Alienation*, 19 PAC. SOC. REV. 98 (1976).

<sup>19</sup> Thomas & Poole, *supra* note 2.

TABLE I  
CORRELATION MATRIX

	X <sub>1</sub>	X <sub>2</sub>	X <sub>3</sub>	X <sub>4</sub>	X <sub>5</sub>	X <sub>6</sub>	X <sub>7</sub>	X <sub>8</sub>	X <sub>9</sub>	X <sub>10</sub>
X <sub>1</sub>	1.000	.222	.111	-.041	.047	.182	.195	.121	.077	.087
X <sub>2</sub>		1.000	.134	-.028	.008	.069	-.008	-.013	-.026	-.018
X <sub>3</sub>			1.000	-.230	.150	.130	.118	.178	.139	.107
X <sub>4</sub>				1.000	-.145	-.081	-.115	-.062	-.089	-.010
X <sub>5</sub>					1.000	.072	.256	.366	.561	.256
X <sub>6</sub>						1.000	.023	-.146	.005	.052
X <sub>7</sub>							1.000	.213	.284	.477
X <sub>8</sub>								1.000	.452	.427
X <sub>9</sub>									1.000	.319
X <sub>10</sub>										1.000

X<sub>1</sub> = Educational Attainment; median = 9-12 years.

X<sub>2</sub> = Monthly Income; median = \$201-\$250.

X<sub>3</sub> = Longest Period Employed; median = 7-9 months.

X<sub>4</sub> = # Felony Arrests; dichotomy of one and more than one arrest.

X<sub>5</sub> = Contextual Powerlessness; mean = 14.809, standard deviation = 4.358.

X<sub>6</sub> = Years Served This Sentence; dichotomized into less than and more than 1 year served.

X<sub>7</sub> = Postprison Expectations; mean = 23.882, standard deviation = 4.999.

X<sub>8</sub> = Prisonization; mean = 11.126, standard deviation = 3.276.

X<sub>9</sub> = Opposition to Prison Organization; mean = 24.862, standard deviation = 7.809.

X<sub>10</sub> = Criminal Identification; mean = 13.419, standard deviation = 3.309.

that advocates of the deprivation model are correct, structurally-generated powerlessness should emerge as a significant determinant of prisonization. On the other hand, Thomas and Poole, in their analysis of data obtained from inmates in a maximum security penitentiary, found that "the impact of what we have referred to as structurally-generated alienation on reductions in levels of organizational effectiveness appears to operate only indirectly through its influence on levels of prisonization."<sup>20</sup> Thus, the significance of powerlessness as a predictor of the two consequence variables considered in this analysis is not expected to be great when the influence of prisonization is held constant.

To insure that the degree of isomorphism between the conceptual meaning of structurally-generated powerlessness and the operational measure of the variable be as great as possible (a problem made more acute because the data were obtained from a single prison), a contextual measure of powerlessness comparable to that used by Thomas and Zingraff<sup>21</sup> was employed in this study. The five items in the Likert-type scale were derived from a larger

pool of potential items. The higher the scale score, the lower the level of powerlessness. The method of item selection for this scale and the other attitudinal measures was accomplished by correlating item responses to raw summated scale scores. Items with correlations of less than .50 were not included in the final scale. Where necessary, a revised scale score was then computed on the basis of the items that met the inclusion criteria.

*Length of Confinement.* Particularly in custodially-oriented institutions, length of time confined has been linked to degree of assimilation into the inmate subculture.<sup>22</sup> This influence is a deprivation model variable in the sense that it represents a fundamental problem of confinement as well as an influence that is manipulatable by prison officials to a significant degree. The range of variations on this variable among the inmates in this sample was not great. The inmate population of the institution is primarily composed of younger offenders who do not have particularly long sentences (85.9 per cent of those in the sample were between eighteen and twenty-two; 43.9 per cent had total sentences of five years or less). The frequency

<sup>20</sup> *Id.* at 35.

<sup>21</sup> Thomas & Zingraff, *supra* note 18.

<sup>22</sup> D. CLEMMER (1940), *supra* note 2; Garabedian, *supra* note 2; Wheeler, *supra* note 2.

distribution on this variable revealed that 17.8 per cent of those in the sample had served less than six months time on their present sentence, 48.1 per cent had served between six months and one year, and only 34.1 per cent had served more than one year. Because of this, a single dichotomous variable (one year or less served on this sentence versus more than one year served) was employed in the regression analysis.

*Preprison Influences.* Preprison factors may be grouped into at least two general categories: those that reflect prosocial involvement or experience and those that indicate varying degrees of involvement in criminality. Four variables are included in the analysis to reflect these influences. First, educational attainment (less than high school graduate versus high school graduate), average monthly income during the two years prior to arrest (measured on a nine-point equal interval scale), and the longest period of continuous employment during the same two-year period (also a nine-point scale) were employed as indicators of prosocial involvements. Second, the number of self-reported felony arrests was used as an indicator of criminal involvement.

*Postprison Expectations.* One of the pressures associated with confinement over which prison officials have little direct control is the manner in which inmates evaluate their probable post-release life-chances. Previous research has shown that such expectations have a strong influence on the consequences of confinement under examination here, but this research has been limited to maximum security institutions.<sup>23</sup> A six-item Likert scale similar to that employed in previous studies<sup>24</sup> was employed as a measure of the postprison expectations variable. The higher the scale score, the more positive the expectations.

*Consequences of Confinement.* The analysis focuses on three consequences of confinement: prisonization, opposition to the prison organization, and criminalization. *Prisonization* may be conceptualized as the degree to which an inmate has developed a responsiveness to the normative tenets of the inmate subculture. In custodially-oriented settings this normative system has generally been described as one in

which emphasis is placed on physical toughness, manipulative relationships with staff members, and inmate solidarity. A four-item Likert scale was developed as a measure of this variable. *Opposition to the prison organization* has been viewed as one of the short-term consequences of prisonization. Research has shown that increasing levels of prisonization are linked to high levels of opposition to both the organization and its representatives. When such oppositional attitudes are present, it is improbable that inmates will be supportive of the formal goals of the organization or of policies and programs designed to achieve these goals on an operational level. A nine-item Likert scale provided a measure of this consequence variable. Finally, *self-identification as a criminal* has been viewed as an indicator of the probable long-term consequence of confinement because of its hypothetical link to postprison reinvolvement in criminal activity. A four-item attitude measure was developed to measure this variable. Each of these measures was derived from scales that have proven their utility in previous research.<sup>25</sup> Higher scores on these variables reflect a lack of prisonization, positive orientations toward the prison organization, and low levels of criminal identification.

#### ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

The logic of the analysis may be simply summarized. The research problem requires an assessment of the predictive utility of major importation and deprivation model variables. The analysis must, therefore, provide information about whether each set of variables includes indicators that significantly increase the quality of our predictions of one or more of the three variables that are conceptualized as consequences of confinement.<sup>26</sup> Thus, in the initial phase of the analysis importation and deprivation model variables were included in six separate regression equations; two for each of the dependent variables. Those that proved to be

<sup>23</sup> E.g., Thomas & Foster (1973), *supra* note 3; Thomas & Foster (1972), *supra* note 3; Thomas & Poole, *supra* note 2.

<sup>26</sup> For the purposes of this analysis, a significant increase in the quality of predictions obtained was defined as the addition of one per cent or more to the explained variance in the dependent variable when the independent variable was entered into the regression equation. All regression equations were based on a step-wise solution.

<sup>23</sup> Cf. Thomas & Foster (1972), *supra* note 3; Thomas & Poole, *supra* note 2.

<sup>24</sup> Thomas & Foster (1972), *supra* note 3.

significant were merged into an equation that included both importation model and deprivation model variables as predictors of each dependent variable. The latter aspect of the analysis was further elaborated by recomputing each of the equations for three types of drug experiences (never used, used only prior to confinement, used both before and after confinement)<sup>27</sup> in order to assess any variation in the quality of predictions obtained when types of inmates that previous research has shown to differ in their responses to confinement are examined separately.

The findings presented in Table 2 show that influences emphasized in each of the theoretical models are linked to all three consequence variables. Postprison expectations and preprison employment stability are significant importation model predictors of both prisonization and opposition to the prison organization; only the postprison expectations variable is significantly associated with criminal identification. Structurally-generated powerlessness is clearly the most important of the deprivation model variables with regard to each of the three consequences of confinement, but duration of incarceration is also a significant predictor of prisonization. Thus, stable patterns of preprison employment, the relative absence of feelings of powerlessness, a short period of exposure to the influences of prison life, and a positive orientation toward the future appear to inhibit prisonization. Much the same can be said about the development of negative attitudes toward the prison organization with the exception being that length of confinement is not so pronounced an influence. With regard to criminal identification, only two of the eight independent variables, postprison expectations and structurally-generated powerlessness, seem particularly relevant. When an inmate's evaluation of his future life-chances is negative and when he perceives himself to be powerless, the probability that he will also have a relatively high level of criminal identification increases.

Several important implications are supported by these initial findings. The proportion of variance in both prisonization and opposition to the prison organization accounted for by im-

portation model variables is low. Only when attention is focused on criminal identification does any importation model variable provide a better means of prediction than the deprivation model variables. This, by itself, is not particularly surprising. Hypothetically, as the degree of custodial orientation (hence, the presence of a greater degree of reliance on coercive power) increases, the immediate pressures and problems associated with confinement may well assume a degree of saliency that would not otherwise be the case. Thus, it seems likely that the predictive utility of importation model variables may decrease with increases in coercion exercised by prison officials. What is surprising is that only the *preprison* indicators derived from the importation model are shown to assume a uniformly secondary influence on all three consequence variables. Though perhaps an oversimplification, in this custodially-oriented setting the measured effect of the past appears far less important than the immediate pressures of the present and perceptions of the future.

At this point, however, a more thorough understanding of these and other relationships is obscured by the fact that the importation and deprivation model variables are being dealt with separately. The Beta coefficients presented in Table 2, therefore, provide an indication of the relative importance of the individual variables related to *each* model, but they do not suggest how significant these variables will be when *both* sets of variables are merged into a single equation. Thus, the significant predictors of each dependent variable were included in separate regression equations that represent the effect of importation *and* deprivation model variables on the dependent variables.

The implications of the initial segment of the analysis are further supported when the variables from both models are employed together. With regard to prisonization, the deprivation model variables continue to be more important, but the importation model variables are still a significant influence. As levels of powerlessness and duration of confinement increase, so does the degree of prisonization, but both stable preprison employment patterns and positive post-release expectations have the opposite effect on prisonization. Although the proportion of the variance explained by employing both sets of influences increases, the extent of improvement is slight. Similarly, although the extent to which the two sets of variables are capable of

<sup>27</sup> For reasons that are explained more fully later in the paper, it was not necessary to examine a separate group of inmates who used drugs in prison but not prior to imprisonment. Only four inmates began to use drugs while in prison.

TABLE 2  
MULTIPLE REGRESSION ANALYSIS EMPLOYING IMPORTATION AND DEPRIVATION MODEL VARIABLES SEPARATELY

	Multiple R	R <sup>2</sup>	R <sup>2</sup> Change	B
<i>Dependent Variable: Prisonization</i>				
Importation Model Variables:				
Postprison Expectations	.213	.045	.045	.174
Employment	.263	.069	.024	.179
Monthly Income	.272	.074	.005	-.092
Education	.284	.081	.007	.088
Deprivation Model Variables:				
Contextual Powerlessness	.369	.136	.136	.380
Years Served	.400	.160	.024	-.140
<i>Dependent Variable: Opposition to Prison</i>				
Importation Model Variables:				
Postprison Expectations	.284	.081	.081	.260
Employment	.303	.092	.011	.123
Monthly Income	.310	.096	.004	-.073
Felony Arrests	.311	.097	.001	-.031
Education	.313	.098	.001	.028
Deprivation Model Variables:				
Contextual Powerlessness	.561	.315	.315	.565
Years Served	.564	.318	.003	-.058
<i>Dependent Variable: Criminal Identification</i>				
Importation Model Variables:				
Postprison Expectations	.477	.228	.228	.466
Employment	.480	.230	.003	.056
Felony Arrests	.481	.231	.001	-.033
Monthly Income	.482	.232	.001	-.034
Education	.482	.232	.000	-.001
Deprivation Model Variables:				
Contextual Powerlessness	.254	.065	.065	.252
Years Served	.257	.066	.001	.038

TABLE 3

MULTIPLE REGRESSION ANALYSIS EMPLOYING IMPORTATION AND DEPRIVATION MODEL VARIABLES TOGETHER

	Multiple R	R <sup>2</sup>	R <sup>2</sup> Change	B
<i>Dependent Variable: Prisonization</i>				
Contextual Powerlessness	.366	.134	.134	.329
Years Served	.396	.157	.023	-.165
Employment	.421	.177	.020	-.131
Postprison Expectations	.437	.191	.034	.122
<i>Dependent Variable: Opposition to Prison</i>				
Contextual Powerlessness	.570	.325	.325	.451
Prisonization	.620	.384	.059	.243
Postprison Expectations	.630	.397	.013	.119
Employment	.630	.397	.000	.006
<i>Dependent Variable: Criminal Identification</i>				
Postprison Expectations	.461	.213	.213	.377
Prisonization	.576	.332	.120	.344
Contextual Powerlessness	.577	.333	.001	.032

accounting for variations of opposition to the prison organization is quite substantial, the prison-specific variables are clearly more important predictors. High levels of powerless-

ness and prisonization are certainly important predictors of opposition, and positive postprison expectations significantly reduce opposition. Stable preprison employment, however, is

not significantly linked to opposition. Finally, the initial segment of the analysis showed that only two variables, postprison expectations and structurally-generated powerlessness, were significant predictors of criminal identification. Prisonization was added as a third variable into this equation, as well as that developed to account for the opposition variable, because prior research<sup>28</sup> has shown that both opposition and criminal identification are partly a consequence of prisonization. The inclusion of both importation and deprivation model variables significantly increases the proportion of the variance in criminalization that is explained. Further, as might be expected given the findings discussed earlier, the postprison expectations variable, an importation model indicator, is the most important of the predictor variables.

In brief, the findings of the regression analysis presented in both Tables 2 and 3 provide important information on the relative significance of variables central to the importation and deprivation model. Perhaps most significantly, the magnitude of the multiple correlations obtained are higher for all three dependent variables when both importation and deprivation model variables are used together. This in turn, supports the contention that an integration of these two perspectives provides a more powerful explanatory model than does either taken separately.

Second, the role played by deprivation model variables, particularly structurally-generated powerlessness, appears to be more important than preprison or extraprisson influences. The exception to this finding is that postrelease expectations were more closely linked to criminal identification than any of the deprivation model variables. Indeed, the powerlessness variable proved to be insignificantly associated with criminal identification after prisonization was added to the equation, prisonization being best conceptualized as the product of both prison-specific and external influences.

Third, the findings consistently show that preprison influences are less important in understanding the consequences of confinement in institutions of this type than either prison-specific or extraprisson variables. This implication deserves very careful consideration if for no other reason than the fact that many impor-

tation model-based analyses concentrate almost exclusively on preprison influences. This may reflect the assumption that there are only two primary sets of influences that determine inmate adaptations: those that exerted an effect before they entered the prison and those that are directly linked to the immediate prison setting. The present analysis rather directly contradicts such a simplistic approach. Instead, these findings and those of several other recent studies demonstrate the importance of influences that become important after confinement, but that are neither directly associated with nor under the control of the prison organization.

Still, the issue of whether categories of inmates whose experience with drugs prior to or after confinement varies has not been addressed. An analysis of this issue is important for two reasons. One is certainly that the influx of large numbers of inmates who used drugs prior to imprisonment could indicate the presence of categories of inmates who will vary considerably in their responses to confinement. There is almost no empirical evidence on this subject. Further, by dividing the sample into categories of inmates who have different types of experience with drugs, three internal replications of the analysis of the relative importance of importation and deprivation model variables are made possible. It is toward this final issue that attention is now directed.

Initially, the drug experience of those in this sample deserves some comment because of its considerable importance for those concerned with this phenomenon. An overview of the findings that are not presented in any of the tables shows that 67.0 per cent (N = 183) of the inmates had used drugs of one type or another prior to imprisonment and that 17.2 per cent (N = 47) of the sample had been convicted of a drug-related offense. The frequency of preprison drug use was substantial: 75.4 per cent (N = 138) of the inmates reported having used drugs more than once a week during the six-month period prior to their most recent arrest; 76.0 per cent (N = 139) reported using drugs at the time of their arrest. Of special importance is the clear evidence that drug use represents a type of behavior that is not spawned by factors associated with confinement. Of the sixty inmates who report drug use in prison (22.0 per cent of the sample), only four reported the onset of drug use taking place after they were con-

<sup>28</sup> Thomas & Foster (1972), *supra* note 3; Thomas & Poole, *supra* note 2.

TABLE 4

MULTIPLE REGRESSION ANALYSIS EMPLOYING IMPORTATION AND DEPRIVATION MODEL VARIABLES TOGETHER FOR INDIVIDUAL CATEGORIES OF INMATES

	Multiple R	R <sup>2</sup>	R <sup>2</sup> Change	B
<i>Dependent Variable: Prisonization</i>				
Inmates Reporting No Drug Use				
Contextual Powerlessness	.485	.235	.235	.435
Postprison Expectations	.517	.267	.032	.155
Years Served	.535	.287	.020	-.153
Employment	.543	.295	.009	.096
Inmates Reporting Prior Use Only				
Contextual Powerlessness	.283	.080	.080	.278
Employment	.330	.108	.028	.166
Years Served	.339	.115	.006	-.086
Postprison Expectations	.347	.120	.006	.077
Inmates Reporting Prison Drug Use				
Contextual Powerlessness	.326	.106	.106	.207
Years Served	.425	.181	.074	-.313
Postprison Expectations	.461	.212	.031	.168
Employment	.479	.230	.018	.142
<i>Dependent Variable: Opposition to Prison</i>				
Inmates Reporting No Drug Use				
Contextual Powerlessness	.657	.432	.432	.462
Prisonization	.729	.531	.099	.340
Employment	.734	.539	.008	.095
Postprison Expectations	.736	.541	.002	.044
Inmates Reporting Prior Use Only				
Contextual Powerlessness	.451	.203	.203	.370
Prisonization	.497	.247	.044	.204
Postprison Expectations	.514	.264	.017	.130
Employment	.514	.264	.000	.010
Inmates Reporting Prison Drug Use				
Contextual Powerlessness	.657	.431	.431	.615
Prisonization	.698	.487	.056	.264
Employment	.744	.554	.067	-.290
Postprison Expectations	.753	.567	.013	.124
<i>Dependent Variable: Criminal Identification</i>				
Inmates Reporting No Drug Use				
Postprison Expectations	.523	.274	.274	.418
Prisonization	.602	.363	.089	.280
Contextual Powerlessness	.605	.367	.004	.074
Inmates Reporting Prior Use Only				
Prisonization	.454	.206	.206	.418
Postprison Expectations	.555	.309	.103	.329
Contextual Powerlessness	.557	.310	.001	-.037
Inmates Reporting Prison Drug Use				
Postprison Expectations	.463	.214	.214	.354
Prisonization	.556	.310	.095	.288
Contextual Powerlessness	.567	.321	.011	.117

finer.<sup>29</sup> For this reason, there is no need to examine the predictions of the two theoretical models for inmates who begin to use drugs only after confinement.

<sup>29</sup> It should be noted that in the previous examination of prison drug use reported by Akers and his associates in 1974 inmates were asked about the drug use they knew about that involved other inmates. No

The separate regressions computed for the three categories of inmates (no drug use; drug use only before confinement; drug use during confinement) generally indicate that a slightly

self-reports on the drug experiences of the respondents were obtained. Thus, no data were available on individual use patterns nor was there information on whether drug use began before or after confinement.

greater proportion of the variance in each dependent variable is accounted for among those who have never used drugs, but the differences are not striking. Further, although there are some variations in which of the predictor variables play an important role in accounting for the explained variance, the interpretation provided previously need not be changed. The deprivation model variables continue to exert a stronger influence on both prisonization and opposition to the prison organization, but the postrelease expectations variable is closely associated with criminal identification. With regard to both opposition to the organization and criminal identification, the influence of prisonization, a product of both importation and deprivation model variables, is consistently in evidence. Further, the shifts in relative importance that are noted are very probably a reflection of the fact that these categories of inmates vary a good deal in their general responses to confinement, particularly with respect to the extent to which they hold negative attitudes toward the prison organization and show high levels of criminal identification. Specifically, although a comparison of the mean prisonization levels revealed no statistically significant differences between the three groups, those who had used drugs only prior to confinement or who had continued to use drugs afterwards were significantly more oppositional to the prison than those with no drug experience (the *t*-ratios were significant at less than the .01 level), and those who reported prison drug use were significantly higher in their levels of criminal identification than those who had never used drugs (again, the *t*-ratio was significant at less than the .01 level).

In short, this examination of categories of inmates who vary in their past and present use of drugs adds an important dimension to the analysis. A particularly interesting point is that a very substantial proportion of those in the sample report frequent drug use prior to confinement, and many continue to use drugs even after confinement. Further, contrary to the preponderance of research that has examined another important type of inmate behavior, homosexual involvement, this analysis provides virtually no support for any hypothesis that drug use in prison is a product of the problems and pressures associated with prison life. Instead, over ninety per cent of those reporting the use of non-prescription drugs in

this sample had been using drugs prior to confinement. Finally, the internal replications of the overall assessment of the relative importance of deprivation and importation model variables allowed by separate analyses of these categories of inmates proved generally supportive of the initial analysis, even though significantly different adaptations to confinement were noted among the three groups.

#### SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Previous research on the consequences of confinement has demonstrated the importance of a variety of influences. Many of these are directly linked to the problems and pressures inherent in confinement, particularly confinement in custodially-oriented institutions. Many more are not. Because of this, it is becoming increasingly obvious that further theoretical developments in this important area of criminology are premised on our ability to better understand and better integrate a broad spectrum of factors that determine the impact of confinement.

The analysis reveals two primary findings. Although prison-specific influences are clearly important, variables that are not directly linked to the prison environment also have a significant effect. Further, the inclusion of both prison-specific and extraprisson variables in the regression analysis provided an explanation of a greater proportion of the variance in the three dependent variables than either set of variables could when used separately. These two findings were noted both in the overall analysis and when three internal replications of the analysis were completed by considering categories of inmates who varied in their experience with drugs.

With regard to the drug use aspect of the analysis, the most significant finding appears to be not simply that the majority of the inmates had used drugs prior to confinement or that many continued their use after that point, but that only a very small minority of those who reported drug use in prison began using drugs after they were incarcerated. Although it seems reasonable to predict that an increasing number of inmates may begin to use drugs after confinement if the use of drugs remains so common in prisons, the emergence of drug use in prisons can clearly not be considered a direct consequence of prison-specific factors.

Beyond the fact that both importation and

deprivation model variables have been shown to influence inmate adaptations to confinement, and beyond the rather convincing evidence that prison drug use is imported into rather than spawned by the prison, one additional point seems to be supported by this analysis. Somewhat surprisingly, the effect of preprison variables was generally either insignificant or secondary to both the effect of prison-specific factors or the inmates' evaluation of their probable postprison expectations. Limitations of both data and space preclude the development of this hypothesis, but the relative unimportance of these preprison variables may point to a very significant error in much of the existing theory in this area. Specifically, most of the work that has attempted to evaluate the merits of the importation model has focused attention on indicators of preprison experience and socialization. Indeed, a good deal of the support for the deprivation model has come through findings that show higher correlations between deprivation model variables and relevant dependent variables than have been found

when importation model variables are employed. It seems very possible, however, that when prisons allocate more of their resources in an attempt to attain their control or custodial goals they may so increase the problems of confinement that the potential influence of preprison experiences are largely blocked. In such situations, indicators of preprison experience would not be strongly associated with, for example, levels of prisonization. Still, many other factors beyond the preprison lives of the inmates that are not associated with the prison itself (expectation about the future, the maintenance of family ties or lack thereof, contact with the outside world through visitations and mail, and so on) may well continue to be important even when the emphasis on custodial goals is quite high. This study certainly does not provide any conclusive evidence in this regard, but the support that is presented and the potential significance of the hypothesis may make this point, if it can be better supported in later research, the most important to be made in this analysis.