



**Doctoral School of
Sociology**

THESES

For the Ph.D. dissertation

Gábor Papp

**Reconsideration of Prisonization Theory and Its Application for a
Hungarian Prison Sample**

Supervisor:

Dr. László Huszár

Brigadier-general

Budapest, 2010

Institute of Sociology and Social Policy

THESES

For the Ph.D. dissertation

Gábor Papp

**Reconsideration of Prisonization Theory and Its Application for a
Hungarian Prison Sample**

Supervisor:

Dr. László Huszár
Brigadier-general

© Gábor Papp

CONTENT

CONTENT.....	3
I. INTRODUCTION	4
II. PREVIOUS RESEARCHES.....	5
III. HYPOTHESES	9
<i>H1. Hypothesis about inmate perspectives.....</i>	<i>9</i>
<i>H2. Hypothesis about the explanation of the inmate perspectives.....</i>	<i>11</i>
<i>H3. Hypothesis about the rule infractions and institutional rewards</i>	<i>12</i>
<i>H4. Hypothesis about the relationships between the inmate perspectives and the institutional behavior.....</i>	<i>13</i>
IV. DATA AND METHODS.....	13
V. RESEARCH FINDINGS.....	15
MAJOR REFERENCES	19
AUTHOR’S RELATED PUBLICATIONS	22
ANNEX	24

I. INTRODUCTION

The study of prisonization phenomena have been one of the main popular topics in criminology for long decades, mainly in English-speaking countries. Although the “top period” of the study of prisonization was the 60’-70’s of last century, there is some current publication which deals with this issue (Paterline-Petersen 1999, Gillespie 2003, Dharmi-Ayton-Loewenstein 2007). Unfortunately, this notion has not become known among the Hungarian criminologists, it was only referred to in a few publications, and – as far as I know – there was only one research that examined this subject in Hungary (Huszár 1997). The prisonization, practically speaking, may be interpreted as a kind of prison socialization. Studying this issue is reasonable for at least two reasons. One of them is a “purely” scientific regard, which allows modelling basic social psychological and sociological processes, and therefore it is possible to study as important issues as inter-group relationships and group formulation in controlled conditions, and so on. The other regard (instrumental) can be useful to the user’s group of research findings (experts in prison administration, students, decision-makers).

Preparing my dissertation, I have two main objectives. On the one hand, I made an attempt to reconstitute, systematize and create a scientifically more acceptable knowledge connected with the prisonization by using earlier theoretical orientations, measures, conceptualizations. On the other hand, my intention was testing empirically this reconstituted theoretical model in Hungarian prison context. I made an effort to apply the same specific questionnaire items, which were the part of the questionnaires of the main (mainly North-American) preliminary studies. In this respect, my research may be interpreted as the revision of earlier researches.

The theoretical approach in my research, and accordingly the creation of the measures was quite different from the earlier practices. It was necessary to restructure the theoretical background, since in earlier publications models were tested, in which certain variables and some groups of variables may not be or my partly be explored by current methods of social sciences. Another problem aroused by former researches is whether these theoretical models could be translated into the “language of variables”. Therefore it was necessary to create new variables from the old ones, which are more distinctive from each other, hereby I tried to minimize the distortion arising from the contamination of different phenomena.

II. PREVIOUS RESEARCHES

The conception of prisonization was coined by Clemmer (1940/1965), his original notion was “...*the taking on in greater or less degree, of the folkways, mores, customs, and the general culture of the penitentiary*”. Clemmer emphasized in his theory factors which have influence on the inmates’ prisonization level. He labelled these “universal factors of prisonization”. He mentioned, among these factors, the duration of sentence, the personality of inmates, relations with persons outside the prison, integration into prison groups, acceptance and subscription of the “inmate code”, relationships with the cellmates and with fellow-workers, as well as the level of participation in illegal prison activities. He reckoned, among these factors, the age as well, the level of criminality, the ethnical and racial identity, the religion and so on. Clemmer stressed that each of these factors is related to each other. He studied the function of the prisonization phenomena mainly by qualitative measures (principally by case studies) and he was skeptical on whether the quantitative measures are applicable for the study of prisonization or not.

However, following Clemmer’s book, the main line in the prisonization research has become essentially quantitative since the late 1950’s, tested by the original (or ascribed to Clemmer) propositions. The researchers of this topic categorized the factors of prisonization on the basis of two background theories. One of them labelled “deprivation”, and the other was the “importation” theory. The basic thrust of the deprivation theory is for the inmate society is primarily important the “present time” strains, namely beyond the loss of liberty the inmates face lots of different kind of deprivations and frustrations due to the imprisonment. Sykes (1958, Sykes-Messinger 1960) used the term of “pains of imprisonment” for these deprivations and frustrations and mentioned, among these “pains” for the inmates, the deprivation of goods and services, of heterosexual relationships, of autonomy, and of security. According to Sykes the prisoners need to respond to these destructive effects in some way, they have to adjust to the prison context in order to reduce the destructive effect of these frustrations. Sykes mentioned several modes of adjustment: physical and psychological withdrawal (escapes, reveries, rioting), patterns of exploitation, using violence as a means to gain one’s ends, isolation from fellow inmates, as well as the opposite of the latter; high level of solidarity with other prisoners. The later works, which cited to the deprivation theory, emphasized particularly the latter mode of adjustment (collective mode, which based on inmate loyalty) and perceived this mode to be conducive to the prisonization.

The other background theory did not focus on intraprisons, but on factors associated with outside the prison in the interpretation of prisonization. The root of this orientation is that it assumes in some respects continuity between value system and behavior before and during the imprisonment. Putting it in another way, the inmates bring their own values to the prison context, that have developed and confirmed before their reception to the prison and they used them in the new situation. (Irwin-Cressey 1962, Irwin 1970). To support this theoretical view, reference is frequently made to Miller's (1958) study. Miller reported about a special value system in lower class culture, which is very similar to the tenets of the inmate code in prison in many respects. According to Miller, in the lower class, there are some main aspects ("focal concerns") which are basically tematize the worldview of the members of this social group. These focal issues include the law-abiding and law-violating behavior, toughness, smartness, excitement, belief in fate, emphasizing the personal autonomy. The starting point of the argument of the importation theory is that most of the inmates recruit from the lower strata of the society due to the screening processes which prevail in criminal justice system. Hence, it is not surprising that the specific normative expectations of the inmates are congruent with the value system of the lower class in main features. According to a later, modified variant of the importation model, the prisonization is not only influenced by the "antecedents", but factors such as relationship with people outside the prison and the perceptions for postprison expectations (Thomas 1970, Thomas-Petersen 1977).

In later empirical studies the aforementioned theoretical orientations were used by researchers, and these models were tested by a relatively standard variable sets. The empirical findings based on this methodology were quite ambiguous for the most part. One of the main and maybe the most important reason of this is that each researcher applied different measures for the operationalization of the prisonization and of the variables connected with this phenomena. In addition the theoretical models were mapped with different variables. Instead of summarizing the earlier empirical findings, it is more reasonable to present shortly the actual tools used for the measuring of the different phenomena. Basically there were three main methods to measure the prisonization in earlier studies. The first is based on the attitudes of the prison inmates, accordingly it used attitude statements (in some instances questions) for the measure. (for example Thomas 1971, 1973, 1977a, 1977b, Zingraff 1975, Thomas-Zingraff 1976, Paterline-Petersen 1999, Gillespie 2003). The second measuring method is based on hypothetical conflict situations, in which the inmates have to choose between two behavioral alternatives, one of them theoretically refers to the prisonization response, and the other refers the conventional response type (Wheeler 1961, Garabedian 1963, Wellford 1967,

Atchley-McCabe 1968, Schwartz 1971, 1973, Troyer-Frease 1975, Alpert 1979). The third kind of measuring tool pertains to the behavioral aspect of the prisonization, which is measured by “rule infractions” or “prison disciplinary tickets”. (Barak-Glantz 1983, Cao-Zhao-Van Dine 1997, Jiang-Fisher-Giorlando 2002, Gillespie 2003, Dhimi-Ayton-Loewenstein 2007).

From the above-mentioned measures, the attitudinal-based one seems to be appropriate mostly to the analysis of the numerous phenomena. The main characteristics of this kind of studies is that it applied the “inmate code” for the measuring of prisonization, and the acquisition and subscription of the tenets of the inmate code were considered as main indicators of the prisonization. The previous studies in pursuance of the conceptualization and operationalization of the prisonization very frequently quoted the works of Ohlin (1956) and of Sykes and Messinger (1960), which contains considerably detailed description of the inmate code. The most prevalent version of the attitudinal methods has been developed by Thomas (1971), this was applied by most of the prisonization studies. The concept and measure of prisonization used by Thomas is essentially multidimensional. Thomas was conceptualized as the extent to the proscriptions and prescriptions which reinforces a set of attitudes which encourage inmate solidarity, physical toughness, and manipulative relationships with the members of the prison staff. Besides Thomas labelled to this inmate code that is “oppositional”, “antisocial” and “hostile”. Thomas and his followers made and tested such theoretical models, in which they examined correlates of the different factors with the prisonization. In these theoretical models the prisonization was partly an independent, and partly a dependent variable. Accordingly Thomas and others on the one hand examined the “determinants”, on the other hand the “consequences” of the prisonization. Although on the ground of the previous literature, it is obvious that the “location” of the variables related to prisonization can not deem constant in some cases, in most publications that used the attitudinal measures the following variables were applied. There were distinguished “short-term” and “long-term consequences of the prisonization”. The first is “short-term” in the sense that it is related to the attitudes of prison inmates while they are still imprisoned (high priority on interpersonal relationships with other inmates, oppositional attitudes toward the prison and the staff), the latter is associated with the inmate adaptations they will make when they return to the larger society (criminal identification, attitudes toward the law and criminal justice system) (Thomas 1971, Thomas-Foster 1972, Thomas 1977a, Thomas-Petersen 1977, Thomas-Petersen-Cage 1981). Using of this “consequence” approach is fairly arguable in earlier theoretical models. On the one hand these earlier studies were based on cross-sectional

design, hence it is highly questionable whether these “consequences” (or rather the used variables) are the “real” effects of prisonization. Besides these logical errors in models, it is also problematic that the aforementioned “consequences” are distinct from each other and from the prisonization variable. Since the publications of Ohlin (1956) and Sykes-Messinger (1960) which depicted the contents of the inmate code, these attitudinal notions are the part of a “general inmate worldview”, which are closely related to each other. The “location” of the specific variables is neither so obvious in the developed indexes as it was supposed by many researchers frequently. The “high priority of interpersonal relationships with other inmates”, namely for the inmates, to what extent it is important to sustain the relations with their peers, logically it would be related to an aspect of inmate solidarity of the prisonization also. Behind the logic of the specific items for the measure of the “criminal identification” used in previous studies, indeed, it can be identifiable by two latent dimensions: besides the criminal identification, the association with criminals. It is probable that the oppositional attitudes toward the prison and staff and another dimension of the prisonization (i.e. manipulative relationships with the members of the prison staff) can be related to each other as well. In the case of the attitudes toward the law and the criminal justice is also problematic considering that these are the effects of the prisonization, since probably this kind of attitudes had characterized the inmates before they confined. Apart from the “consequences”, the role of the determinants was emphasized in the earlier studies. In this case it is important what way the researchers of the theoretical models tried to operationalize by variables. The only aspect of the Sykes’ “pains of imprisonment”, which was applied in studies, was the deprivation of autonomy, which was called alienation (or powerlessness). Another deprivation variable was the time factor. The items used to measure the alienation refer to the degree of a general feeling of helplessness and subordination to power, invested in others in prison context. The role of the time factor relating to prisonization was investigated in several ways. On the one hand it used the “time served” as the main time variable; the longer the time served, the higher was the degree of prisonization. On the other hand it developed another kind of variable, which takes the time remaining into consideration as well (Wheeler 1961, Atchley-McCabe 1968).

For the measuring by the importation model variables, researchers applied three main groups of variables. One of them were the main socio-demographic background variables (age, social class, marital status, educational qualification, etc.), in addition it used some indicators of criminal career (number of previous arrests, number of previous offences, age at first arrest and at first conviction, and type of crimes, and so on) for the operationalization of

the “preprison” dimension. The “postprison” dimension was measured by perceptions for the future-life expectations, and the “extraprison” factors were operationalized by the frequency of the relationships with people outside the prison walls (mails, visits).

III. HYPOTHESES

On the grounds of previous researches, and of the above mentioned inconsistencies, as well as the logical and empirical shortcomings, it is necessary to reconsider the main theoretical models and the role of the variables. My alternative theoretical model is different from the earlier ones in a manner that I applied unidimensional indexes to measure each phenomenon. One group of phenomena implies the attitudes toward the prison staff, attitudes toward the programs of the institution, the prohibition of the communication with the prison staff, contextual powerlessness), and I labelled these “attitudes toward the institution”. The second cluster of the examined phenomena was so called “criminal ideology”, of which indicators were the criminal identity, the associational preference, attitudes toward the law and criminal justice system, attitudes toward the police. The third group of variables was named “institutional adaptation strategies”, which includes the inmate cohesion, inmate isolation, and attitudes toward violence and toughness.

Besides the above mentioned attitudinal indexes, I used two additional indicators of the prisonization in behavioral sense, the number of rule infractions and institutional rewards. Beyond preparing my theoretical model, I applied some background variables, which were not grouped into importation or deprivation models, since in my point of view it is highly problematic to classify these variables whether or not they are related to each model.

H1. Hypothesis about inmate perspectives

I assume that the different inmate perspectives are related to each other. My specific assumption is that the correlations between indexes in a given category (attitudes toward the institution, criminal ideology, institutional adaptation strategy) and intercategory relationships, will be powerful.

H1.1. Namely, I assume that the indexes which refer to the attitudes toward the institution (attitudes toward the counselors, toward the prison officers, toward the

institutional programs, the prohibition of the communication with the prison staff and contextual powerlessness) will closely and directly relate to each other (*sub-hypothesis about general attitude toward the institution*).

H1.2. I also assume that views supporting the crime are prevalent in inmates' mind, so the indexes which measure them will closely and directly relate to each other (criminal identification, supporting criminal associations, rejecting of the law and of the criminal justice system, negative attitudes toward the police) (*sub-hypothesis about criminalization*).

H1.3. I suppose that there are different kinds of the adaptation strategy in the case of inmates. Two of them (inmate isolation and inmate cohesion) are related to the third one (attitudes toward the violence and toughness) in different ways. Accordingly, I assume that the strategy of inmate isolation will be inversely related to the strategy of inmate solidarity. While the association between the indexes of the inmate solidarity and of violence-toughness will be positively, and in the case of the latter and the inmate isolation this relation will be inversely (*sub-hypothesis about institutional strategies*).

H1.4. I presume that there are no significant differences between the opinions about the police and about the prison staff members (hereby attitudes toward institution). Hence I assume that the following indexes will be positively related to each other: attitudes toward the police, toward the counselors, toward the prison officers, the prohibition of the communication with the prison staff and contextual powerlessness (*sub-hypothesis about armed forces*).

H1.5. I suppose that the acceptance of the criminal ideology and the oppositional attitudes toward the institution will be directly related to each other, so the firmer the criminal worldviews in one's mind, the more oppositional they are toward the institution and its representatives (*sub-hypothesis about the association between criminalization and institutional opposition*).

H1.6. Another assumption of mine is that the different kinds of institutional strategies and negative attitudes toward the institution are related to each other. The inmate

solidarity will be related to the oppositional attitudes toward the institution and its staff, and it will be the same in the case of the strategy of loneliness (isolation) and supportive opinions about the institution. Accordingly, I presume a direct association between inmate cohesion and the attitudes toward the violence and toughness, with the attitudes toward the counselors, toward the prison officers, toward the institutional programs, the acceptance of the communication-based prohibition with the prison staff, the high level of the contextually-generated powerlessness. While, in the case of the inmate isolation these relationships will be inversely (*sub-hypothesis about relationships between institutional strategies and attitudes toward the institution*).

H1.7. Finally, I suppose that there will be relationship between the adaptation strategies and the indicators of criminalization. The inmate solidarity and the supportive attitudes toward the violence and toughness will rather be related to the criminal views, while in the case of the isolation strategy these relationships will be inversely (*sub-hypotheses about relationships between institutional strategies and criminalization*).

H2. Hypothesis about the explanation of the inmate perspectives

My second main hypothesis is that different kind of inmate perspectives will be influenced by the same or very similar factors.

H2.1. I assume that inmates who have more negative attitudes toward institution (who are more oppositional to counselors, prison officers, institutional programs, who keep to the communication-phohibited normative maxim and feel more alienated from the institution) will be the ones who are confining their punishment at maximum-security level and safety regulations, who are not working in the institution, who were not living in relationship, who are younger and who have been sentenced for violent crimes, the less educated, and who had problems in school in their preprison life, who have not or have a few relations with people outside the walls, and who feel that their family members and friends have given up on them, who think that the society will stigmatized them after getting out, and who have extended “criminal past”, finally who have more than relatively longer period from their imprisonment (*sub-hypothesis*

about the explication of the attitudes toward the institution).

H2.2. I presume that those who appear to have a firmer criminal identity, the acceptance of the criminal associations, and the oppositional attitudes toward the police, are the ones who are confining their punishment at maximum-security level and safety regulations, who are not working in the institution, who were not living with a partner, who are younger and who have been sentenced for violent crimes, the less educated, and who had problems in school in their preprison life, who have not or have a few relations with people outside the walls, and who feel that their family members and friends have given up on them, who think that the society will stigmatized them after getting out, and who have extended “criminal past”, finally who have more than relatively longer period from their imprisonment (*sub-hypothesis about the explication of the criminal views*).

H2.3. It is likely to be the case with inmates who have supportive attitudes toward the inmate cohesion and toward the violence and toughness - and inversely with inmates who chose the isolation strategy, it will not be as characteristic, - who are confining their punishment at maximum-security level and safety regulations, who are not working in the institution, who were not living in relationship, who are younger and who have been sentenced for violent crimes, the less educated, and who had problems in school in their preprison life, who have not or have a few relations with people outside the walls, and who feel that their family members and friends have given up on them, who think that the society will stigmatized them after getting out, and who have extended “criminal past”, finally, who have more than relatively longer period from their imprisonment (*sub-hypothesis about the explication of the criminal views*).

H3. Hypothesis about the rule infractions and institutional rewards

Supposing that the rule infractions in prison and institutional rewards are the opposite indicators of the inmates' behavior, I presume that the frequency of the rule infractions will be higher (inversely the number of rewards will be fewer) in the case of inmates who are confining their punishment at maximum-security level and safety regulations, who are not working in the institution, who were not living in relationship, who are younger and who

have been sentenced for violent crimes, the less educated, and who had problems in school in their preprison life, who have not or have a few relations with people outside the walls, and who feel that their family members and friends have given up on them, who think that the society will stigmatized them after getting out, and who have extended “criminal past”, finally who have more than relatively longer period from their imprisonment.

H4. Hypothesis about the relationships between the inmate perspectives and the institutional behavior

My final assumption is that the different inmate perspectives (attitudes toward the institution, criminal views, and the institutional adaptation strategies will be manifested in the inmates’ behavior. As I mentioned above, I suppose the two behavioral indicators are opposite to each other. Hence, the assumptions in the case of these indicators are contradictory. So I presume that the number of rule infractions by inmates during the period of the current sentence will be higher if they have more negative attitudes toward the institution (and toward the prison staff and institutional programs), and are more alienated from the prison organization, and support the maxim of the communicational proscription. Besides I presume that the number of the rule infractions will vary directly according to the inmates’ elements of criminal ideology (who are more identified criminally, who accept the criminal associations, and have more oppositional attitudes toward the law and the criminal justice system and its representatives, who are against the police). Last but not least, the frequency of rule infractions will be higher in the case of inmates who have more supportive attitudes toward the inmate solidarity and toward the violence and toughness. In the case of the inmate isolation I presume the inverse of the latter.

IV. DATA AND METHODS

In order to prepare my analysis, I conducted an investigation in a Strict and Medium Regime Prison in Vác between March 1 and April 7, 2010. The total sample universe was defined as all permanently assigned adult male inmates present in the institution on March 1, 2010. The definition yielded a total universe of 618 inmates. The final total number of the respondents was 368, which is 59.5 percent of the total inmate population. However, there

were cases when it was not possible to draw a sample, follow-up the data collection I lied in power to check some main features of the total population and of the respondents. Comparing these to population, it appears that the respondents are very similar to a “real” sample, thus none of the features used comparing (maximum-medium security level, safety regulations, age, marital status, educational level, type of crime, work in institution, main characteristics of the current sentence) shows any systematic distortion. I applied the most frequently used measures in my questionnaire to operationalize of the different variables. Accordingly the questionnaire contains attitude items, hypothetical conflict situations, questions about the extent of satisfaction with inmates’ life, and about relationships with people outside prison, in addition about the inmates’ past (criminal and non-criminal). All attitude indexes in this research were constructed – as were in the previous studies – by using firstly principal component analysis, and by item-to-total score technique. Any item which was not meeting these criteria was not included in the final indexes. The responses to all items were summed in each index. The lower the scores obtained on each index, the greater the degree of acceptance of the given attitude. For the analysis, the following attitude indexes were prepared: attitudes toward the police, attitudes toward the institutional programs, attitudes toward the law and criminal justice system, attitudes toward the counselors, attitudes toward the prison officers, criminal identity, criminal associational preference, contextually generated powerlessness, communication prohibited maxim from the staff, inmate cohesion, inmate isolation, and attitudes toward the violence and toughness. I distinguished two separate aspects of the postprison expectations, one of them referred to the anticipations for the the family members and friends outside the prison, the other was the perception of stigmatization after the release.

The variables of behavioral indicators, the rule infractions and the institutional rewards have been created with taking the time factor into consideration. Consequently, these data were divided by time sentenced (months). Since these two variables appear to be significantly skewed, as such it was reduced by its logarithmical transformation. Besides the above mentioned variables, I used additional variables. These are: security level (medium or maximum level), safety level, whether he works in the prison or not, cohabitation before imprisonment, age, type of crime (violent or non-violent), previous experiences with the school (schoolworks, school behavior problems, truancy), relationships with people outside the prison (number of letters received, of packages received, frequency of visitations), age at first arrest, total amount of the time served in any prison of inmate’s lifetime, the number of previous sentences, the amount of the remaining time till the release (more than six months or

less).

For testing the hypotheses I used basically two analytical techniques. For the verification of the H1 hypothesis (about the intercorrelations of the inmate perspectives) I used the Personian correlation coefficients. This technique is appropriate to study relationships between least interval measure level variables. Studiously I did not expect casual relationship between the different components of inmate perspectives, as it had been done in the most of the earlier studies. As previously mentioned, these earlier studies were based on cross-sectional design, hence they seemed to be exploring these relationships by the strenght and direction.

In case of the testing of hypotheses H2., H3. and H4., I used the ordinary least squares (OLS) regression technique. This is appropriate for analyzing the relationships between dependent and independent variables.

V. RESEARCH FINDINGS

The main empirical findings can be summarized as follows (for the relevant data see the tables in Annex):

- There are significant correlations between attitudinal indexes in the three supposed categories and across this categorization, which shows that there exists a relatively measurable coherent inmate ideology or worldview in Hungarian prison context, too.
- The correlations between the different attitude indexes in opinions about the institution (attitudes toward the counselors, toward the prison officials, toward the institutional programs, the communication-based prohibition with the prison staff members, and the contextual powerlessness), apart from the supposed relationships between the prison programs and powerlessness, are direct and significant. Accordingly, in the examined prison population, there is an opposition to the institution and its staff, which is related to negative orientation toward the institutional programs, and the manipulation of the staff members and a general feeling of alienation.
- There is a significant level of a criminal ideology amongst Hungarian prisoners. This kind of ideology implies the criminal self-image, acceptance of criminal associations, and oppositional attitudes toward the law and criminal justice system, and toward the

police. These indexes are related directly to each other.

- In the instance of the indexes of the third cluster of the inmate perspectives (adaptation strategies), the inmate cohesion and the attitudes toward the violence and toughness relate to each other directly, and the association between the collective and isolation strategies is inverse.
- Among the different clusters of inmate perspectives, there are significant correlations between indexes indicated by the general views on the institution and the elements of criminal ideology. The hypothesis which stated that there are slight differences between the opinions about the police and different groups of prison staff (particularly prison officials) in inmates' mind, has been verified. In addition, it has also been confirmed that the ones with firmer criminal ideology have more negative attitudes toward the institution and its staff members.
- The hypothesis about the relationships between the institutional adaptation strategies and the attitudes toward the institution was not or partly supported. The results connected with the intercorrelations between the inmate cohesion and inmate isolation, and institutional indexes are fairly ambiguous. The findings indicate that the lower level of each of the inmate cohesion and of the inmate isolation is correlated with the negative attitudes toward the counselors and institutional programs, while in the case of the oppositional attitudes toward the prison officers, there is no significant correlation. Beyond that, there is no achievement in showing significant relationships between the inmate solidarity and the communicational-based seclusion from prison staff. At the same time, the hypothesis about associations with the third type of institutional strategies (supportive attitudes toward the violence and toughness) and the negative attitudes toward the institution and its representatives, has been supported.
- In the cases of the collective, the isolated and the violent strategies and the different aspects of the criminal ideology, the most of my hypotheses were supported by research findings. Respondents who are more supportive to the inmate cohesion and the violent-based attitudes, are the same persons who have criminal self-image, who prefer the criminal associations, and who have more negative attitudes on criminal justice system. The isolation strategy is associated with these above mentioned factors inversely.
- The variance explained in each inmate perspectives by independent variables is not

too high. In the case of two of the twelve inmate perspectives (the inmate cohesion and the inmate isolation), was the lowest explained variance (8.7 and 12.3 percent). This rate was higher in indexes indicated criminal ideology (approximately 24-35 percent), and in the case of the general attitudes toward the institution these variances are between two of the above mentioned.

- In general, there are different independent variables appear to be the predictors of the clusters of the inmates' worldview. The most important predictor of the most of the attitudinal indexes was found to be the perception of stigmatization after the release. Thus, the hypothesis connected with relationship was supported; respondents who think about their postprison life with pessimism and who think that they will have to face the social rejection, do accept the anti-institutional and criminal components of the general inmate worldview to a greater extent. The micro-level aspect of the future life expectations is related to the opposite direction of different elements of inmate perspectives. It seems that the expectations for the family members and friends do not decrease, rather increase the acceptance of the oppositional and antisocial perspectives.
- There are different predictors of the two distinct behavioral indicators (rule violations and institutional rewards). In the case of the rule infractions the total amount the variance explained by all inmate perspectives was 34.8 percent, in the case of institutional, this rate was only 20.8 percent. The results of regression analysis show that respondents who commit more rule violations are the ones who are sentenced in stricter safety level conditions, who do not work in prison, the younger, who had numerous previous, and who have longer time of the time remaining from the current sentence. It is likely to have more institutional rewards, in case an inmate served his sentences in moderate security and safety level conditions, if he works in the institution, if he is visited frequently by his associates, and if he was younger at the first arrest when the crime was committed, and the remaining time is longer than six months.
- The hypothesis regarding the relationships between the attitudinal and behavioral indicators was not or partly supported by the data. Generally, there are no significant associations between the inmate perspectives and the behavior in institution. The total amount variance explained by all ideological components was very low (10.5 percent) in the case of the rule infractions, and this was lower in the case of the prison rewards (6.2 percent). The findings are ambiguous, because the acceptance and preference of

the criminal association is an important predictor of the highest number of the negative and positive sanctions.

- Respondents who commit more official rule violations, are the ones who find the communication-based seclusion from the staff members important, and who feel the contextually-generated powerlessness to a lesser degree, and who are more isolated from other prisoners. The one and only attitudinal predictor of the institutional rewards (beyond the above mentioned relationship with the criminal associations) is the inmate solidarity. This relationship is opposite to the assumed direction, which indicates that the acceptance of the maxim of the inmate cohesion, the more it will be rewarded.

MAJOR REFERENCES

- ALPERT, Geoffrey P. [1979]: Patterns of Change in Prisonization: A Longitudinal Analysis. In: *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, vol 6., No.2: 159-173.
- BARAK-GLANTZ, Israel L. [1983]: Patterns of Prisoner Misconduct: Toward a Behavioral Test of Prisonization. In: *Sociological Focus*, Vol.16., No.2.: 129-146.
- CAO, Liqun – ZHAO, Jihong – VAN DINE, Steve [1997]: Prison Disciplinary Tickets: A Test of the Deprivation and Importation Models. In: *Journal of Criminal Justice*, Vol.25., No.2.: 103-113.
- CLEMMER, Donald [1940/1965]: *The Prison Community*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- DHAMI, Mandeep K. – AYTON, Peter – LOEWENSTEIN, George [2007]: Adaptation to Imprisonment: Indigenous or Imported? In: *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, Vol. 34., No.8. : 1085-1100.
- GARABEDIAN, Peter G. [1963]: Social Roles and Processes of Socialization in the Prison Community. In: *Social Problems*, Vol.11., No.2.: 139-152.
- GILLESPIE, Wayne F. [2003]: *Prisonization: Individual and Institutional Factors Affecting Inmate Conduct*. New York: LFB Scholarly Publishing.
- HUSZÁR László [1997]: ...és bűnhődés: A magyar börtönlakók szociológiai vizsgálata. Kandidátusi értekezés. Budapest: ELTE.
- IRWIN, John [1970]: *The Felon*. New York: Practice Hall.
- IRWIN, John – CRESSEY, Donald R. [1962]: Thieves, Convicts and the Inmate Culture. In: *Social Problems*, Vol.10., No.2.: 142-155.
- JIANG, Shanhe. – FISHER-GIORLANDO, Marianne [2002]: Inmate Misconduct: A Test of the Deprivation, Importation, and Situational Models. In: *Prison Journal*, Vol.82., No.3.: 335-358.
- MILLER, Walter B. [1958]: Lower Class Culture as a Generating Milieu for Gang Delinquency. In: *Journal of Social Issues*, Vol.14., No.3.: 5-19.
- OHLIN, Lloyd E. [1956]: *Sociology and the Field of Corrections*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

- PATERLINE, Brent A. – PETERSEN, David M. [1999]: Structural and Social Psychological Determinants of Prisonization. In: *Journal of Criminal Justice*, Vol.27., No.5.: 427-441.
- SCHWARTZ, Barry. [1973]: Peer versus Authority Effects in a Correctional Community. In: *Criminology*, Vol.11., No.2.: 233-257.
- SCHWARTZ, Barry. [1971]: Pre-institutional vs. Situational Influence in a Correctional Community. In: *Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology and Police Science*, Vol.62., No.4.: 532-542.
- SYKES, Gresham M: [1958]: *The Society of Captives: A Study of a Maximum Security Prison*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- SYKES, Gresham M. – MESSINGER, Sheldon L. [1960]: The Inmate Social System. In: *Theoretical studies in the social organization of the prison*. New York: Social Science Research Council. p. 5-19.
- THOMAS, Charles W. [1971]: Determinants of Prisonization: A Test of Two Analytical Perspectives on Adult Resocialization in Total Institutions. Ph.D. dissertation. University of Kentucky.
- THOMAS, Charles W. [1977a]: Prisonization and its Consequences: An Examination of Socialization in a Coercive Setting. In: *Sociological Focus*, Vol.10., No.1.: 53-68.
- THOMAS, Charles W. [1973]: Prisonization or Resocialization?: A Study of External Factors Associated with the Impact of Confinement. In: *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, Vol.10., No.1.: 13-21.
- THOMAS, Charles W. [1977b]: Theoretical Perspectives on Prisonization: A Comparison of the Importation and Deprivation Models. In: *Journal of Criminal Law & Criminology*, Vol.68., No.1.: 135-145.
- THOMAS, Charles W. [1970]: Toward a More Inclusive Model of the Inmate Contraculture. In: *Criminology*, Vol.8., No.3.: 251-263.
- THOMAS, Charles W. – FOSTER, Samuel C. [1972]: Prisonization in the Inmate Contraculture. In: *Social Problems*, Vol.20., No.2.: 229-239.
- THOMAS, Charles W. – PETERSEN, David M. [1977]: *Prison Organization and Inmate Subcultures*. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill
- THOMAS, Charles W. – PETERSEN, David M. – CAGE, Robin J. [1981]: A Comparative Organizational Analysis of Prisonization. In: *Criminal Justice Review*, Vol.6., No.1.: 36-43.

- THOMAS, Charles W. – ZINGRAFF, Matthew T. [1976]: Organizational Structure as a Determinant of Prisonization: An Analysis of the Consequences of Alienation. In: *Pacific Sociological Review*, Vol.19., No.1.: 98-116.
- TROYER, Joseph G. – FREASE, Dean E. [1975]: Attitude Change in a Western Canadian Penitentiary. In: *Canadian Journal of Criminology and Corrections*, Vol.17., No.3.: 98-116.
- WELLFORD, Charles [1967]: Factors Associated with Adoption of the Inmate Code: A Study of Normative Socialization. In: *Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology, and Police Science*, Vol.58. , No.2.: 197-203.
- WHEELER, Stanton [1961]: Socialization in Correctional Communities. In: *American Sociological Review*, Vol.26., No.5.: 697-712.
- ZINGRAFF, Matthew T. [1975]: Prisonization as an Inhibitor of Effective Resocialization. In: *Criminology*, Vol.13., No.3.: 366-388.

AUTHOR'S RELATED PUBLICATIONS

Studies, articles:

Papp Gábor (2002): Kriminálstatisztikai indikátorok, mutatószámok. Központi Statisztikai Hivatal, Budapest.

Papp Gábor (2003): Társadalmi problémák. In: Bukodi Erzsébet (szerk.): *Társadalmi Helyzetkép 2002*. Központi Statisztikai Hivatal, Budapest. p. 145-164.

Papp Gábor (2004): Bűnözés. In: Kacsuk Zoltán (szerk.): *Fiatalok a felnőtt válás küszöbén*. Központi Statisztikai Hivatal, Budapest. p. 153-166.

Papp Gábor (2004): Bűnözés és társadalmi kirekesztettség. In: Monostori Judit (szerk.): *A szegénység és a társadalmi kirekesztődés folyamata*. Központi Statisztikai Hivatal, Budapest. p. 175-195.

Papp Gábor (2004): Társadalmi problémák. In: Bukodi Erzsébet (szerk.): *Társadalmi Helyzetkép 2003*. Központi Statisztikai Hivatal, Budapest. p. 157-172.

Papp Gábor (2005): A jogerősen elítéltek társadalomstatisztikai vizsgálata, 1990-2003. Központi Statisztikai Hivatal, Budapest.

Papp Gábor (2006): Társadalmi problémák. In: Harcsa István (szerk.): *Társadalmi helyzetkép 2005*. Központi Statisztikai Hivatal, Budapest. p. 129-146.

Papp Gábor (2007): Bűnügyi helyzet. In: Polónyi Katalin-Székely Gáborné (szerk.): *Társadalmi ellátórendszerek*. Központi Statisztikai Hivatal, Budapest. p. 115-121.

Papp Gábor (2007): Fiatalkori bűnözés és demográfia. In: Both Emőke-Deres Petronella (szerk.): *Kriminológiai Közlemények 64*. Magyar Kriminológiai Társaság, Budapest. p. 232-239.

Papp Gábor (2009): A prizonizációs jelenség elméleti háttere – kritikai megközelítésben. In: *Börtönügyi Szemle*. 2. szám. p. 29-60.

Papp Gábor (2009): Bűnözés, alkohol- és kábítószerfogyasztás, öngyilkosság Magyarországon a rendszerváltás után. In: Borbíró Andrea-Kerecsi Klára (szerk.): *A kriminálpolitika és a társadalmi bűnmegelőzés kézikönyve*. Igazságügyi és Rendészeti Minisztérium, Budapest. p. 37-58.

Gábor Papp – Gábor Scheiring (2009): Fear of Crime and Confidence in Justice in Hungary. In: Anniina Jokinen-Elina Ruuskinen-Maria Yordanova-Dimitar Markov-Miriana Ilcheva (eds.) *Review of Need: Indicators of Public Confidence in Criminal Justice for Policy Assessment*. HEUNI, Helsinki. p. 93-115.

Participation in conferences:

Fiatalkori bűnözés és demográfia. Országos Kriminológiai Intézet. Budapest, 2006. szeptember 16.

A bűnözés és a vándorlás kapcsolata. Andorka Rudolf Társadalomtudományi Konferencia. Budapest, 2007. október 19.

A bűnözés mérésének problémái. VI. Országos Kriminológiai Vándorgyűlés. Miskolc, 2008. október 16.

ANNEX

TABLE 1. THE PERSONIAN CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS FOR THE DIFFERENT INMATE PERSPECTIVES

		X1	X2	X3	X4	X5	X6	X7	X8	X9	X10	X11	X12
Attitudes toward the institution	Attitudes toward the counselors (X1)	1											
	Attitudes toward the prison officers (X2)	0.611**	1										
	Attitudes toward the institutional programs (X3)	0.385**	0.245**	1									
	Prohibition of communication with the prison staff (X4)	0.353**	0.541**	0.119*	1								
	Contextually generated alienation (X5)	0.453**	0.554**	0.073	0.339**	1							
Criminal ideology	Criminal identity (X6)	0.289**	0.366**	0.323**	0.463**	0.148**	1						
	Associational preference (X7)	0.319**	0.266**	0.330**	0.275**	0.083	0.505**	1					
	Attitudes toward the police(X8)	0.286**	0.537**	0.081	0.525**	0.369**	0.347**	0.215**	1				
	Attitudes toward the law and the criminal justice system (X9)	0.226**	0.424**	0.168**	0.550**	0.281**	0.648**	0.285**	0.563**	1			
Adaptation strategies	Inmate cohesion (X10)	-0.151**	0.000	-0.116	0.275**	-0.042	0.188**	0.168**	0.194**	0.264**	1		
	Inmate isolation (X11)	-0.105*	0.015	-0.328**	0.064	0.215**	-0.158**	-0.431**	0.140**	0.099	-0.105*	1	
	Attitudes toward the violence and the toughness (X12)	0.215**	0.304**	0.141**	0.421**	0.168**	0.542**	0.261**	0.400**	0.512**	0.272**	-0.009	1

** Correlation is significant at 0.01 level (2-tailed)

** Correlation is significant at 0.05 level (2-tailed)

TABLE 2. INMATE PERSPECTIVES REGRESSED ON INDEPENDENT VARIABLES (STANDARDIZED REGRESSION COEFFICIENTS)

	Attitudes toward the institution					Criminal ideology				Adaptation strategies		
	Attitudes toward the counselors	Attitudes toward the prison officers	Attitudes toward the institutional programs	Prohibition of the communication with prison staff	Contextually generated alienation	Criminal identity	Associational preference	Attitudes toward the police	Attitudes toward the law and criminal justice system	Inmate cohesion	Inmate isolation	Attitudes toward the violence and the toughness
Prison security level	0.022	-0.011	-0.045	-0.045	0.075	0.014	0.042	-0.013	0.086	-0.048	0.033	0.018
Safety regulation (level 2)	0.092	0.052	-0.072	0.065	0.128**	-0.122**	-0.057	0.128**	-0.009	-0.023	0.090	0.003
Safety regulation (level 4)	0.042	-0.026	0.026	0.004	-0.075	0.031	0.038	-0.051	-0.024	0.013	-0.073	-0.051
Work in institution	-0.068	-0.003	-0.026	-0.009	0.088	0.044	-0.077	-0.015	0.057	0.041	0.093	0.035
Cohabitation before imprisonment	-0.050	-0.076	-0.080	-0.022	-0.041	0.011	0.046	-0.050	0.033	0.062	0.020	-0.086
Age	0.000	-0.151*	-0.019	-0.243**	0.008	-0.193*	-0.148	-0.060	-0.101	-0.138	0.168*	-0.157
Type of crime (violent or not)	0.115*	0.059	-0.016	0.036	0.088	-0.035	0.019	-0.059	-0.037	-0.012	-0.021	0.087
Education level	-0.034	0.003	0.016	0.025	-0.078	0.004	-0.032	0.043	0.064	0.039	0.059	-0.003
Schoolworks	0.032	0.062	0.048	-0.006	-0.042	0.003	0.030	-0.030	0.060	0.040	-0.013	0.057
School behavior	0.177**	-0.002	0.076	0.001	0.077	-0.020	0.161**	0.011	0.031	-0.096	-0.034	0.046
Truancy	0.010	0.021	-0.105	0.075	0.112*	0.166**	0.120*	0.131*	0.104	0.078	0.002	0.040
Number of packages received	-0.060	-0.081	-0.023	-0.053	-0.031	0.004	0.011	-0.050	-0.034	-0.162**	0.005	0.073
Number of letters received	0.117*	0.042	0.082	0.120*	0.071	0.106*	0.022	0.111*	0.096	0.113*	-0.055	0.133**
Frequency of visitations	0.030	0.042	0.073	0.037	-0.062	-0.046	0.063	-0.015	-0.123*	0.083	-0.113*	0.038
Post-release expectations (micro-level: family and friends) (6 items)	0.019	-0.028	0.071	-0.101*	-0.145**	-0.057	-0.056	-0.150**	-0.166**	-0.102	-0.299**	-0.142**
Perception of stigmatization (6 items)	0.319**	0.427**	0.235**	0.307**	0.286**	0.298**	0.196**	0.350**	0.267**	-0.060	0.008	0.191**
Age at first arrest	-0.022	-0.060	0.053	0.177*	0.042	-0.072	-0.099	-0.058	-0.014	0.131	-0.022	0.031
Total amount the time served in prison	-0.018	0.057	-0.064	0.123	-0.015	0.157*	-0.066	0.031	0.116	-0.033	0.018	0.130
Number of previous sentences	0.070	-0.013	0.180*	0.100	0.030	0.063	0.009	0.014	0.072	0.143*	-0.002	0.098
The amount of the remaining time till the release (more than 6 months or less)	0.019	0.031	-0.001	-0.003	0.011	-0.037	0.031	-0.002	-0.011	0.012	0.005	-0.021
R²	20.2	27.2	12.3	19.9	16.0	34.6	24.3	25.7	24.4	8.7	12.3	20.8

** Significant at 0.01 level

* Significant at 0.05 level

TABLE 3. RULE VIOLATIONS AND INSTITUTIONAL REWARDS REGRESSED ON INDEPENDENT VARIABLES (STANDARDIZED REGRESSION COEFFICIENTS)

	Rule infractions	Institutional rewards
Prison security level	0.008	-0.120*
Safety regulation (level 2)	-0.124**	0.106*
Safety regulation (level 4)	0.154**	-0.010
Work in institution	0.212**	-0.254**
Cohabitation before imprisonment	-0.037	-0.008
Age	-0.313**	0.076
Type of crime (violent or not)	-0.041	-0.054
Education level	0.008	-0.061
Schoolworks	-0.003	-0.011
School behavior	0.030	0.010
Truancy	-0.013	-0.031
Number of packages received	-0.044	-0.004
Number of letters received	-0.015	-0.001
Frequency of visitations	-0.022	0.108*
Post-release expextations (micro-level: family and friends) (6 items)	-0.047	0.002
Perception of stigmatization (6 items)	-0.030	0.037
Age at first arrest	-0.035	-0.155*
Number of previous sentences	0.141*	-0.069
The amount of the remaining time till the release (more than 6 months or less)	-0.237**	-0.189**
R²	34.8	20.8

** Significant at 0.01 level

** Significant at 0.05 level

TABLE 3. RULE VIOLATIONS AND INSTITUTIONAL REWARDS REGRESSED ON INMATE PERSPECTIVES (STANDARDIZED REGRESSION COEFFICIENTS)

		Rule in fractions	Institutional rewards
Attitudes toward the institution	Attitudes toward the counselors	-0.051	0.033
	Attitudes toward the prison officers	-0.056	0.068
	Attitudes toward the institutional programs	0.039	-0.032
	Prohibition of the communication with prison staff	0.205**	0.047
	Contextually generated alienation	-0.158*	-0.076
Criminal ideology	Criminal identity	0.029	-0.145
	Associational preference	0.148*	0.153*
	Attitudes toward the police	0.047	0.106
	Attitudes toward the law and criminal justice system	0.050	-0.128
Adaptation strategies	Inmate cohesion	-0.035	-0.114*
	Inmate isolation	0.162**	0.090
	Attitudes toward the violence and the toughness	0.006	0.023
R²		10.5	6.2

** Significant at 0.01 level; ** Significant at 0.05 level