INFORMATION TO USERS

This material was produced from a microfilm copy of the original document. While the most advanced technological means to photograph and reproduce this document have been used, the quality is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help you understand markings or patterns which may appear on this reproduction.

1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting thru an image and duplicating adjacent pages to insure you complete continuity.

2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a large round black mark, it is an indication that the photographer suspected that the copy may have moved during exposure and thus cause a blurred image. You will find a good image of the page in the adjacent frame.

3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., was part of the material being photographed the photographer followed a definite method in "sectioning" the material. It is customary to begin photoing at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue photoing from left to right in equal sections with a small overlap. If necessary, sectioning is continued again — beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.

4. The majority of users indicate that the textual content is of greatest value, however, a somewhat higher quality reproduction could be made from "photographs" if essential to the understanding of the dissertation. Silver prints of "photographs" may be ordered at additional charge by writing the Order Department, giving the catalog number, title, author and specific pages you wish reproduced.

5. PLEASE NOTE: Some pages may have indistinct print. Filmed as received.

Xerox University Microfilms

300 North Zeeb Road
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106

78-4806

SCHAFER, Nancy Eike, 1940-
A DESCRIPTIVE STUDY OF POLICIES AND PRACTICES RELATED TO THE VISITING OF PRISONERS IN CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTIONS.

The University of Michigan, Ph.D., 1977
Sociology, criminology

University Microfilms International, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106

A DESCRIPTIVE STUDY OF POLICIES AND PRACTICES RELATED TO THE VISITING OF PRISONERS IN CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTIONS

by
Nancy Eike Schafer

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
(Education)
in The University of Michigan
1977

Doctoral Committee:

Professor William M. Cave, Chairman
Associate Professor Lawrence S. Berlin
Professor Finley Carpenter (deceased)
Associate Professor Mark Chesler
Assistant Professor William F. Dunifon

DEDICATION

To Stacey and Jenny Schafer who were present at every stage of the research and writing of this dissertation, and to my mother, Dorothy Rhodes Eike, who wanted to be.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Without the support and assistance of many people, this research would not have been completed. I am most grateful to Dr. William M. Cave for his long distance guidance and assurance, and to the other members of the committee for their thoughtful consideration and helpful suggestions.

Special thanks go to Mr. Karl Gottesman for his encouragement, assistance, and able editing, and for listening carefully and commenting thoughtfully.

I must also thank the superintendents of "Central" and "Rural" and Mr. Howard Ay Gibbs, and the other members of the Prisoners Representative Committee for overseeing the distribution of some of the questionnaires.

Judy Jordan, Ken Stevenson, and John Baldwin, who like computers, contributed their time and attention, and my daughters helped in every way they could.

PREFACE

> I'm not gonna get institutionalized. I don't want to lose my hatred of this damn place. Once you lose the hatred, then the can's got you. You can do all the time in the world and it doesn't bug you . . . . No. Outside is real; inside is a lie. Outside is one kind of life, inside is another. And you make them the same if you lose your hate of prison.
>
> --Piri Thomas, Down These Mean Streets, pg. 263.

There are approximately 250,000 men and women currently incarcerated in the nation's correctional institutions. The vast majority of them are from the lowest socio-economic levels, most are poorly educated, and many are members of minority groups; they are, for the most part, the least skilled and least employable of all Americans. More than ninety percent of those who are behind bars today will ultimately be released. Soon after release the majority of them will commit acts which will return them to the correctional system.

It is the task of correctional agencies to intervene in this cycle. None has been particularly effective. Jails and prisons are called upon to both restrain and rehabilitate. Restraint involves confinement both to and within the institution; rehabilitation involves making useful citizens out of convicted criminals by modifying their attitudes and values and by providing them with marketable skills. Correctional facilities have been

notably successful at restraint, remarkably unsuccessful at rehabilitation. According to Nathan Leopold (1969), who spent nearly fifty years in prison, those persons who do become rehabilitated, do so in spite of the prison, not because of it.

The following study is colored by the belief that correctional institutions, by their very nature, cannot induce criminals to adopt conventional life styles. The organization, operation and policies of these institutions create a social climate which encourages behavior specific to the institution, behavior which is often inappropriate in the external community. More important, the enforced isolation of their residents from the external community insures their failure. It is difficult to learn how to function in a society from which one is totally isolated; it is nearly impossible when one is simultaneously learning how to function within the institutional environment.

This investigation is firmly based on a conviction that individuals are strongly influenced by their environments, and that in the environment of the total institution the influences are such that they may erode or replace skills needed for functioning in the larger society. One way to diminish the effects of these environmental influences is to increase the resident's contact with the external community. Frequent visits with family and friends help to provide this contact. In addition, families and friends of prisoners may motivate them to

assume conventional attitudes, encourage them to learn skills which will improve their ability to function lawfully in society, supply opportunities to practice conventional social roles during visits, and provide emotional support both during incarceration and after release.

While there is both theoretical and empirical evidence to support the rehabilitative impact of visits, humane considerations have also influenced correctional authorities to view the visit in a new light. Until recently the visit was viewed as a privilege to be granted or denied the prisoner. Since World War II the medical model of offender rehabilitation dominated corrections. Among the variety of psychological treatment technologies employed were some which emphasized behaviorism. The visiting privilege had a place in behavior modification programs and could be earned by improved behavior and lost when the behavior was unacceptable. The visit has recently begun to be viewed not as a privilege, but as a right of the convicted offender, as well as a valuable rehabilitative tool.

This study, though primarily concerned with the theoretical and empirical foundation of correctional visits, is also influenced by humane considerations. It is the conviction of the author that visits are not only a right of the prisoner, but also <u>a right of the prisoner's family</u>, and that their access to him or her at reasonable times and intervals is constitutionally guaranteed.

The institution ought not to have the authority to punish the prisoner's family for his or her institutional behavior.

The following study is descriptive in nature. It is not based on any particular theory of criminology or of correctional treatment. Neither crime causation nor the vagaries of the American criminal justice system are relevant to the study. The theories and the data are concerned solely with post-conviction problems and some possible solutions. Underlying the interpretation of the data is a firm conviction that human dignity should be permitted prisoners, regardless of their crime.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

DEDICATION ii

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS iii

PREFACE iv

LIST OF TABLES viii

LIST OF APPENDICES xi

CHAPTER

I. INTRODUCTION 1

II. INSTITUTIONALIZATION 12

III. INSTITUTIONALIZATION AND RESOCIALIZATION 29

IV. VISITING IN CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTIONS 43

V. NATIONWIDE SURVEY OF VISITING PRACTICES 58

VI. SURVEY OF VISITORS 92

VII. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS 126

APPENDIX 145

BIBLIOGRAPHY 155

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE

1. INSTITUTIONS AT THE EXTREMES OF THE VISITING SPECTRUM ... 67
2. TOTAL VISITING HOURS PER WEEK BY TYPE OF FACILITY 70
3. VISITING ROOM CAPACITIES OF ALL INSTITUTIONS 73
4. INSTITUTIONS WITH THE LOWEST VISITING ROOM CAPACITIES (VRC) 75
5. CAPACITY OF VISITING AREAS IN OLDEST INSTITUTIONS 78
6. INSTITUTIONS WITH THE HIGHEST VISITING ROOM CAPACITIES .. 79
7. NUMBER OF VISITS PERMITTED PER RESIDENT PER MONTH 82
8. PERMITTED LENGTH OF VISIT 84
9. PERMITTED LENGTH OF VISIT BY MILEAGE 87
10. VISITING ENCOURAGEMENT-TOLERANCE INDEX 90
11. RELATIONSHIP OF VISITORS TO PRISONERS, BY INSTITUTION.... 98
12. FREQUENCY OF VISITS (WIVES AND FEMALE FRIENDS)..... 100
13. FREQUENCY OF VISIT (PARENTS-SIBLINGS)..... 103
14. AGE OF VISITORS 105
15. FREQUENCY OF VISIT BY AGE OF VISITOR 106
16. FREQUENCY OF VISITS BY INSTITUTION 108
17. ONE-WAY MILEAGE, EACH INSTITUTION 110
18. FREQUENCY BY MILEAGE 112
19. CUMULATIVE ADJUSTED FREQUENCY (%) FREQUENCY BY MILEAGE.. 114
20. MILES TRAVELED BY FREQUENCY OF VISIT 115

LIST OF TABLES (continued)

21. INCOME OF VISITORS 117

22. INCOME BY MILES TRAVELED FOR VISIT 119

23. INCOME BY FREQUENCY OF VISIT 120

24. STATE VARIATIONS IN VISITING SCHEDULES 148

25. INSTITUTIONS RANKED BY VISITING ROOM CAPACITY (MIDDLE RANGE) 149

26. MILES TRAVELED BY FREQUENCY OF VISIT 154

LIST OF APPENDICES

APPENDIX A: QUESTIONNAIRES 145

APPENDIX B: SUPPLEMENTARY DATA 148

CHAPTER I. INTRODUCTION

It is the purpose of this study to establish a body of information about visiting policies and practices in the nation's correctional institutions with a view toward providing a foundation on which in-depth studies can be based. The literature which deals with the subject of visiting is not abundant. Authors often concern themselves with single institutions or certain types of visitors. It is difficult to generalize from this research and, since visiting policies vary from institution to institution, futile to make recommendations based upon it. More information about the current status of visitation in many correctional institutions and about the people who visit is necessary. This study is concerned with both the visit and the visitor.

Certain developments in the area of corrections provide a basis for investigating the subject from the broad perspective used here: disillusionment with the "rehabilitative ideal"; empirical evidence which suggests that visits influence parole success;and a new interest in the constitutional rights of the convicted.

For the last generation rehabilitation has been considered one of the goals of correctional systems. To this end a vast number and variety of programs have been instituted in correctional

facilities around the country. Where these programs have been evaluated, usually on the basis of parole success or reduced recidivism, they have been found to be, at best, ineffective. Bailey (1966) analyzed the outcomes of 100 treatment studies and found the results less than encouraging. In a thorough evaluation of the benefits for prisoners of group counseling, Kassebaum, Ward and Wilner (1971) did not find such programs effective. Glaser (1964), and Hood and Sparks (1970), and Robison and Smith (1971) have all found little evidence of the value of "rehabilitation programs."

Such studies, as well as continued high estimates of the rate of recidivism, have led many penologists to become disillusioned with the rehabilitative ideal. On June 6, 1976, the New York Times reported that Connecticut's Commissioner of Corrections, John R. Manson, "long an advocate of rehabilitation" has, after six years in office, "reluctantly concluded" that rehabilitation does not work (p. 23). As a result the state is curtailing many of its treatment programs. Corrections Magazine (1975) devoted an issue to the subject "Is Rehabilitation Dead?"

The current investigation is opposed to the wholesale abandonment of the rehabilitative ideal. Note is made of the fact that much that falls under the label of rehabilitation is but a fragment in the institutional life of the offender, and thus has minimal effect. To counteract this, a commitment to "total treatment" is desirable and with it a commitment to the goal of

releasing into the community at the end of their sentences individuals who will not commit further crimes. This study rejects the term "rehabilitation" as descriptive of this goal.

As a generic term, rehabilitation implies increasing or improving the individual's ability to function in his society, most usually through the acquisition of new or better skills. Although rehabilitation thus defined has a place in corrections, it does not serve to define the major changes in values and attitudes necessary to direct the offender away from a criminal commitment. The term "resocialization" has been chosen for the purpose of this study as encompassing all of these changes, including the acquisition of new skills.

Resocialization implies a process directed toward changing the individual's orientation from a life style committed to crime to one committed to conventional social roles. Selected as the most appropriate definition of the term is that of Brim (1966), emphasizing "the acquisition of the habits, beliefs, attitudes and motives which enable a person to perform satisfactorily the roles expected of him in his society." (p. 5) This definition suggests the correction of early (childhood) socialization patterns which may have led toward deviance. If one can accept, in whole or in part, the theories of Sutherland, Lemert, and Becker as explanations for criminal behavior, then a resocializing process is necessary to change the criminal orientations of some, perhaps most, prisoners.

Such resocialization is difficult to achieve in a correctional setting. There is a fundamental contradiction inherent in the suggestion that an imprisoned individual can learn how to function in a society from which he is totally isolated. Contacts with the external community must therefore be maintained. The prison visitor is one such contact.

The research of Holt and Miller (1972) in California and of Glaser (1964) in the federal system, has indicated that successful completion of parole is related in a significant way to the continued support of the prisoner's family during the period of his incarceration. Others have found visiting to have a positive effect on the offender's institutional behavior (Scudder, 1954; Hopper, 1969; et al). Although these studies may not be definitive, they do raise questions about the opportunities provided in correctional facilities for maintaining relationships with family and friends through policies related to visiting.

Whether based on parole success or institutional behavior, many correctional authorities have begun to view visits as rehabilitative, and attitudes toward visitation have begun to change. In addition the courts, after years of silence on the subject, have begun to consider and affirm the prisoner's right of access (Carothers v. Follette, 1970; Washington Post v. Kleindienst, 1972). Although visits as such have not received a high degree of the courts' attention, a federal court in California required San Quentin officials to permit his German "pen pal" to visit one death row prisoner (Duren v. Procunier, 1972). Some correctional

authorities anticipate further court decisions in this area and are already attempting compliance. The National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals (1975) has argued that visits are a constitutionally guaranteed right of prisoners and recommended in Standard 2.17 that "correctional authorities should not merely tolerate visiting but encourage it" (p. 68).

The present investigation assumes that visiting policies and procedures are indicative of the extent to which correctional facilities encourage and facilitate visitation, and it is from this perspective that the problem is approached. An attempt is made to analyze obstacles to increased visiting as well as surveying the opportunities provided. Standard 2.17 is used as a basis for comparing variations in institutional policies and as a criterion for evaluation.

The investigation was exploratory in nature. Visiting policies and practices were surveyed by means of a questionnaire (Appendix A) mailed to state correctional facilities for adult felons throughout the country. Institutions for misdemeanants were excluded because of the vast number of institutions and the county jurisdictions under which most of them operate.

The study was limited to institutions which house adults, in part because of the increased numbers involved in considering juveniles, as well as the problem of definitions and the difficulty of making comparisons. Adults have available to them a larger number of potentially significant relationships than do juveniles--friends of the opposite sex, spouses, and children, in

addition to parents and other relatives. The friends of adult prisoners have, by and large, more freedom of movement than do the friends of persons under age 18. Also, adults serve longer sentences, which makes the maintenance of relationships both more difficult and more important. Inquiries have therefore been directed to those institutions in the Directory of the American Correctional Association (1976) which are listed as without age limits.

Geographical considerations were instrumental in excluding federal institutions from the survey. Each federal facility may draw its population from all states of the Union; the distances involved for some visitors affect visit frequency and make comparison difficult. Also excluded from the survey were reception and diagnostic centers where new admissions are evaluated and assigned. The prisoner's stay in these facilities is quite brief (four to eight weeks is usual), and in most states visits are not permitted until institutional assignment has been made. The questionnaires were mailed to individual institutions rather than to state departments of corrections, because visiting policies often vary from institution to institution within the state.

The survey examined the practical considerations of maximizing the prisoner's contact with significant others, with particular attention to the obstacles of distance, space and time. The practical problems of budget and personnel were not considered, since it was assumed that in any institution priorities are established and personnel deployed in accordance with these.

When the survey was initiated the chief obstacle appeared to be distance; prisons are usually characterized as geographically isolated. In order to analyze distance as an obstacle to visiting, three basic assumptions have been made: 1) the prison population tends to be drawn from those communities in which the bulk of crimes are committed; 2) the prisoners' families and friends are likely to reside in or near these areas; and 3) in states which have more than one correctional facility, institutional assignment is made when possible on the basis of the facility's proximity to the prisoner's home community. (Data from the New Jersey Correctional Master Plan (1976) support these assumptions.) Distance was therefore assessed in relation to the high crime areas of each state.

The problem of space was explored in terms of the institution's visiting room capacity relative to its total population. Although it appears logical to conclude that the larger institutions (measured by population) will have the greatest visiting room capacity, it is also possible that, due to changes in prison priorities and the increased mobility of Americans, newer institutions devote more space to visiting than do older ones. An attempt is therefore made to correlate the institution's age and size with its visiting room capacity.

The problem of time as related to correctional visitation has two components: the visiting schedule; and the permitted length of visit. Visiting schedules (days and hours) were

requested in the survey. For easier comparison schedules are converted to total hours per week (days x hours). An attempt was made to analyze the factors which relate to generous or restricted schedules and those which relate to variations in the permitted length of visit.

In addition visiting policies and practices were examined for possible regional variations, and comparisons were made among different types of facilities to determine differentials related to type of population, security designation, etc.

In line with Standard 2.17 (National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals, 1975) an encouragement-tolerance index was devised, based on institutional efforts to facilitate visits. The ratings give some indication of the current status of visiting.

A further aspect of the present study was the examination of the obstacles to visiting from the perspective of the visitors. To this end questionnaires were distributed to visitors in the lobbies of two prisons in the same state. The prisons were selected for their dissimilarities: one of them is centrally located and highly accessible (Central); the other is located in a much more isolated area and is relatively inaccessible (Rural).

Central is located in the capital city and can be easily reached by car, train or bus from most of the highly populated areas of the state. The physical plant dates in part back to the 1830's, and it is situated in what was then a rural area, but

is now central city. It is separated by a street's width from the residential buildings which surround the prison. The other prison is in the southeast corner of the state, is considerably newer, and is geographically more isolated and less accessible.

The locations of the two institutions, their visiting room capacities, and their visiting schedules are very different. The visitor survey attempted to discover how these differences affect visiting. The two institutions were compared on the basis of several factors reported by visitors, including distance traveled for a visit (in miles), frequency of visits, and their personal characteristics. Distance and frequency were cross-tabulated in an effort to determine the importance of distance as an obstacle to regular visitation. The relationship of the visitor and the prisoner, and the age, sex and income of the visitors were listed and examined for possible indications of the sources of family support and influence.

While the object of the study is the establishment of a body of current information about visiting and visitors, the study itself is based upon some widely accepted theories. Three of the following chapters are devoted to building a theoretical framework for perceiving visit and visitors as important to the resocializing goal of corrections. One basic consideration is that isolation from the community erodes one's ability to function within it. Chapter II deals with the interrelated problems of isolation and institutionalization. Included is an analysis of the prison as a total institution according to the definition of Goffman (1961)

and a review of the literature on isolation and institutionalization. The works of several criminologists are reviewed including Clemmer's theory of prisonization (1940) and Sykes' discussion of the "pains of imprisonment" (1958). In addition to the scholarly literature, attention is given to the self-reporting of prisoners as it concerns isolation and change.

Because of the physical and psychological isolation of imprisonment, the personal changes which prisoners undergo tend to be directed toward successful functioning within the institution. In Chapter III a case is made for viewing institutionalization as a process of resocialization . The socialization theories of Mead, Cooley, Parsons, and others are used to draw an analogy between socialization processes and those processes which lead, in prisons and other total institutions, to institutionalization. The theories of Brim and Wheeler (1966) form a basis for viewing visitation of prisoners as a vehicle for reducing the impact of institutionalization through increasing contact with the external community and providing role practice during incarceration. Visitors thus function as informal resocializing agents.

Chapter IV reviews the literature on prison visiting and visitors. Included is the available empirical evidence which affirms the importance of visits and the potential resocializing impact of visitors. The descriptive literature on the families of visitors is reviewed, and studies of prisoner's families form a foundation for selecting the personal characteristics of visitors analyzed in the visitor survey.

Chapter V presents the data from the nationwide survey, and Chapter VI, the data from the visitor survey. The final chapter summarizes the data, draws conclusions, and makes recommendations for further research.

CHAPTER II. INSTITUTIONALIZATION

All institutions have encompassing tendencies and all exert influences on the lives of their members. In the "total" institution, where these influences extend over a period of time, institutionalization of the members may result. Institutionalization may be defined as the internalization of institutional roles and behavior patterns to such a degree that these may erode or replace patterns of behavior suitable for functioning outside the institution. This chapter investigates the sources of the prison's institutionalizing impact and the social and psychological effects of institutionalization.

In his book Asylums, Erving Goffman (1961) mentioned the prison as "a clear example" of the total institution. All institutions are, to some extent, closed societies; those which erect physical barriers between their members and the outside society are the most closed and constitute, for the most part, the total institution as Goffman defines it. Although all correctional facilities are closed to a considerable extent, the prison, whether designated maximum or medium security, is a truly total institution. It is this facility which is discussed here because it is a prototype; many of the effects of institutionalization which occur in the prison environment are present to some degree in other correctional facilities.

Prisons erect almost impenetrable physical barriers between their residents and the rest of the society. These barriers are a function of prison architecture and location, both of which are intended to maximize security and isolate the criminal from the society in which his crime was committed.

Prisons are usually located in relatively rural areas, as far from the general population as possible. Small towns are ideal, for they provide the desired isolation and a source of prison workers. For example, in the small western New York town of Attica, the prison is the main industry and major employer. This is true of other prisons as well, for decisions on the sites of new prisons have often been made on the basis of a state legislator's desire to provide jobs for his constituents in an economically depressed area (President's Task Force Report: Corrections, 1967).

Several acres are necessary for the site. Usually there is a large open space surrounding the physical plant; walkaways and escapees are obvious and retrievable under such circumstances. The plant itself is designed with security the uppermost consideration and is typically constructed of stone, steel and concrete. High walls, broken at regular intervals by manned gun towers, encircle the prison proper. These walls, often forty feet high and three to six feet thick, are built to last. According to the President's Task Force Report: Corrections (1967) prisons are "noteworthy for their endurance." Of approximately 400 institutions for adult felons in the United States, sixty-one were built before 1900 and twenty-five of these are now over 100 years old (p. 4).

Heavy iron gates and doors, under twenty-four hour surveillance, mark the entrance to the prison. In many prisons entry from the main lobby to the inside is gained through a set of two electrically controlled gates which cannot be opened simultaneously. All movement to and from the inside is carefully regulated and severely restricted. Visitors are screened and must be on a resident's approved list of visitors; mail is often limited to an approved list of correspondents, and the number of letters which may be sent is often limited by the amount of postage permitted to individual residents. (Recent court decisions have removed all restrictions on a prisoner's communications with courts and counsel.) Though communication with the outside world may thus be severely limited, for many prisoners it is highly desirable. Sykes (1958) has suggested that riots in prisons "may be viewed as highly dramatic efforts to communicate with the outside world." (p. 8)

When the physical barriers erected between the prisoner and the society are so nearly complete, there is a psychological isolation which follows. Such isolation has been found to be stressful, to evoke fear, to result in a reduction of mental efficiency, and to require adaptations so that the individual can cope with the shock of separation from society (Ruff, 1963; Burns & Kemura, 1963; Pyron, 1972).

For large numbers of prisoners the outside world gradually fades in interest and meaning, and life inside the institution becomes the only reality for its residents. One prisoner reported:

> I had a measure of how quickly a man becomes engrossed with the life in prison when Dot visited me . . . . Today, after a month of not having seen her or anyone else from the outside world, she brought . . . (a reminder) . . . that an outside world does exist--and I needed it as much. (Hassler, 1954, p. 62.)

This involvement in the institution is part of the process of institutionalization. Clemmer (1940), in a study of a prison, called the phenomenon "prisonization." He viewed it as in essence a process of assimilation, whereby the individual enters and fuses with the prison group by learning and accepting the prison culture. He defined prisonization as "the taking on in a greater or less degree of the folkways, mores, customs, and general culture of the penitentiary" (p. 299) and argued that complete prisonization may breed deeper criminality, and he constructs a scheme of the phenomenon to illustrate its two extremes. Certain factors, Clemmer said, characterize the lowest and highest degrees of prisonization, among them: length of sentence, individual personality, continued positive relations with family and friends, cooperation with or defiance of prison officials, and chance (greater or less exposure to the general mores).

Clemmer was primarily concerned with the problem of induction into the prison culture and the permanent effects of prisonization. Ohlin (1956) was also concerned with the induction process which all new prisoners undergo. He viewed it as a self-defining process, and, like Clemmer, feared that it permanently seals the individual into a criminal life style.

Wheeler (1961) became interested in changes in depth of prisonization which might occur over time. Using a questionnaire designed to test prisoners' conformity to official role expectations, he found a U-shaped distribution of high conformity responses. To a large extent, prisoners were more conforming at the beginning and end of their sentences. Thus, though an immersion into the prison culture does exist, it may not have the permanent effects which both Clemmer and Ohlin assumed. Indeed, it may reflect a change in the individual's orientation from his outside environment to the encompassing environment of the institution.

Zimbardo (1972), in a report on his aborted simulated prison experiment, provided an interesting insight into this immersion phenomenon. Both the prisoners and guards in his simulated prison were highly paid college student volunteers. For both groups the artificial situation took on a greater reality than the actual situation--that they were participants in a psychological experiment. Zimbardo reported on three prisoners who begged to be paroled:

> By (the fifth day) they had been so programmed to think of themselves as prisoners that when their request for parole was denied they returned docilely to their cells. Now, had they been thinking as college students acting in an oppressive experiment they would have quit . . . . However, the reality was not quitting an experiment but 'being paroled by the parole board from the Stanford County Jail.' (p. 4, 6)

In another article on the same topic, Zimbardo (1973) reported that the monitored conversations of the "prisoners" revealed that only ten percent of their conversations were devoted

to "outside" topics. Ninety percent of the time they discussed internal concerns such as escape plans, the awful food, how to deal with certain guards, etc. The experimenter concluded that this was because they knew one another only as prisoners, and that having witnessed the humiliations of others, as well as enduring their own, added impact to their images of themselves as prisoners. In any event, these college students became immersed in the environment and formed a separate group in opposition to the guards.

Clemmer (1940) has suggested that the prison culture serves to promote a feeling of solidarity in opposition to the staff. Some authorities have suggested that this solidarity may be viewed as a necessary psychological defense mechanism. The society has publicly rejected the offender and exiled him from its ranks; this can have a severe effect on the offender's self-image. Therefore, once imprisoned, it is self-protective of the ego to move away from the rejecting society (and its representatives, the staff) and into the culture which stands against it. This phenomenon Myrl Alexander (1969) called "the circle of rejection." The inmate is, in his turn, rejecting the society which has rejected him. Whether the offender is angry at society for the criminal label which has been thrust upon him, or, as a professional criminal, he is angry at having been caught and thus labeled a failure, the blow to his ego must somehow be softened (McCorkle & Korn, 1954).

Immersion into the prison culture involves learning the inmate code or system of values, and demands at least lip-service

adherence to it. This code includes rules of behavior not only within the inmate social system, but also between this system and the official (staff) one. Included are such recommendations as: doing your own time, never squealing on a fellow; never stealing from a fellow, using the system, non-cooperation with staff, etc. (Clemmer, 1940; Sykes, 1958; Sykes & Messinger, 1960; Street, Perrow & Vinter, 1968; and others).

To some extent the chief injunctions of the inmate code are contradictory. The new inmate is enjoined both to show solidarity with other inmates and to look out for himself. While the myth of solidarity is espoused, the reality of prison life demands that inmates compete for the privileges that exist. Kassebaum, Ward and Wilner (1971) suggest that the inmate code may be thought of as "acting like a brake on the unfettered exercise of force and cunning in the interaction of men in prison." (p. 154) They point out that in spite of the stated ideal of presenting a united front to the administration, many inmates are distrustful of their fellows and exhibit alienation and isolation.

Nonetheless the existence of a code, whether adhered to or not, has psychological benefits for the inmate. There are ways of belonging without taking action. One of these is learning and using prison argot. Some writers feel that this special language serves as an expression of group loyalty and group membership. Sykes (1958) however, suggests that "the more critical function of prison argot would appear to be its utility in ordering and classifying experience within the walls in terms which deal

specifically with the major problems of prison life." (p. 85)

The argot serves in part to classify the various roles within the inmate social system. The rat or squealer is an inmate who betrays a fellow prisoner; a tough is one who is aggressive and fights easily; a gorilla exploits his fellow inmates through the use of force; a merchant or peddler manipulates others by selling or bartering goods that are in short supply; a square John allies himself with the administration; and, of course, there are the sexual roles of wolf, punk and fag. (Sykes and Messinger, 1960)

Sykes and Messinger (1960) describe the ideal member of the inmate culture who may be called a right guy, real con, or real man:

> A right guy is always loyal to his fellow prisoners . . . . He keeps his promises . . . . He isn't nosy . . . and doesn't shoot off his mouth about his own (business). He doesn't act stuck up . . . (but) he has a certain dignity. The right guy never interferes with other inmates who are conniving against the officials . . . he shares with his friends.
>
> In his dealings with prison officials the right guy is unmistakably against them, but he doesn't act foolishly . . . (He) sticks up for his rights, but he doesn't ask for pity. (pp. 10, 11)

The right guy is, of course, seldom found in any prison. His type is, however, the pattern for many inmates. Just as the ideal seldom exists, the inmate code is seldom adhered to, else there would not be squealers, gorillas, etc.

Some researchers have argued that the inmate value system has a functional significance beyond the solidarity and ego preservation mentioned above. According to Sykes and Messinger (1960):

> The maxims of the inmate code do not simply reflect the values of imprisoned criminals; rather they are directly related to mitigating the pains of imprisonment under a custodial regime having nearly total power. (p. 19)

Street (1965) suggested that the inmate social system is a problem-solving system, its function to ameliorate the deprivations caused by imprisonment.

The pains of imprisonment have been catalogued most notably by Sykes in his classic study The Society of Captives (1958). What Sykes labeled the pains of imprisonment are paralleled in many ways by what Goffman called "mortifications of the self" (1961, p. 5). Both these writers viewed these deprivations and mortifications as systematic attacks on the individual's status and self-image which begin with the institutional admissions procedures.

It may be argued however, that these assaults on image and status begin earlier, during the period of transition between active membership in the society and the point of admission to the institution. In the case of the mental patients studied by Goffman, the transition may consist of a period of illness, during which active membership in the society is difficult or impossible. At some point the patient is labeled and committed, either voluntarily or involuntarily.

In the case of prisoners, this period of transition is marked by very specific events which systematically attack the ego. These are processes of degradation and rejection which begin with the arrest of the offender, are emphasized during any period of pre-trial detention, formalized in the courtroom, and finalized in

the institution. The courtroom scene serves as a modern model of what Garfinkel (1956) has called "successful degradation ceremonies." It meets nearly all the conditions which Garfinkel analyzed and resembles markedly similar ceremonies of other cultures.

In this ceremonial scene the defendant is both physically and symbolically set apart from the rest of society, for criminal cases are presented in terms of the State versus the individual, and "the State" represents all other members of society. Through the testimony of witnesses and the presentation of evidence, the defendant's guilt is proved. Once proved, it is publicly announced, and the guilty one stands before the raised bench from behind which a black-robed judge formally labels him a criminal and pronounces his sentence.

The courtroom ceremony is in many ways a process of "decitizenization," for the court ritually removes the individual from the society and formally denies him the rights of citizenship enjoyed by others. Imprisonment provides the experience of loss of citizenship which the court has ritually imposed. Indeed, society's directives to prison administrators to contain and punish permit the institution to be the ultimate instrument of the inmate's degradation and to represent his total rejection by society.

The process of admission and classification begins a series of personal abasements which serve to reiterate and emphasize the stigma of the courtroom process. Usually in the company of other prisoners, the new arrival is photographed, fingerprinted, stripped

of his clothing and other personal possessions, searched, bathed, issued institutional clothing, issued a number, instructed in institutional rules and regulations, tested, and assigned. Goffman (1961) calls this process "trimming," and indeed much of what has been left to the inmate of his self-concept, of his means of protecting his private self, is trimmed away, and he is objectified and depersonalized. The admission procedures, according to Goffman, "can be characterized as a leaving off and a taking on, with the midpoint marked by physical nakedness." (p. 18)

Because one is, to a large extent, defined by one's personal possessions, the divesting of these and the taking on of institutional garb lead to a redefinition of the self. The physical nakedness is a major example of what has been called institutionalized exposure by Schwartz (1972). This author made the point that the right to privacy includes the right to conceal imperfections which might discredit the image of oneself that one presents to society. That numerous humiliations are imposed in the admissions process, both with and before others, deepens the mortification and causes a painful loss of face. Schwartz also pointed out that one is not protected from witnessing the debasement of others, and that the prisoner is "contaminated by receipt as well as transmission of damaging information." (p. 233)

After assignment the prisoner is subjected to those losses of citizenship which characterize life in a total institution. These Sykes has labeled the pains of imprisonment. Loss of liberty is the most obvious of these. The inmate is confined both to

the institution and within it. This confinement affects his image of himself, his relationships with family and friends and colors his standing in the eyes of others. The other pains of imprisonment listed by Sykes are: deprivation of goods and services, deprivation of heterosexual relationships, loss of autonomy, and deprivation of security. The American Friends Service Committee (1971) lists "depersonalization, loss of autonomy, separation from family, denial of privacy, (and) the imposition of all restrictions inherent in any institution." (p. 26)

Deprivation of goods and services is similar to the trimming mentioned by Goffman in its impact on the self, for in Western society material deprivation is often equated with personal inadequacy, and the Spartan existence which is the prisoner's lot is a measure of society's attitude toward him and affects his own feelings about himself.

The loss of heterosexual relationships obviously produces sexual frustrations. These may lead to masturbation, to activation of latent homosexual tendencies, or to open homosexual behavior. Each of these may lead to feelings of guilt, and to self-doubt about one's own sex role and status. In addition, much of a person's self-identity is reflected in his relationships with others. In prison half of one's audience is removed, that half of the population which is of the opposite sex. The result is a somewhat distorted self-image.

To Sykes, deprivation of security means the exposure of each prisoner to others who may be aggressive and violent. He is thrown into prolonged intimacy with persons whose actions are unpredictable and whose attitudes toward him are unknown. He is exposed and defenseless and is subject to theft, injury, homosexual rape, and even death. These dangers are real. The June 3, 1976, issue of the New York Times reported a sworn statement by a federal prisoner from Lewisburg that the murdering of inmates for consideration was not uncommon. The prisoner was quoted, "No big deal. With a population of 1,600, we get about twenty-five murders a year. With the going price for murder at two cartons of cigarettes, I guess that isn't bad." (p. 21)

The denial of privacy, which is also one of the pains of imprisonment, includes not only the enforced physical exposure at admission, already discussed, but other programmed invasions of privacy carried on by prison officials--constant surveillance, night checks, shakedowns, body searches, inspections. Visits are usually overheard by both staff and fellow prisoners, and mail is sometimes read by the staff. In addition, the prison contains open information networks which provide a free flow of information about the individual to all personnel. In a prison, for example, there is no such thing as "privileged communication" with one's counselor, psychiatrist, or even pastor (Schwartz, 1972).

One author, in a footnote to an article on "the treatment game," quoted a prisoner:

> There is a constant conflict between what they say and what they do . . . . Man, if you do protest, or speak out or tell all, the result can be anything from a report against you to the hole. (Prettyman, 1972, p. 27f)

Prettyman concluded that in the treatment-centered institution which he studied, there was no way out but escape or shamming.

Loss of autonomy may be the most debilitating of the pains of imprisonment, for it denies to the prisoner the privilege of making any of his own decisions and fosters in him feelings of dependence. The institution controls the individual's behavior to the smallest detail. His freedom of choice is restricted to electing obedience or disobedience. Every action, other than reaction, is decided for him. Over time this can lead to uncertainty about his own ability to make real choices, and, in some cases, a fear of taking responsibility for his own actions or even his own maintenance upon release.

Gunn and Pearman (1969) have discussed the dependence which is nurtured in mental hospitals through the exercise of control over all the details of the patient's life. They characterize the hospital as "an all-providing, all-decision-making mother substitute," and feel that is it not surprising that "many of her charges cling to her apron strings." (p. 425)

Prisons, too, foster dependence, which can bring the prisoner back again and again. In 1974, much media attention was focused on Iowa Reformatory inmate Bobby Ferguson, whom the Associated Press labeled "the totally institutionalized man."

(New York Times, 1974) Ferguson requested a life sentence from the governor of Iowa because he was certain of his inability to function outside the prison environment. His life had been spent in and out of institutions, he had no family or friends on the outside, and he had found friends and security inside the institution.

Irwin (1970) gave the label "jailing" to one mode of prison adaptation, discussed in his book The Felon. Jailing is the tendency to make a world out of prison, and it is an adaptation made by convicts who do not retain or never had a commitment to outside social groups. It is typical of the "state raised" youth who has previously served time (p. 74).

Piri Thomas (1968) argued from his own experience and his observation of other convicts that the person who learns to function as well inside as out will no longer care if he is imprisoned or not and is increasingly likely to return (p. 263).

The ultimate result of such adaptation may be a Bobby Ferguson, who prefers the inside to the outside. While his is an extreme case, it has been suggested that nearly all prisoners (and mental patients as well) suffer from some degree of release anxiety. (Goffman, 1961; Gunn & Pearman, 1969; Hersen, 1969; Wierig & Robertson, 1972).

Hassler (1954) observed from his own experience as a convict:

> I can understand how fearful and reluctant to leave some men become after really long periods in prison. When one has had one's whole life completely ordered down to the minutest detail, it becomes a fearsome

> thing to face the prospect of freedom and responsibility again . . . . For men who need, almost more than anything else, training in self-discipline (prison) provides a complete system of rigid discipline externally applied. The result, of course, is to make the man even less capable of coping with the problems and temptations that come to him than he was to begin with. (p. 124)

The ordering of the prisoner's life establishes behavior patterns which have the purpose of making orderly the internal operation of the institution. Wolfgang (1961), in a study of prisoner adjustment, cautioned that, while the individual whose adjustment caused no problem for prison staff has a better chance for early release, "these same criteria (may not be) in fact valid indications of adjustment upon release into the community." (p. 169)

McCleery (1960) argued that authority of the prison staff rests not upon the imposition of punishment, but on the establishment of these behavior patterns. Control, he said, rests

> on the definition, in a system of authority, of a role for the ruler which makes the use of punishment superfluous. Thus the heart of custodial controls in traditional prisons lies in the daily regimentation, routines and rituals of domination which bind the subjects into a customary posture of silent awe and unthinking acceptance. (p. 54, emphasis added)

Totalitarian authority in the closed institution rests then on inculcating habits of obedience which are learned by new arrivals from those who are already habituated. The monotony of ritually repeated routine helps to destroy initiative and individuality and thus aids in management and control. Thus the prison administration and the general population encourage the institutionalization of the residents.

Eldridge Cleaver (1969) described the changes the prison had wrought in him:

> I was very familiar with the Eldridge who came to prison, but that Eldridge no longer exists. And the me I am now is a stranger to me. You may find this difficult to understand, but it is very easy for one in prison to lose his sense of self . . . . Individuality is not nourished in the prison, neither by the officials nor by the convicts. (p. 16)

The changes which the individual undergoes in prison are to some extent the outcome of a resocialization process. Pressures to conform to institutional norms of behavior, exerted by both staff and fellow prisoners, lead to the internalization of these norms. The individual has become socialized to the new environment: i.e., he has acquired "the habits, beliefs, attitudes and motives which enable (him) to perform satisfactorily the roles expected of him . . . ." as Brim (1966) defines socialization.

CHAPTER III. INSTITUTIONALIZATION AND RESOCIALIZATION

Institutionalization can be considered a form of resocialization, which is directed inward rather than outward. The resocialization which occurs in correctional facilities is directed toward habituating the individual to behavior patterns which are not duplicated in the outside society, rather than toward the stated goal of increasing the prisoner's ability to function conventionally outside the institution. Perrow (1972) described a number of organizations in which energies are directed toward unstated goals which may subvert or contradict the organizations' public goals. This occurrence is not deliberate, but rather a result of bureaucratic structure, and, to some extent, the personal goals of the organization's members. Perrow argues that conflicting organizational goals can be achieved if they are pursued sequentially. In correctional organizations goal conflict, frequently referred to as custody versus treatment, has been recognized and documented in the literature (Cressey, 1960; Street, Vinter & Perrow, 1966; and others). Most authorities recognize that this conflict is more complex than it seems and that it varies in intensity according to the orientation of the institution studied.

In essence the goal of custody is the protection of society through prevention of escapes from the institution (security), while the goal of treatment is the rehabilitation of the prisoner.

Frequently programs designed for reform require activities which threaten security.

Although walls, bars, locks and gun towers are major barriers to escape, an additional one is the orderly daily operation of the institution. Confusion threatens security (riots are the maximum confusion). Order is achieved by establishing and enforcing rules and routines and regimentation (McCleery, 1961). Thus, it may be that a major unstated goal of custody is the socialization of prisoners into institutional attitudes and behavior patterns. In short, the unstated goal is successful institutionalization of prisoners.

Institutionalization is a form of socialization, and the processes whereby one becomes institutionalized parallel the socialization process. Socialization can be defined as the process by which a child becomes a functioning member of the society into which he is born; a process which leads to the internalization of the folkways and mores of his group. In becoming institutionalized the adult internalizes the folkways and mores of the groups in which he finds himself and becomes a functioning member of the (new) group.

All of the elements of socialization theory are present in the institutionalization process: development of a concept of the self, language as an ordering of the society, the learning of roles, the impact of the primary group, the adoption of and satisfactory performance in the social group's role prescriptions.

The first step in the socialization of the child is the development of a concept of self in relation to the other members of one's society. Theorists agree that the self is developmental and that there can be no self without others. According to Cooley (1956) it is a "palpable absurdity to think of the 'I' as apart from society." (p. 179) He used the concept of the "looking-glass self" to illustrate that the 'self' develops as the child discovers how he is perceived by others. Who he is, is reflected by the other members of the group.

Mead suggested the concept of the objectification of the self. The individual becomes both subject and object as he learns to view his own actions as if he were an observer of them. The reactions of others help him to objectify himself, and through becoming an object the self develops. Mead developed the term "generalized other" to indicate the "social group which gives to the individual his unity of self." (p. 154) Gradually the individual learns to organize the reactions of the generalized other into a system of personality.

When the reactions of others change, it is possible that the individual undergoes a redefinition of the self. People who are incarcerated for criminal behavior can have little doubt about how they are perceived by the majority of society. They are criminal, inferior, captive, evil. Although the institution affects this redefinition of the self, the process begins before admission. In many ways a developmental self-concept, as Mead and Cooley envision it, is closely related to the theories of deviance

of Lemert & Becker.

Lemert (1951, 1964) used the term "secondary deviation," which he defined as the point at which the individual organizes his life around a deviant role. Earlier deviant acts (primary deviation) were risk-taking incidents in which the individual viewed himself as doing things which did not indicate the person he really was. Society's reaction to his primary deviation makes him hostile, which leads to further acts of deviance. The society, having reached the limits of its tolerance, may place restrictions upon his social participation and, ultimately, his self redefined, he organizes his personal and social characteristics around the now accepted deviant label.

Becker (1963) was also concerned with the sequence of steps which lead to a confirmed deviant status, and he argued that a deviant status is conferred upon individuals by the society.

> One of the most crucial steps in the process of building a stable pattern of deviant behavior is likely to be the experience of being caught and publicly labeled as a deviant . . . . The most important consequence is a drastic change in the individual's public identity. Committing the improper act and being caught at it places him in a new status . . . revealed as a different kind of person from the kind he was supposed to be." (p. 31, 32)

There is a formal labeling process which criminals undergo in our society (Garfinkel, 1961). It provides a clear and definite understanding of how the offender is perceived by others. The language of the court specifies an outcast status, for most criminal cases are represented as "the State" vs. the individual

offender. In a formal way the society becomes the "generalized other" by which the individual assesses his own behavior. Upon entry into the institution, the convicted offender finds this status reiterated and reaffirmed. In addition he must redefine himself as a prisoner both through the reflected perception of institution staff and his association and interaction with his peers. Clearly a new concept of the self is called for.

Through association with fellow prisoners and with the informal groups which constitute the inmate subculture, the prison in some ways provides a new "generalized other" which may help the individual toward this redefinition.

For Mead a crucial element in the development of self is the learning of the common language. It is only through the vehicle of gestures and symbols which constitute communication that the individual may become an object to himself. Language plays a major role in the theories of other social scientists. Cooley argues that the social self "is drawn from the communicative life." Communication is a major component of interaction theory. Parsons (1967) states "a cultural system . . . is organized about patterns of the <u>meaning</u> of objects and the expression of these meanings through symbols and signs." (p. 141)

If the learning of the common language plays an important role in the socialization of the child, the learning of prison argot can be considered a component of the socialization process which new prisoners undergo. Prison argot is a language form which

serves to describe the prison world and the statuses and roles within it. (Sykes, 1958; Sykes and Messinger, 1960; Irwin, 1970; Schrag, 1954; and others.) The learning of the common language helps the new prisoner to identify with his fellow prisoners and reinforces his concept of himself as a convict and criminal.

The "solidary opposition" theory of Sykes and Messinger (1960) suggested that the inmate code and argot serve to unite prisoners in opposition to the staff. Sykes (1958) stated: "A cohesive inmate society provides the prisoner with a meaningful social group with which he can identify himself and which will support him against his condemners." (p. 107)

The potential of the inmate subculture for encouraging individual prisoners to continue their commitment to criminal values has been of concern to a number of writers. (Ohlin, 1956; Clemmer, 1960; and others.) Several studies have attempted to determine the degree of "solidary opposition" to staff by measuring prisoner attitudes against staff expectations. (Wheeler, 1961) Schwartz (1973) addressed himself to whether rehabilitation efforts should be directed toward changing the inmate culture or to changing the relationships of individuals to it.

The observations of Goffman (1961) suggest that the organization and structure of the total institution encourage inmate cohesiveness by formalizing the dependent statuses of the residents through rules, routines, and regulated interaction patterns. Eye contact, ways in which staff and residents may address one

another, and body language constitute what he calls "enforced deference patterns." Though Goffman dealt specifically with mental hospitals, parallels can be found in the prison. In one state prison system, for example, a prisoner may be brought before the disciplinary committee on charges of "silent insolence," an act which is difficult to define.

Thus, in a variety of ways, staff as well as fellows encourage the new prisoner to view the inmate culture as his primary group. Cooley (1956), who coined this term, defined it as "those groups which are characterized by intimate face-to-face associations and cooperation." (p. 23) Though he was mainly concerned with the family, playground and neighborhood as groups which assert a strong influence upon the social development of the child, he did mention adult primary groups such as those formed through one's occupation, church, fraternal organizations, etc. Within the prison the inmate subculture serves as a primary group, and its influence is important.

One of the functions of primary groups as socializing agents is to provide role models for the child. It has already been suggested that the purpose of the special language of the inmate subculture which has been called "prison argot" is to define the statuses and roles in the prison society. Indeed most of the argot is related to roles: "merchant," "wolf," "fag," "punk," "right guy," "square John"--all refer to prison roles.

Much of the literature on socialization is concerned with the concept of role. One may find a variety of sociological

and psychological definitions of the term (Nieman & Hughes, 1958). Mead (1934) felt that the concept of role was "a basic factor in the process of socialization." (p. 178) He felt that the child uses roles to build a self, particularly through play and games. Park & Burgess (1921) suggested that an individual's personality is the organized sum of all of the roles played in all of his or her groups.

James (1892), Park & Burgess (1921) and Mead (1934) all noted that each individual fulfills a variety of social roles. Roles are patterns of behavior appropriate to specific social situations. They may or may not be accompanied by appropriate attitudes and beliefs; one may conform without commitment. (Kiesler & Kiesler, 1970) Social situations evoke role expectations which the individual learns and follows. The role expectations vary with the social situation, and the behavior may be different for kinship roles than it is for occupational roles or social roles. Children learn role expectations by imitation; by taking, in play, the role of mother, policeman, etc. (Mead, 1934; Maccoby, 1959, 1961)

One learns role prescriptions by interacting with others in a variety of social situations and by gradually developing the ability to take the role of the other. (Brim, et al, 1960)

Parsons (1967) argues that a social system is organized around the interaction of a plurality of human individuals, and that a social system consists of individuals in roles organized to

form one collectivity. Every role and collectivity is ordered and controlled by norms and values (p. 141).

Prisoners, too, learn and meet the role expectations of their primary group in order to make their incarceration more tolerable. According to Guthrie (1960), "Self-preservation is the fundamental law of learning." (p. 291) To a large extent the learning of institutional patterns of behavior, institutional roles and subcultural values and beliefs is necessary to survival. In some ways psychological survival (but in many institutions physical survival as well) is dependent upon acquiring skill in institutional roles.

The subculture encourages solidarity and offers status to the individual who does not conform to staff expectations. Cloward (1960) argued that staff reinforces the status of certain inmates in some prison roles. Since custody personnel have lost some traditional means of control over prisoners, certain patterns of accommodation have evolved as control techniques. He describes three types of structural accommodation, including status accommodation which is centered around the role of "right guy." Usually the "right guy" is defined by his peers and the officials through an act of conspicuous defiance. When this act is harshly punished and the punishment appears ineffective, the esteem of the "resolutely defiant inmate" rises. Since he cannot be dealt with by traditional means, the official system defers to him. He has forced the system to recognize his integrity.

Status accommodation serves as a means of social control because the "right guy," "by demonstrating that the official system can be forced to capitulate without continually resorting to violence . . . mobilizes sentiment in support of order and docility." (p. 41) This is but one example of the ways in which staff legitimizes institutional roles and statuses. These roles take on greater importance for some prisoners than roles which they performed on the outside. In a closed social system the institutional roles, modes of behavior, attitudes and values assume a greater reality than those once practiced in the external community.

Thus resocialization does occur in correctional institutions, but it is not the kind of resocialization which prisons purport to promote. It is resocialization directed inward and is thus synonymous with institutionalization. Institutionalization processes parallel socialization processes. They involve 1) a labeling process which encourages a convict/criminal self-image; 2) regimentation and routine which encourage institution-specific behavior; 3) support of prison argot and culture which establish role-models; 4) reinforcement of barriers to contact with the outside society, which direct the prisoner inward. Having presented the argument, it is now necessary to make use of theories of adult socialization and studies of resocializing agencies to determine the ways in which resocialization in correctional institutions could be directed outward.

Only in fairly recent years have attempts been made to analyze socialization in adult years. Some of the most provocative

theories appear in the book Socialization After Childhood by Orville Brim and Stanton Wheeler (1960). In the two separate essays which constitute this slim volume, the authors discuss the socialization of adults and the components and characteristics of resocializing agencies.

Brim characterized adult socialization as "the acquisition of the habits, beliefs, attitudes and motives which enable a person to perform satisfactorily the roles expected of him in his society" (p. 5). While socialization in childhood is a developmental process, resocialization may demand changes of one's former socialization. In order to change, the adult must meet three requirements: 1) he must know what is expected of him in behavior and values; 2) he must be able to meet the role requirements; and 3) he must desire to practice the behavior (p. 25).

Brim argued that role-learning is the major aspect of resocialization and argues that latter-life socialization is more concerned with the outward manifestations of role behavior than it is with the underlying values and motives. Becker (1964) seems to concur, in that he argued that individuals take on the characteristics required by the situations they find themselves in, a process he calls "situational adjustment."

A related suggestion is made by Pearl (1964) in an argument for the Halfway House as essential to any conversion of low-income offenders to a conventional way of life. Among the tasks of the Halfway House are help with employment, social contacts, ways

of using leisure time, etc. These offenders should be encouraged to acquire all of the accoutrements of the working class which will cement them into a working class mold or role. In essence this is a practical utilization of the social-psychological concept "compliance": one behaves as the group wants him to behave, regardless of his private convictions (Kiesler & Kiesler, 1970). The offender would join one group, workers, and learn to conform to the behaviors and goals of that group.

In the second essay in Socialization After Childhood (Brim & Wheeler, 1966), Wheeler was particularly concerned with the structure and effectiveness of resocializing agencies. He identified two types of organizations: Those which train (e.g., universities) are engaged in developmental socialization; those which correct early patterns (e.g., prisons) are engaged in resocialization. Several components of resocializing systems are discussed: agency goals, the recruit population, patterns of interaction (recruit-recruit, recruit-agent), the relationship between the agency and the external environment, and the social climate within the agency.

It is not difficult to take prisons as examples and see that the workings of each of these components lead to institutionalization: correctional agencies frequently have conflicting public and private goals; the population is not voluntary; interaction patterns encourage membership in the sub-culture; the relationship between the institution and the external environment is restricted. The point then is not to reiterate the discussion of the

institutionalization process but to determine how these components may work to resocialize from criminal to conventional life styles. The component which is of major interest in this study is the relationship of the resocializing setting to the external environment. In the case of the prison, we are dealing with a total institution, one which erects physical barriers between members and the outside society. The physical barriers enforce psychological barriers. In order to encourage conformity to conventional roles, a balance is necessary

> . . . if the goal of the organization is to provide training or inculcate values that may be useful after the person leaves it, too much separation may breed highly unrealistic images, and severe 'reality shock' may result. The greater the separation, the greater the segregation of contexts and therefore, the less carry-over . . . from what is learned. (Brim & Wheeler, 1966, p. 80)

Wheeler offers as a solution to this problem the possibility of trial periods in the external world. Parole is philosophically meant to be a trial period for prisoners; many corrections departments offer work-release and home furloughs for qualifying prisoners. These are pre-parole experiences in the external environment, but they are available to a relatively small number of prisoners, and usually one criterion for eligibility is that the prisoner be within a few months of his release date.

One wonders whether a reduction of the barriers during the period of incarceration might not reduce release anxiety, contribute to a change in the prisoners' self concept, and reduce the

institutionalizing effect of immersion into the inmate subculture. A suggestion along this line has been made by Gresham Sykes (1968). He had subtitled this short essay "a modest proposal," a term he used in the Swiftian sense. In it he suggests providing conventional role models and a counter-culture within the institution by mixing offenders and non-offenders. To achieve this, students, VISTA workers, and religious groups could be invited to volunteer to live in prison for a time.

Wheeler deals specifically with the case of prisons in the problem of the segregation of contexts and cites the importance of visits by family members and others to overcome the physical separation from the outside society (p. 79-80).

The families and friends of prisoners can be assumed to be <u>significant others</u> who have considerable potential as resocializing agents. The relationships of such agents to the "socializee" is of some interest. Brim (1966) found two components important: the dominance of the socializing agent in the relationship and the affective nature of the relationship. Since the affect of family members and friends is usually high, their resocializing potential is also high. Wheeler (1966) stated that some agents are unaware of their socializing role. (Thus socializing agents may be informal as well as formal.)

Since face-to-face interaction has greater impact than either correspondence or telephone calls, the prison visit seems to be one of the important means of achieving resocialization rather than institutionalization of prisoners.

CHAPTER IV. VISITING IN CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTIONS

All of the available empirical evidence strongly suggests that a prisoner's visitors have considerable effect on his or her parole success. Holt & Miller, in one California study, found that "loners" were six times more likely to be returned to prison in the first year of release than were those prisoners who had three or more visitors. They state: ". . . the central finding of this research is the strong and consistent positive relationship that exists between parole success and maintaining strong family ties while in prison." (p. V)

Glaser (1964) reported similar results. He dealt with the federal prison system, which, because of geographical considerations, receives few visitors. He therefore used both visits and correspondence to classify family interest. Those prisoners categorized as having "active" family interest had a 71% success rate; those who had had no communication from relatives had a 50% success rate.

Ohlin (1954) classified family interest as very active, sustained, passive, and none. He found steadily declining parole success rates which corresponded closely to his classification. These rates ranged from 75% success for active down to 34% success for the none category.

It is unclear from these reports whether the family members served as resocializing agents, as neutralizers of the prison

immersion phenomenon, or as supporters upon release. Each of these functions might influence parole success. Probably the last is the most important. Glaser (1964) also asked prisoners to designate the persons whom they most counted on for post-release help. Seventy-six percent indicated family members.

The "release anxiety" syndrome mentioned in earlier chapters is probably lessened when a prisoner is certain of family help on release. After a period of isolation from society, the external world may seem strange; many prisoners doubt their ability to cope with the new surroundings. Bowlby (1974), in a discussion of self-reliance, emphasized the importance of the familiar-strange parameter and argued that one's response to strangeness may be affected by the presence or absence of a trusted companion (p. 36). It appears that the support of one's family is an important factor in one's ability to adapt to the experience of institutional release and extra-institutional functioning.

Clearly, regular visits help to promise this support, but in addition they help to familiarize the prisoner with changes in his home community and maintain his interest in it. The self-reporting of Hassler (1954) and others, cited above, suggests that visitors help to bring the outside world into focus. Thus they may also serve to neutralize some of the effects of immersion into the inmate subculture and into institutional roles.

Family and friends may also influence the prisoner to adopt conventional social roles and learn the skills required for successful role performance. This influence may be direct or

indirect. By indicating the hardships caused by his or her incarceration, the family member may motivate the prisoner to participate in his or her own resocialization.

Visiting is not, however, a simple matter for the relatives and friends of most prisoners. It is frequently both time consuming and expensive. When measuring family interest Glaser (1964), in the study cited above, felt that visits should be assessed at a much higher rate than correspondence, because the energy, time, and expense involved was indicative of considerably more support to the prisoner, both during the period of incarceration and upon release.

The prison visit itself and the actual difficulties and rewards involved have not been treated extensively in the literature. Prison visitation is not a new phenomenon. Lay visitors, concerned citizens who visit prisoners, have existed for some time. The "Newgate Angel," Elizabeth Fry, is one of the most famous. During the first half of the 19th century, she brought ladies with her to Newgate to teach the women incarcerated there how to read, sew, and knit and to encourage their Christian reformation.

The Philadelphia Society for Alleviating the Miseries of Public Prisons, which was instrumental in organizing a portion of the Walnut Street Jail as a penitentiary in 1787, also carried on a program of visiting (and educating) there. The lay visitors had access to the prisoners in their cells. Their families did not. According to Barnes and Teeters (1959), one of the earliest

references to family visiting may be found in the 1808 Minutes of the Board of Directors of the Walnut Street Jail. There provision is made for family visits to hardworking and diligent prisoners, once every three months for a period of 15 minutes (p. 505).

For a report to the British government in 1835, William Crawford visited several state penitentiaries in the United States. An advocate of the Pennsylvania System, he saw no value in family visitation. In his report he recommends: "All letters, as well as visits and messages from friends, should be strictly prohibited under a penalty." (p. 36)

His review of the rules of the Eastern Penitentiary, successor to the Walnut Street Jail, states a policy of permitting none but official visitors (and certain lay visitors):

> No person who is not an official visitor of the prison . . . shall be allowed to visit it. The official visitors are the Governor, Speakers and members of the Senate, the Speaker and members of the House of Representatives, the Secretary of the State, the Judges of the Supreme Court, the Attorney-General and his Deputies; the Mayor . . . of the cities of Philadelphia, Lancaster, and Pittsburgh; the Commissioners and Sheriffs of the several Counties; and the Acting Committee of the 'Philadelphia Society for the alleviation of the miseries of public prisons'. (Appendix, p. 10)

Crawford (1834) duly reported the policies on visits of most of the prisons he visited. In Auburn (New York), Massachusetts, and Connecticut, neither visitors nor letters were permitted. In Virginia visitors were not permitted, but letters were allowed every three months. In Maine and Maryland visitors were allowed to write and visit. Crawford's description of the visit in Maryland may be of interest:

> The friends of convicts are admitted to see them, on obtaining an order from the keeper or one of the directors. A deputy keeper is always present at the interview which takes place at the entrance to the men's yard. This entrance is through a small apartment constructed in the wall about ten feet square, in two sides of which is an iron grated door. At one of these doors stands the prisoner, and at the opposite door his visitor, the deputy keeper being in the place between. (Appendix, p. 95)

Such a visit is really "closed," i.e., the prisoner and his visitor have no physical contact. A lapse of 100 years found the closed visit still quite popular. Teeters (1940) surveyed visitation in 38 institutions and reported that half had closed visits. At this time, "closed" meant separation of prisoner and visitor by glass or screens. He also found that length of visits varied from 20 minutes to all day, and frequency from once a month to twice a week.

Zemans and Cavan (1958) reported two surveys of family visiting, one completed in 1951, the other in 1956. They found that the most common pattern was visits twice a month for not more than two hours. Twenty-one of the 47 institutions which responded permitted no physical contact.

Although descriptions of the mechanics of the prison visit are not widely found in the literature, attention has been given to the effects of imprisonment on the prisoner's family. From these reports the difficulties which visiting poses for the family can be inferred. Most of the studies have focused on the prisoner's wife. One of the major effects of incarceration on the prisoner's wife, and one which affects her ability to visit, is that the loss

of the husband places her under severe financial pressures.

In a report on a crisis intervention program for prisoners' wives, Schwartz & Weintraub (1974) characterize the typical client as living with her children in an urban area and in marginal poverty. In one of four case studies presented by Crosthwaite (1975), the wife was encouraged by the authorities to visit her husband often, and without the children, after he was transferred to a nearby psychiatric facility. Since the family was under financial pressure and child care was a problem, this was a source of considerable anxiety to her.

Schneller (1975), in a study of the families of Negro prisoners, measured three components of change caused by incarceration. He found that changes in economic status and the sexual-emotional frustration of the spouse were problems for the majority of families. The third component, changes in the social acceptance of the family, was not a significant problem.

A study in England found many prisoners' wives evading admitting to their children that their fathers were imprisoned. Morris (1965) interviewed the wives of prisoners in an attempt to analyze the family crisis caused by incarceration and to evaluate the social services available to assist the family. With only a few exceptions, she too found that these families "showed acute anxiety about money." (p. 153)

Morris asked the women about visits and found, indeed, that among the prisoners' wives interviewed, the primary reason for

not visiting the prisoner was the expense involved. Other reasons included the distance involved and child care problems. She found that the distance often involved a full days' journey, and in one institution an overnight journey was required.

These problems seem to be nearly universal. Fenlon (1972) addressed these problems specifically as they relate to prison visiting at a federal facility in Florida. She recommended that the community provide a hostel for visiting family members where lodging, food and child care could be obtained by visitors. An additional recommendation was the provision of counseling services, particularly for wives.

Counseling services for prisoners wives are reported in the literature. Most are directed toward the preservation of the marriage. (A felony conviction is grounds for divorce in most states (Rubin, 1963). If the marriage can be preserved throughout the period of incarceration, then parole support is assured and the prisoner has a guaranteed place of residence.

Neussendorf (1969) reported a program of marriage group-counseling which provided opportunities for married couples to see one another more often and to discuss problems with other couples in similar circumstances.

Schwartz & Weintraub (1974), in a report of a crisis intervention program, suggest that the counseling of the prisoner's wife should be directed at problems of demoralization as well as problems of separation.

Though most of the literature on prisoners' families has focused on the wife, attention has been given to the effects of incarceration on the children of prisoners. About the children Morris (1965) says, ". . . most of them miss their father a great deal, and talk about him a lot. A fair number fret inwardly and miss their father, but are reluctant to talk about him" (p. 114). A descriptive account of the problems encountered by the child of an imprisoned mother has been reported by Cottle (1976).

Friedman and Esselstyn (1965) studied the school adjustment of the children of jail inmates. They recommended that social services provide special attention to children at the time of their parents' incarceration.

Weintraub (1976) recommended that social service agencies provide services to the families at specific crisis points: arrest, sentencing, incarceration, and release. Of particular interest here are the specific recommendations related to visiting. These include:

1. Mailing information regarding visiting hours, rules, and regulations, permitted packages and traveling maps to family members.
2. Establishing a visitors' service which would, at a minimum, provide free transportation between the institutions and the nearest public transportation terminal.
3. Instituting problem and information sessions at the institution.

4. Developing liaisons between the institution and the family or community.

Weintraub strongly urges that volunteer programs be developed by the institution to help provide these services.

One of the most thorough descriptions of a family counseling program appears in a book called The Prisoner's Family, by Norman Fenton (1959).

This program did not stress marriage counseling; it enlisted the cooperation of all family members in the rehabilitation and treatment of the prisoner. Counseling sessions were viewed as the means of achieving this cooperation. Fenton identified four hypothetical levels of family treatment:

1. Orientation of the family to the life of men in prison and on parole.
2. Individual and group counseling of relatives on a superficial level.
3. Individual and group methods of psychotherapy with relatives for the purpose of giving insight into the inmate's symptoms and needs.
4. Deeper therapeutic methods leading to insight of relatives into their own casual relationships to the client's troubles. (p. 30)

In addition, Fenton suggested that family members tour the facilities, receive publications, participate in some institutional programs such as Alcoholics Anonymous, and meet with the parole officer when the prisoner's release date is near. Though Fenton does not state it, the premise upon which the family treatment program is based is the potential of the prisoners' relatives as resocializing agents.

Although information can be gleaned from studies of prisoners' families and reports of family counseling services, there is little data on the visit itself in the literature. The exception to this is the availability of reports on conjugal visitation. In most of these, support for this type of visit seems to be based on the need for a healthy sexual outlet to relieve problems of homosexual activities among prisoners.

A number of reports cite the acceptance of such visits in other countries. Hayner (1972) dealt with Latin America; Conrad (1965), in a review of several correctional systems, reported its acceptance in Sweden and the U.S.S.R.

Mississippi was the only state in this country for many years which permitted conjugal visits. It existed informally before it became formal practice at the state prison farm at Parchman. Both prisoners and staff seem to regard the program highly (Hopper, 1962, 1965).

A recent survey reported that three more state prison systems now provide conjugal visits (Braswell & DeFrancis, 1972). The authors also report that a large number of state systems now have home furlough programs, which the authors view as a much more satisfactory alternative.

Hayner (1972) reviewed conjugal visits in Latin America, examined attitudes toward them in Canada and the United States, and reported the experience with conjugal visits at Tehachapi, California. He concluded that such visits cut down homosexual

activity (though they do not eliminate it), improve family relationships in many cases, and contribute to a more relaxed social atmosphere in the prison.

The California Department of Corrections began a pilot program of conjugal visits in 1968. In 1972 there were 6,000 visits in the twelve state prisons. The visits are called family visits and are not for wives only. Of 2,816 visits in the final quarter of 1975: 1,031 were wife alone, 1,061 were both wife and children, 215 were parents, 24 were children only, and 485 were other immediate family members. Any prisoner not in maximum custody is eligible for visits. The purpose is to help maintain family relationships, in the hope that there will be support for the prisoner upon release (Los Angeles Times, 1976).

The conjugal visit is only one of six types of prison visiting arrangements identified by Nagel (1973). The first Nagel calls the closed visit. No physical contact is permitted; often mesh screens or glass partitions separate the prisoner and the visitor; in some closed visiting arrangements telephones are used to communicate. Nagel's remaining 5 categories are variations of contact visits 2) The Limited Contact visit usually involves separation of visitor and prisoner across a table; there is often a low partition over which handshakes or kisses may be exchanged on arrival or departure. 3) The Informal Contact visit provides comfortable furniture in natural groupings and permits handholding, etc. for the duration of the visit. 4) Freedom of the Grounds

visits permit visitor and prisoner to walk together and sit together privately throughout a large area. 5) is the conjugal visit which permits visitors to remain for 24 hours on the institution grounds. Sixth are home furloughs where the prisoner visits his family (Nagel, pp. 102, 109).

The informal visit seems to be the most desirable arrangement. The Manual of Correctional Standards (American Correctional Association, 1966) encourages informal visits in all institutions, regardless of security designation. These informal visits should, The Manual states, be as frequent as facilities and staff supervision allow, and should be long enough to be of value to both residents and visitors.

This type of visit was instituted by Kenyon Scudder when he became Warden of the new facility at Chino, California in 1954. He made an effort to provide large, attractive visiting areas, to extend the length of visits, and, in pleasant weather, to permit picnicking on the grounds. He wrote about this policy: "the liberal visiting privileges at Chino have contributed a great deal to the adjustment of the men. It is one of the best things we have done." (1954, p. 84)

Scudder used the term privilege in connection with visits. The Manual of Correctional Standards (American Correctional Association, 1966) discussed visiting under the subheading "Visiting Privileges." There is a trend now to view visitation as a right. The National Council on Crime and Delinquency included visitation

in its "Model Act to Provide Minimum Standards for the Protection of Rights of Prisoners" (1972). The act called for establishing rules and regulations which would permit attorneys, families and friends to visit and hold private conversations with prisoners. They stipulate that schedules and restrictions should be reasonable. The National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals states clearly: "Offenders should have the right to communicate in person with individuals of their own choosing" (Corrections, 1975, p. 66). This commission's report, which excited much controversy on its release, suggested that correctional authorities encourage visitation rather than merely tolerate it, advocated informal visits and approved conjugal visits. The following guidelines are from the Report on Corrections:

1) Correctional authorities should not limit the number of visitors an offender may receive or the length of such visits except in accordance with regular institutional schedules and requirements.

2) Correctional authorities should facilitate and promote visitation of offenders by the following acts:

   a) Providing transportation for visitors from terminal points of public transportation . . . .

   b) Providing appropriate rooms for visitation that allow ease and informality of communication in a natural environment as free from institutional or custodial attributes as possible.

3) The correctional agency may supervise the visiting area in an unobtrusive manner but should not eavesdrop on conversations or otherwise interfere with the participants' privacy. (pp. 66-67)

Although the tendency to view visitation as a right of the prisoner seems relatively recent, it was suggested by Zemans and Cavan (1958). They were dismayed to find in their surveys that

visits were granted as a privilege and denied for the purpose of punishment. Twelve of the 47 responding prison administrators indicated that an offender could lose his visiting privilege for as much as six months if prison rules were violated.

Zemans and Cavan (1958) also found that 19% of the institutions surveyed permitted visits of less than one hour's duration. The Manual of Correctional Standards (American Correctional Association, 1966) urges that visits be as frequent and as long as possible. Ordinarily a visit of less than one hour would not be regarded as adequate (p. 543).

Zemans & Cavan (1958) also found that slightly more than half their respondents permitted contact visits (55%). Since the informal contact visit has been advocated by the American Correctional Association (1966), The President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice (1967), the National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals (1975) and many individual authors as well, one might assume that by 1977 all correctional facilities would permit at least limited contact visits. The present study sought to determine if contact visits are, indeed, a universal phenomenon. Of 168 institutions which responded to a mailed questionnaire, 167 did indeed provide contact visits. Some of these did not permit them for close custody prisoners, but did permit them for the rest of the population.

Only one institution had closed visits.*

Further results of the current survey of visiting policies and procedures are presented in the following chapter. Included is data concerning the permitted length of visits and the number of visits permitted each resident in a month, which may be compared with that gathered 20 years ago by Zemans and Cavan (1958) above.

---

*Apparently the closed visit is the only type of visit provided in all state adult facilities in Texas. Only one institution responded to the questionnaire, but a representative of the State Department of Corrections indicated that all visits were closed.

CHAPTER V. NATIONWIDE SURVEY OF VISITING PRACTICES

On the basis of resocialization theory and the empirical research reported by Glaser (1964), Holt and Miller (1972), and others, recommendations could be made for increasing, through visiting policies, the use of family and friends as resocializing agents in correctional institutions. To do so would be to operate in a vacuum. It is first necessary to establish a body of information about the current status of visiting policies and procedures in the nation's correctional facilities. The present study surveyed these policies and procedures, using a mailed questionnaire, and attempted to identify those factors which most influence visiting practices in correctional institutions, particularly those related to the obstacles of time, space and distance.

The survey requested visiting schedules and the capacity of the visiting area. The schedules were given as days per week and hours per day. To simplify comparisons, these were then computed to a figure of total visiting hours per week. Most visiting rooms have seats available for the prisoners and visitors. Respondents were asked to indicate the number of persons who could be accommodated at one time. Numbers are not useful when institutions of such varying sizes are being compared. Therefore the visiting room capacity (VRC) is expressed as a percentage of the total population of the institution.

The obstacle of distance was more difficult to analyze and required some arbitrary decisions. Since correctional institutions (other than community-based facilities) are usually characterized as geographically isolated, one of the objectives of the study was to determine the extent to which this characterization is true. Another objective was to find a means of comparing isolation among institutions. Mileage measurements were therefore necessary.

To determine mileage, individual states were treated as single units and measurements were made between the institutions and the highest crime areas in the state. The areas with the highest crime rates (determined from Uniform Crime Reports, 1976) also have the greatest number of arrests, the greatest number of convictions, and the greatest number of institutional sentences. It follows, then, that high crime areas contribute the highest number of admissions to state correctional facilities.

Data from one state, New Jersey, corroborate this assumption. In a survey of the county of residence of admissions to all state correctional facilities, six of the state's 21 counties accounted for two-thirds of all new admissions to the system. Each of these counties contains or is adjacent to a high crime area as identified by the Uniform Crime Report (1976). One of the six counties accounts for more than twice as many admissions as any of the others (Correctional Master Plan, 1976).

A further assumption is that offenders are arrested in or near the areas in which they and their families reside. Thus the distance (degree of isolation) is measured from the institution to the areas where the majority of prisoners' family and friends are likely to reside.

Since measurements are made in miles, the size of the state is a factor in determining isolation. Even in geographically small states the facility may be isolated in a region which is not readily accessible. Accessibility is difficult to assess. Though the survey questionnaire did request data related to accessibility, the responses did not provide adequate information for comparison purposes. Only nineteen respondents indicated that the institution was not on or near a major highway. More than half indicated that bus service was available, but some service was inter-city, some local, and some indicated that special visiting buses served the institution, either under grants or under the aegis of private community groups. Since this data is not particularly useful, it was decided that mileage measurements would be the most practical means of comparing facilities for isolation.

The study assumes a mileage-time equation, in which 50 mph is an average driving speed. Since it represents a four hour round trip, an institution is considered isolated if it is

100 or more miles from the highest crime area(s) in the state.* Some states have more than two cities whose crime rates are either very large or at least very nearly the same. In these states the distance is measured from the institution to the nearest high crime area. This decision reflects an assumption that most states will, all other things being equal, assign the offender to the institution closest to his county of residence. (Pennsylvania has had such a policy for a number of years, and other states do consider geography for assignment.)

The state of California may serve as an example of the measurement method. Using the Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas identified in the Uniform Crime Reports (1976), Los Angeles and San Francisco are the two highest crime areas in the state. There are twelve state institutions in California: one is primarily a drug rehabilitation center and is excluded from consideration. Of the remaining eleven: three are within 100 miles of Los Angeles; four are within 100 miles of San Francisco; four are more than 100 miles from either city and are characterized as geographically isolated.

---

*For the most part, areas designated as Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas by the Uniform Crime Reports were used to determine high crime areas. Frequently cities border one another across state lines, and this affects the crime rate. In states where such areas are not defined (e.g., Vermont), the city tables are used.

Using this method, a mileage was assigned to each institution which responded to the nationwide survey, and an attempt was made to correlate mileage (isolation) with reported visiting policies. For the survey a questionnaire (See Appendix A) was mailed to each state adult correctional institution (for felons) listed in the 1975-76 Directory of the American Correctional Association (1976).

The questionnaires were mailed to individual facilities rather than to state departments of corrections, because visiting procedures often vary from institution to institution within the state. In addition, information was sought about factors peculiar to the institution: population, age of residents, capacity of visiting area, etc.

Only state institutions were included. County institutions are too varied, too numerous, and house offenders for much shorter periods of time. Federal institutions are too widespread and may draw their populations from all states. Juvenile institutions were excluded because juvenile offenders tend to have fewer relationships and their friends are usually less mobile than those of adults.

The Census of State Correctional Facilities (1975) identifies 600 separate state correctional facilities. This includes each distinct road camp, half-way house, etc. However, since the organization of correctional systems and services varies

from state to state, some arbitrary decisions were made in the selection of the sample for the present study. In order to achieve a nationwide sample those facilities which, in a few states, house both felons and misdemeanants were included. Some states (Rhode Island, Delaware, Connecticut, Alaska, Vermont) have assumed jurisdiction over detention facilities, jurisdiction elsewhere reserved to counties. Where the distinction between detained and sentenced prisoners was clear, detention facilities were eliminated from the survey. In many states a single central office directs community or camp facilities. Questionnaires were sent to the central office only. In addition medical and reception facilities, which usually hold offenders for short periods, were eliminated from the survey.

In all, 257 questionnaires were mailed, and 176 responses were received (a 68.5% response). One was eliminated because it was clearly a juvenile facility and six because they served primarily as detention facilities. Thus the total sample consisted of 168 institutions. Since this figure represents 88% of all state departments of corrections, the sample is quite broad.

Zemans and Cavan (1958) commented that the response to their survey was indicative of great interest on the part of prison administrators. A two-thirds response to the present survey also reflects considerable interest in the subject of visiting.

An interest in the survey may not indicate great interest in the subject of visiting in one's own institution. Records are not kept nor are statistics compiled, according to many respondents. Thirty-four per cent indicated that information on the number of residents with no visits was not available. Fourteen per cent frankly estimated this data, and some (3%) used words like "most" or "few." Thus, 51% of the responding institutions do not gather this information.

Such data would be valuable to institutions which are interested in encouraging visits rather than merely tolerating them. A few respondents indicated that no prisoners were without visits because lay visiting programs had been established with community citizen's groups. Knowing precisely which residents had no visitors is essential to such a program.

The major intent of the survey was to examine current policies and procedures regarding visitation. The visiting schedule (days and hours) was considered to be indicative of the institution's commitment to encouraging the maintenance of family relationships and increasing contact with the external community. The schedule is by no means an infallible indicator, since some state corrections departments set policy for all institutions under their jurisdiction, while others leave policy decisions to the discretion of the individual facility. Other factors also affect the schedule: the number of personnel available to process

visitors and supervise the visiting area; the amount of space available for visits; whether the institution is crowded; etc. One of the assumptions of this investigation is that personnel will be deployed, and space allocated, in accordance with the priorities established. Where visitors are seen as resocializing agents and a source of parole support for prisoners, the schedule will be generous. An additional indicator of the facility's interest in visitation will be the degree to which the problems of space and overpopulation are compensated for by adjustments in schedules.

The National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals (1975) recommended that prison authorities encourage visitation rather than merely tolerate it. The schedules do seem to reflect an encouragement/tolerance continuum. When a state-by-state analysis is made, using the number of visiting days per week, some interesting regional variations can be seen. Since schedules vary within states, the dominant pattern was chosen; e.g., in Alabama, three institutions reported that visits occur on Sundays only, and one reported visits scheduled on Saturday and Sunday; Alabama was therefore placed in the one day a week category. (See Appendix B.) (Institutions in six states did not respond.)

Seven states were too varied to fit any category (Connecticut, New Jersey, Ohio, Oregon, Tennessee, Utah and Wisconsin).

Twelve states fell into the weekend or weekend plus holiday category; all but two of these (Washington and Hawaii) were southern or southwestern states. Twenty states offered daily visits; most of the Midwest fell into this category and many eastern states as well. These regional variations are quite clear-cut, though they are not absolute. The only southern state which did not fall into the weekend or less category, Louisiana, fell into the very generous daily category. Nevertheless, there is an indication that encouragement or tolerance tends to be regional.

A closer look at schedules is necessary to determine what factors influence the variations. Table I compares the three institutions with the most restrictive schedules with the three which had the most generous on a variety of factors: type of facility, institutional capacity, institutional population, average age of population, visiting room capacity, and geographical isolation.

Classifying institution by type is a difficult process, since there is often considerable overlap. Classifications used by others were not acceptable. The Census of State Correctional Facilities (1975) classifies adult institutions as prisons, medical centers, and community centers. It further divides prisons into closed prisons, road camps, farms, conservation camps, and other prisons (reformatories, training centers, youth facilities, et al),

TABLE 1

INSTITUTIONS AT THE EXTREMES OF THE VISITING SCHEDULE SPECTRUM

	Institution	Schedule		Type of Facility	Inst. Capacity	Inst. Population	Avg. Age of Pop.	Visiting Room Capacity		Mileage
		Days	Hours					No. of Persons	% of Inst. Pop.	
Restrictive	108	Sun	12-4:00	1 Women	500	436	(16-72)	675	154.8[a]	120
	93	Sun	11-3:30	R/TC		750	24	425	56.7	46
	94	Sun	11-3:30	R/TC		700	23	1,000	142.9[a]	46
Generous	73	Daily	9-9:00	Prison	600	600	23	-	-	177
	74	Daily	8-8:00	Prison	1,144	1,484	18	168	11.3	122
	129	Daily	8:45-9	Prison	2,067	1,750	23	80	4.6	15

[a]These institutions have visiting rooms which can accommodate more than 100% of the institutional population.

with no mention of institutions for women. The first classification is too broad for the purpose of this study; the second too narrow.

For the present purpose five categories are identified: Institutions for adult male felons (Prisons), institutions for females, regardless of security or label (Women), institutions such as farms and conservation camps which are minimum security and are located in special areas (F/C), institutions for youthful offenders or for vocational training, usually called Reformatories or Training Centers (R/TC), and community based institutions, such as work-release centers, pre-release centers, halfway houses, etc. (CB). The distinctions are not absolute; some institutions are called state farms, but are in essence maximum security prisons and are classed as such here, many reformatories, for example, while housing youthful offenders, resemble closed prisons more than they do training centers. For classification purposes, coeducational facilities are placed in the women category: most were originally women's facilities, and women still constitute the majority of residents.

Since the three correctional institutions with the most generous visiting schedules are prisons, and the three with the most restrictive schedules are other types of institutions, visiting by type of facility bears investigation. The stereotypes which one may glean from the literature about these six categories seem not to extend to visiting. Since correctional institutions

for women are usually characterized as minimum security facilities of informal cottage-type construction, one could conclude that visiting policies would also be informal and schedules generous. Farms and camps and community-based facilities are usually minimum custody facilities, in which restrictions are few. Reformatories are usually medium to maximum security institutions for young adults (aged 16-30).

One would expect schedules to be more generous for women and minimum custody inmates than for medium or maximum custody inmates. No such pattern occurs. Table 2 cross-tabulates total visiting hours per week (days x hours = total) with type of facility.

The low number of responses from farms and camps (F/C) and community-based (CB) facilities is the result of a number of factors. Several states have central offices for all farms or all camps. Failure of the central office to respond to the survey eliminates many facilities. The same is true of some Community-Based programs. Half-way Houses may not be state-operated, and many have no visiting policies as such; some permit week-end furloughs and free evenings. Responses from community-based programs are therefore minimal. Farms are often satellite units of larger institutions, and many of these institutions returned questionnaires for the main facility only or combined the satellite units with the main facility. Where distinctions are clear, they are included in the table, but the numbers are so low

TABLE 2

TOTAL VISITING HOURS PER WEEK BY TYPE OF FACILITY

TOTAL Hours per Week	PRISON		R/TC		WOMEN		CB		F/C	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
0-5	0	0.0	2	7.1	1	4.2	2	22.2	0	0.0
6-10	8	13.3	1	3.6	3	12.5	1	11.1	1	10.0
11-15	11	18.3	1	25.0	5	20.8	2	22.2	5	50.0
16-20	5	8.2	3	10.7	1	4.2	3	33.3	0	0.0
21-30	7	11.8	3	10.7	4	16.7	0	0.0	0	0.0
31-40	3	6.0	4	14.3	2	8.3	0	0.0	0	0.0
41-50	15	25.0	6	21.4	6	25.0	0	0.0	3	30.0
51-60	8	13.3	1	3.6	2	8.3	1	11.1	1	10.0
61-70	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
71-80	1	1.6	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
81-90	2	3.3	1	3.5	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
TOTALS	60	99.9[a]	28	99.9	24	100.0	9	99.9	10	100.0

[a]Percentages may not total 100 due to rounding.

that valid comparisons are not possible.

Fifteen hours available for visiting per week is not a very generous figure, yet 31.6% of the prisons, 35.6% of reformatory/training camps, and 37.5% of the institutions for women provided fifteen or fewer hours per week. More than 40 hours per week requires more than a normal work week for staff and thus seems a generous figure: a larger percentage of prisons had total hours greater than 40 (43.2%), while 33.3% of women's facilities and 28.4% of reformatories provided more than 40 visiting hours per week. No single type of facility seems to have significantly more generous or more restrictive total visitation hours than any other. Thus, type of facility does not appear to be a factor in visiting schedules.

The single factor which correlates most closely with visiting schedule is the capacity of the visiting area. Where it is small relative to the population, the schedule is generous; where it is large, the schedule is restrictive. This seems to be a simple matter of increasing hours to handle volume.

This striking correlation demands that the area of visiting-room capacity be examined more thoroughly. Since actual numbers indicate little unless they are compared with the population of the institution, the visiting room capacity is represented as a percentage of the total population. The figure used to obtain the percentages represents the total capacity of the visiting areas,

both number of prisoners and number of visitors. Thus in institution 129, for example, fewer than 5% of the population would fill the visiting room; assuming one visitor per resident, only 2.5% of the residents could receive visitors at any one time. Although the survey requested a separate number, most respondents indicated a total capacity. The percentage given fills the visiting area with prisoners and permits no visitors. Nevertheless, it is a clear indication of the space and time needed for visiting.

The percentages ranged from 3% to 300%. Table 3 summarizes the distribution of these percentages. Since the percentages were rounded, a capacity of 5.8% of the population fell into the 6-10% category, while one of 5.3% fell into the 0-5% category, and so forth.

Twenty-one respondents omitted this item from the questionnaire.

Twenty percent of the responding institutions had visiting area capacities which held fifteen percent or less of their total populations. Assuming just one visitor per prisoner, only $7\frac{1}{2}$% or fewer of the residents could receive visitors at one time. To compensate for the volume of visitors, it would seem that these facilities would have generous visiting schedules but would still have to restrict the length of the visit as well as the number of visitors permitted each resident at one time.

TABLE 3

VISITING ROOM CAPACITY OF ALL INSTITUTIONS

N = 147

Visiting Room Capacity as a Percentage of Institutional Population	Number of Institutions at Each %	Percent of Total Sample at Each %	Cumulative Adjusted Frequency
0-5%	6	4.1	4.1
6-10	14	9.5	13.6
11-15	10	6.8	20.4
16-20	16	10.9	31.3
21-30	20	13.6	44.9
31-40	9	6.1	51.0
41-50	17	11.6	62.6
51-60	11	7.5	70.1
61-70	7	4.8	74.9
71-80	3	2.0	76.9
81-90	3	2.0	78.9
91-100	4	2.7	81.6
100-150	10	6.8	88.4
151-200	6	4.1	92.5
200-300	11	7.5	100
TOTALS	147	100	100

Table 4 examines closely the twenty facilities with the lowest visiting room capacity (under 10%) in order to compare the compensations made. Table 6 examines the policies of the seventeen institutions with the largest capacities, to see whether the pattern suggested by Table 1 continues; i.e., where a large number of visitors can be accommodated, visiting schedules are limited. Tables related to the middle range are included in the Appendix. (Appendix C, Table #24) Fourteen of the facilities with the smallest V.R.C. are prisons. Eleven are very large institutions (population over 1,000). Of special interest here is the fact that the majority of the nineteen are clearly compensating for their small visiting room capacity by expanding days and hours to accommodate the volume of visitors. Fifteen of the nineteen institutions offer visitation seven days a week. Eight of them offer more than 50 hours per week for visitation. The two which offer more than 70 hours a week seem to be making a major compensatory effort. Most of the nineteen restrict the length of the visit as well; four of them restrict weekend visits (weekdays are peak visiting days). Only one institution would fall at the tolerance end of the encouragement/tolerance continuum. One might lie rather close to it.

Some questions can be raised about the capacity of the visiting area. Since it is calculated relative to the total population of the facility, is it small because the institution

TABLE 4

INSTITUTIONS WITH THE LOWEST VISITING ROOM CAPACITIES (VRC)

Institution	(Type)	VRC.	Visiting Schedule: No. of Days	Visiting Schedule: No. of Hours	Total Hours Per Week	No. of Visits Per Month Per Resident	Permitted Length of Visit (hrs)	No. Visitors at One Time
119	(P)	3.0	7	(Var)	-	unl	2	3
67	(P)	3.6	7	8	56	5	2	var
55	(P)	3.8	7	7	49	3	2	3
80	(P)	4.5	7	6	42	10	6	3
129	(P)	4.6	7	12 1/4	85 3/4	3	3	3
46	(P)	4.8	7	7 3/4	54 1/4	3	2	-
48	(P)	5.9	7	6	42	unl	max 1/min 4[a]	4
17	(W)	6.5	5	8	40	-	8	unl
49	(F/C)	8.1	7	7 1/4	50 3/4	2	2 Da./1 Wk.[b]	4
78	(P)	8.2	7	7 1/4	40 3/4	4	6	6
50	(R/TC)	8.4	7	6	42	20	1	4
45	(P)	8.5	7	8	56	4	2 Da./1 Wk.	4
62	(P)	8.7	5	8	40	-	-	unl
5	(P)	9.1	7	(Var)	-	unl	2	3
52	(P)	9.4	7	8	56	unl	4 Da./3 Wk.	unl
132	(P)	9.7	7	12/8½	77	5	3	5
66	(R/TC)	9.9	7	6	42	12	2 Da./1 Wk.	3
113	(R/TC)	10.0	6	5	30	3	2 1/2	unl
145	(P)	10.0	2	8	16	2	2	2

[a] "Max" = maximum custody; "Min" = minimum custody.

[b] Da. = daily; Wk. = weekend.

is overcrowded, i.e., is the population greater than the designed capacity of the facility? Is there a relationship between type of facility and small visiting room capacity? What factors influence this relationship? Six of the nineteen facilities report total populations below their capacity; seven are severely overcrowded; five are crowded; and one is at capacity. While crowding may be a factor in the small capacity of the visiting areas, it is not the major factor.

All of the facilities are large. Twelve have capacities of over 1,000 prisoners. The smallest holds 502 people, the largest 3,478. Most are prisons: three are reformatories, one is a farm, one is a facility for women offenders. Prisons, then, are the institutions most likely to have small visiting areas relative to their populations.

In addition to type of facility, the factor which correlates most closely with VRC is age; eight of the nineteen were constructed more than 100 years ago; only two are less than 50 years old. When these large, old prisons were constructed, the general population was not as mobile as it is now. Visitors were not expected in any great number, nor were they encouraged. Prison architects allocated minimal space for visits, and the arrangements were usually screens or grates through which conversations might be held.

The nineteen institutions with the smallest visiting room capacities which are discussed here are nearly all large prisons and many are old ones. Their visiting room capacity is between 3 and 10 percent of their institutional population. There are 26 facilities with visiting room capacities of 11-20% of their total populations. Thirteen are prisons, nine are reformatories, two are institutions for women, and two are farms or camps. Seven are 100 years old or more; eleven are less than 40 and the remainder are between 45 and 98 years old.

To further examine the effect of age on the institutions' visiting room capacity, Table 5 lists the VRC (% of total population) of all responding institutions constructed more than 50 years ago. Of the 50 institutions represented, 70% have VRC's of 25% or less of their population. Assuming just one visitor per prisoner, this means that fewer than 13% of the population can have visitors at one time.

It appears that large old facilities must compensate for their low visiting room capacities and accommodate the volume of visitors by increasing visiting days and hours. Table 1, which compared the three most restrictive visiting schedules with the three most generous, seemed to indicate that where the visiting area is sizeable, the authorities see no need for a more generous schedule. Table 6 lists the 19 facilities with visiting room capacities of over 100%. This table may offer

TABLE 5

CAPACITY OF VISITING AREA IN OLDEST INSTITUTIONS

AGE	CAP	AGE	CAP	AGE	CAP	AGE	CAP	AGE	CAP
177	-	118	5.9	100	11.3	81	10.0	64	8.4
162	18.9	117	8.4	100	15.1	79	25.0	63	8.1
153	9.9	116	6.9	99	-	79	-	62	23.2
151	26.7	113	3.8	98	3.6	77	69.9	61	42.6
142	4.5	111	8.7	95	9.7	76	17.4	59	42.0
140	29.6	111	12.4	94	21.5	76	26.7	57	33.9
137	9.4	107	11.5	92	16.7	75	59.3	56	83.5
131	11.5	106	43.0	88	14.0	69	26.1	56	53.1
126	-	106	5.8	88	30.7	68	16.4	54	8.4
124	25.9	105	17.0	88	30.7	65	-	52	17.2

TABLE 6

INSTITUTIONS WITH THE HIGHEST VISITING ROOM CAPACITIES

Institution	Type	(%) Visiting Room Capacity	Visiting Schedule: No. of Days Per Week	Visiting Schedule: Hours Per Day	Total Hours	No. Visits Per Month	Permitted Length of Visit	No. Visitors At One Time
40	W/CB	300	2	6	12	var.	4+	var
167	FC	241.1	3	3 3/4	11 1/4	12	6	unl.
58	P	214.3	7	4	28	4	4	3
35	W	200.0	2	4	8	8	2	unl.
140	RTC	200	2	6	12	8	6	unl.
157	CB	182.5	3	1	3	12	1	2
61	RTC	176.9	2	7	14	8	7	unl.
108	W	154.8	1	4	4	4	4	unl.
118	CB	145.8	2	7	14	8	7	unl.
31	RTC	144.4	2	6	12	8	6	unl.
6	W	143.0	7	3	21	-	2	3
94	RTC	142.9	1	4 1/2	4 1/2	4	4 1/2	unl.
15	RTC	136.1	2	5	10	8	5	10
7	RTC	133.3	2	9	18	8	9	10
116	RTC	119	2	5 1/2	11	8	5 1/2	10
123	FC	101.9	2	7 1/2	15	8	7 1/2	unl.
121	RTC	101.8	2	7	14	8	7	unl.
148	P	100	5	6	30	17	3-8	unl.
166	RTC	100	7	6 1/2	45 1/2	8	3	unl.

a clearer indication of the facilities' encouragement or tolerance of visiting. Total hours are given in the table along with the schedule.

Two of the institutions permit daily visits; twelve have 2-day schedules; and two have 3-day schedules. When total visitation hours per week are used as a measure, we find three institutions which have fewer than five hours per week available for visits; two have more than thirty hours per week, and the remainder have from 8 to 28. Nearly three-fourths (73.3%) of the institutions with the highest visiting room capacities have fifteen or fewer total hours available for visitation. Certainly the trend seems to be tolerance rather than encouragement, when total hours are used as an indicator.

Though the highest capacity facilities have fewer available hours per week, one area which is much less restrictive is the number of visitors each resident is permitted at one time. The facilities with spacious visiting rooms permit almost any reasonable number. Most have no written limit, some have a limit of ten. The institutions with limited visiting areas tend to limit the prisoner to five or fewer visitors at one time. This too is an item which is closely related to available space for visitation.

However, the number of visits each resident is permitted to have in a month does not seem to correlate with visiting room

capacity. Some institutions place restrictions on the visitor rather than the resident. Most institutions require that visitors be listed on the prisoner's visiting list. Some institutions permit each visitor to come only once a month or once a week, etc., though the resident may receive in the same time period as many visitors as he has on his list. Those institutions which place limits upon the number of visits per resident per month (N=153) are listed in Table 7. The restrictions vary from 2 per month to no limit at all. No pattern is discernible when this factor is analyzed alone. The largest percentage permit four visits each month (or one per week); the second largest percentage has no limit on the number of visits permitted per resident per month. This item may also be considered an indication of the institution's location on a tolerance-encouragement continuum.

While only eleven facilities limit visits to fewer than four per month for each resident, nine of these are prisons, which may be an indication that type of facility is a factor here. However, prisons constitute ten of the facilities in the unlimited category (25.4%). It may be concluded that limitations on the number of visits permitted each resident per month are also related to space. Limitations must be placed on number and length of visits in those facilities which cannot accommodate the number of persons who wish to visit. Arrangements must be made which will make visits available to all residents.

TABLE 7

NUMBER OF VISITS PERMITTED PER RESIDENT PER MONTH

(N = 153)

No. of Visits Per Month	No. of Institutions	% of Total Sample	No. of Visits Per Month	No. of Institutions	% of Total Sample
1	0	0.0	12	7	4.6
2	5	3.3	13	1	.7
3	6	3.9	14	0	0.0
4	38	24.8	15	2	1.3
5	9	5.9	16	3	2.0
6	4	2.5	17	1	.7
7	1	.7	18	1	.7
8	32	20.9	19	0	0.0
9	1	.7	20	4	2.5
10	4	2.5	unlimited	34	22.2
11	0	0.0			
			TOTALS	153	99.9[a]

[a]Percentages do not add to 100 due to rounding.

Fifty-nine per cent of the responding institutions permit residents to have visits at least twice a week (8 per month or more). Compared to the pattern found by Zemans and Cavan (1958), this seems quite generous. Certainly it indicates a much less restrictive attitude than was found in the 1956 survey; 62.5% of their sample permitted two or fewer visits per month (p. 52). Even more indicative of changes in visiting policies is that nearly one-fourth of the responding institutions (24.7%) permit twenty or more visits per resident per month.

The question which now arises is how long may these visits last? The length of the visit also depends on visiting room capacity and volume. Most respondents indicated that weekend visits were usually limited. The permitted length of visit is another indicator of changes in attitudes toward visiting on the part of correctional authorities. Table 8 shows the number of institutions at each length of visit category (measured hours). Where weekend visits were limited, the longest visit was selected for the table. Where schedules were erratic, e.g., 3 hours in the evenings and 8 on weekends, the length of visit was averaged.

The permitted length of the visit varies from 45 minutes to more than nine hours. Nearly half the sample limits visits to three hours or less in length. Thirty per cent limit the visit to two hours or less. Thirty-seven per cent permit visits

TABLE 8

PERMITTED LENGTH OF VISIT

(N = 161)

Length in Hours	No. of Institutions	% of Institutions	Cumulative Adjusted Frequency (%)
1	15	9.3	9.3
2	33	20.5	29.8
3	30	18.6	48.4
4	11	6.8	55.2
5	12	7.5	62.7
6	25	15.5	78.2
7	21	13.0	91.2
8	9	5.6	96.8
9+	5	3.1	99.9
TOTAL	161	99.9[a]	99.9[a]

[a]Percentages do not total to 100 due to rounding.

of six or more hours. Often, when visits may last this long, picnic lunches may be brought and shared, there may be freedom of the grounds. Where visits may last six or more hours, the authorities may be assumed to be encouraging them.

Cross-tabulations were made of the permitted length of visit with the number of visits permitted per resident per month. The most common pattern is once a week (four to five visits per month) for up to six hours. This represents a considerable change since the 1956 survey by Zemans and Cavan (1958), where the most common pattern was twice a month for not more than two hours.

The permitted length of each visit is of considerable interest when institutions can be classified as isolated (100 miles or more from the state's highest crime areas). Though correctional facilities are usually characterized as isolated, the mileage measurements made here indicate that 36.9% of the responding institutions are located in areas less than fifty miles from the residences of the majority of their prisoners. Assuming an average driving speed of fifty miles per hour, visits to prisoners in these institutions require less than two hours total driving time for the majority of visitors.

A figure of 100 miles (four hours round trip) was arbitrarily selected as the point at which an institution may be characterized as isolated. According to this criterion, 66 facilities (39.3%) are isolated. Of these, twenty-seven (27)

are between 100 and 149 miles from the high crime areas (16% of the total sample); twenty fall between 150 and 199 miles (11.2%); and nineteen are 200 miles or more from the high crime areas (11.3%).

Isolation (mileage) was cross-tabulated with permitted length of visit for 161 of the responding institutions in Table 9. It was assumed that the more isolated the institution the longer visitors would be allowed to stay. For the most part this proved true. Of seventeen institutions whose isolation was rated very high (more than 200 miles), fourteen (82%) permitted visits to last five or more hours. Only one of the 58 institutions characterized as isolated (100 or more miles) limited visits to one hour; eight limited visits to two hours; and four had a three hour limit. Thirty-one (53.4%) permitted visits of six or more hours.

Table 9 also indicates a reverse trend, which is that the less isolated the institution, the shorter its visiting hours. Of those facilities less than 25 miles from the state's high crime areas, a total of 43 facilities, twenty (46.5%) permit visits of not more than two hours, while fourteen (32.5$) permitted visits of five hours or more. One-third of the 24 facilities between 26 and 50 miles distant from high crime areas limit visits to no more than two hours. There are 103 facilities classified as not isolated (within 100 miles of highest crime

TABLE 9

PERMITTED LENGTH OF VISIT BY MILEAGE

(N = 161)

Miles	Hours																			
	1		2		3		4		5		6		7		8		9+		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
0- 25	7	16.3	13	30.2	7	16.3	2	4.7	5	11.6	4	9.3	2	4.7	2	4.7	1	2.3	43	100.1
26- 50	2	8.3	6	2.5	7	29.1	1	4.2	0	0	5	20.8	2	8.3	1	4.2	0	0	24	99.9
21- 75	2	9.1	4	18.2	4	18.2	2	9.1	2	9.1	0	0	7	31.8	1	4.5	0	0	22	100.0
76-100	3	21.4	2	14.3	2	14.3	2	14.3	1	7.1	0	0	3	21.4	1	7.1	0	0	14	99.9
101-125	0	0	4	22.2	2	11.1	2	11.1	1	5.6	3	16.7	2	11.1	3	16.7	1	5.6	18	100.1
126-150	0	0	2	20	2	20	0	0	0	0	2	20	3	30	1	10	0	0	10	100.0
151-175	0	0	0	0	2	66.7	1	33.3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	100.0
176-200	0	0	1	10	3	30	1	10	2	20	2	20	0	0	0	0	1	10	10	100.0
201-225	1	12.5	1	12.5	1	12.5	0	0	1	12.5	1	12.5	2	25	0	0	1	12.5	8	100.0
226-250	0		0		0	0	0	0	0	0	1	100	0		0		0		1	100.0
251-275	0		0		0		0		0		1	100	0		0		0		1	100.0
276-300	0		0		0		0		0		2	100	0		0		0		2	100.0
301-325	0		0		0		0		0		2	100	0		0		0		2	100.0
326-350	0		0		0		0		0		0		0		0		1	100	1	100.0
401-425	0		0		0		0		0		1	100	0		0		0		1	100.0
451-475	0		0		0		0		0		1	100	0		0		0		1	100.0

areas). Fifty-nine (47.8%) permit visits of no more than three hours. Those institutions which are not isolated probably receive a larger volume of visitors. Thus the visiting period must be restricted to accommodate a larger number of persons. The percentage of non-isolated institutions with short visiting hours (0-3 hrs.) is greater than the percentage of isolated institutions with long visiting hours (6 or more hours).

Though the permitted length of visit is a function of both distance and space it also may serve as an indicator of the degree to which visitors are encouraged. The number of non-isolated facilities with generous visiting periods (6 hours or more) is 29. It can be assumed that these institutions are not compensating for the distance visitors must travel. This figure represents 28.1% of the non-isolated institutions, a significant percentage. These institutions might therefore be characterized as encouraging visitors rather than merely tolerating them. These may be contrasted with the 22.4% of the isolated facilities which limit visiting periods to three hours or less, which suggests discouragement rather than tolerance.*

---

*Many correctional institutions do have special visits of longer duration when visitors come great distances, particularly if they are from another state. Usually such visits are arranged in advance.

Establishing the degree to which correctional institutions encourage, merely tolerate, or even discourage, visitors has been a primary concern of the survey. A rating scale has been devised using three compensation areas, matched against a base obstacle measurement of visiting room capacity. Visiting room capacity was selected in preference to geographical isolation because the data suggest that it has the most impact on compensation patterns and because measurement is not arbitrary. VRC is expressed as a percentage of the total population.

Two time compensation factors are used: total hours available for visitation per week (days per week x hours per day); and the permitted length of visit (in hours). The third compensation factor is visitor frequency, indicated by the number of visits permitted per resident per month. All factors were rated on a scale of 10: a visiting room capacity (VRC) of 100% or more is rated 10.0, of 50% 5.0, of 25% 2.5, etc. Total visiting hours per week were rated at 50 or more as 10, 45 rates 9, and so on. Four of the institutions in the sample have more than 70 hours for visiting each week (see Table 2 supra), and these rather extraordinary efforts are not reflected in the Index Scale. For permitted length of visit, 10 hours or more = 10, nine = 9, and so forth.

Ratings for the four factors were averaged to obtain an Index score. This score is carried to two decimal places. Only institutions which provided information on the four factors are included in the Index rating (N = 132).

TABLE 10

VISITING ENCOURAGEMENT-TOLERANCE INDEX

(N = 132)

Index Rating	No. of Institutions	% of Total	Cumulative Adjusted Frequency (%)
1.5 -2.0	3	2.3	-
2.01-2.5	7	5.3	7.6
2.51-3.0	7	5.3	12.9
3.01-3.5	16	12.1	25.0
3.51-4.0	13	9.8	34.8
4.01-4.5	17	12.9	47.7
4.51-5.0	15	11.4	59.1
5.01-5.5	14	10.6	69.7
5.51-6.0	16	12.1	81.8
6.01-6.5	6	4.5	86.3
6.51-7.0	5	3.8	90.1
7.01-7.5	5	3.8	93.9
7.51-8.0	7	5.3	99.2
8.01-8.5	-	-	-
8.51-9.0	-	-	-
9.01-9.5	-	-	-
9.51-10	1	0.8	100.0
TOTAL	132	100.0	

Scores in the middle range (4-6) are merely tolerating visitors. Sixty-two of the institutions had Index scores between 4 and 6, 47.0% of the total sample. The median score was 4.68. Forty-six institutions had scores below 4, 34.8% of the sample, and 24, or 18.2%, had scores above 6. If 0 indicates discouragement and 10 indicates encouragement of visitors, then more institutions discourage visitors than encourage them.

The highest Index score was 9.58 followed by 8.0. The lowest score was 1.80 and there were two other institutions with scores of less than 2.0. There were 14 institutions with scores between 2.0 and 3.0 and eleven with scores between 7.0 and 8.0. Though the policies surrounding correctional visiting have improved greatly since the survey reported twenty years ago by Zemans and Caven (1958), the majority of correctional facilities still do not approach the National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals (19) standard of encouraging, rather than merely tolerating visitors. Indeed, nearly 35% of the current sample have still not achieved tolerance.

CHAPTER VI. SURVEY OF VISITORS

This segment of the study explores visiting from the perspective of the visitor. There has been little attempt in the literature to deal with this perspective. Those studies which document the hardships endured by the families of prisoners place an emphasis on daily living and give little attention to the mechanics of visiting the prisoner. (Morris, 1965; Schniller, 1974; Schwartz and Weintraub, 1974, et al).

Visitors were surveyed at two correctional facilities in order to determine their relationship to the prisoner, the distance traveled for a visit, frequency of visits, and age and income of the visitors.

To accomplish this, questionnaires (see Appendix A) were distributed to adult visitors at two prisons in one state. The institutions were chosen for their dissimilarity. One, Central, is a maximum security institution located in the central part of the capital city of the state. It was constructed well over 100 years ago when the surrounding area was rural. The city grew and encompassed the prison. It now covers a city block, borders directly on the street, and is surrounded by row houses and small businesses on three sides. It is less than a mile from the train

station which serves the populous northeastern section of the state as well as a large city in a neighboring state to the southwest. It is the same distance from a bus terminal and is also close to city bus lines. In addition, major interstate highways serve the city from many areas of the state.

Accessible Central is sharply contrasted with Rural, a medium security prison in the southeast portion of the state. Rural is a new facility, opened in 1969. Though it is located on a two-lane state highway, the structure itself is nearly a mile from the road and is surrounded by open fields and farmland. The land is farmed by minimum custody prisoners at the adjacent satellite unit. An intercity bus discharges passengers near the prison roadway and picks up fares at the satellite unit (a one and one-half mile walk from the prison).

Visiting policies and procedures at the two prisons are also very different. At Central contact visits are permitted only on weekends. There are three visiting periods which last for two hours. There is a large volume of visitors on weekends and a limited visiting room capacity. Visitors who are turned away from the first period may wait for the second period to start or may choose to have a closed visit. The closed visiting area provides a table separated by a glass partition. At each seat there is a telephone for conversation. The closed visit area is available seven days a week.

At Rural all visits are contact visits. The visiting hours are 9:30 to 3:15 daily, and, unless there is crowding on weekends, visitors may stay for the entire visiting day. The differences, as might be expected from the previous chapter, are related to isolation (Rural is over 100 miles from the highest crime area) and to visiting room capacity.

The visiting room capacity is closely associated with the age of the facility. Central's visiting area is not as large as Rural's, nor is the atmosphere as pleasant. Central has had contact visits for only four years. There was no space available for these visits until 1972, when the Supreme Court's decision vacated the prison's Death House. Cell doors were removed, walls were painted in bright colors, and the electric chair was hidden by a partition. The Death House thus became the contact visiting area. It is available only on weekends because of its location inside the walls. Since more visitors are free for visits on weekends than are free during the week, more visitors can take advantage of contact visits.

Since weekends are peak visiting days at both Central and Rural and summer provides the best traveling weather, questionnaires were distributed on consecutive summer weekends at both institutions. At Rural questionnaires were distributed on 2 successive weekends. At Central questionnaires were distributed for 3 weekends, in the contact visiting area only.

One of the limitations of the study is that personal distribution of questionnaires was not permitted at Central. One of the prisoner organizations, which earned money by taking photographs in the visiting area, volunteered to distribute the questionnaires. They were unable to answer questions or to assure anonymity. As a result many visitors to Central did not complete all the items. Of particular concern was the item which requested place of residence. Twenty-three percent of the respondents at Central omitted this item, probably because it seemed to threaten their anonymity.

At Rural the questionnaires were distributed personally in the prison lobby. A number of questions were raised concerning the necessity of certain items; since these could be answered, questionnaires at Rural were more complete. In addition visitors at Rural were much more likely to add comments at the bottom of the questionnaire. Additional advantages to personal distribution were the opportunities to observe visitor-staff interaction, to chat informally with both visitors and staff, and to analyze the processing of visitors.

Upon arrival at Rural visitors report to the staff in the mailroom. Above the mailroom window is a sign in English and Spanish explaining that proper identification is required of all visitors. Visitors without adequate identification are not admitted. Where there is doubt a sergeant on duty makes the final

decision. Each visitor over sixteen years of age must be on the prisoner's list of visitors. Those who are not are not admitted.

In addition to checking the identification of visitors, the mailroom officer also accepts money to be deposited in the prisoner's account and receives packages for prisoners which will be inspected and delivered to the tiers later in the day. When a number of visitors arrive at once, the line is long and the process time consuming. One visitor suggested a "take a number" system to eliminate the line. The lobby has many soft cushioned chairs which are seldom used and would provide a more comfortable place to await one's turn at the window.

Many visitors filled out the questionnaires while they waited in line. The forms required little writing and could be completed very quickly. For the most part visitors were extraordinarily cooperative. A total of 394 visitors completed the questionnaires. Eleven of those from Central were so incomplete or over-completed that they could not be used. The total sample was thus reduced to 383: from Central, 193; from Rural, 190.

Who were these visitors? The questionnaire contained nine family/friend categories: mother, father, wife, son, daughter, brother, sister, male friend, and female friend, as well as an "other" category with a blank in which visitors were asked to specify their relationship. This category included aunts, cousins, grandparents, nieces and nephews and assorted in-laws.

Together, the "other" group constitutes only 4.4% of the total sample and, while they are included in tables concerning the total visitors, no single "other" category is sufficient to consider separately.

One might assume that at institutions which confine only men, the largest number of visitors will be women. The survey supports this assumption. Women comprise 73% of the respondents.

Table 11 lists the ten family/friend categories and the number and percent of each category at each prison. The large percentage of women is clear from the table.

The son and daughter categories are negligible. Since the average age of prisoners at both institutions is less than 30, the reason for this is clear. Questionnaires were distributed only to adults. Large numbers of children do visit with their parents. Infants, teenagers and every age between visited at Rural. Some were the prisoner's siblings, some nieces or nephews, and some their sons and daughters. A few adult respondents did check categories for the children but filled the rest of the questionnaire with information about themselves. The few children who were thus "co-listed" were omitted from the data.

The largest category at both institutions, and possibly the most interesting, is the "female-friend." The women in this category have varying relationships with the prisoners. Some are casual friends who have "given in" to frequent written requests for a visit. One young woman at Rural had come with the prisoner's

TABLE 11

RELATIONSHIP OF VISITORS TO PRISONERS, BY INSTITUTION

Relationship	Central		Rural		All Respondents	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Mother	26	13.5	29	15.3	55	14.4
Father	8	4.1	19	10.0	27	7.0
Wife	31	16.1	30	15.8	61	15.9
Son	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Daughter	3	1.6	1	0.5	4	1.0
Brother	10	5.2	14	7.4	24	6.3
Sister	11	5.7	15	7.9	26	6.8
Male Friend	20	10.4	15	7.9	35	9.1
Female Friend	72	37.3	58	30.5	130	33.9
Other	12	6.2	9	4.7	21	5.5
TOTAL	193	100.1[a]	190	100.0	383	99.9

[a]Percentages do not add to 100 due to rounding.

sister. She had corresponded with the prisoner for about eight months and was at last responding to his repeated request to visit. Other casual friends may be affiliated with volunteer organizations who correspond with prisoners.

Some of the women are engaged to the prisoner. Several used the blank for "other" category to define their status as "fiancee," "girl friend," "wife-to-be," and, in one case, "old lady." Some of these women are deluding themselves. The visiting officer at Rural told of one prisoner whose blonde "fiancee" visits on Saturday, whose brunette "fiancee" visits on Sunday, and whose wife and children visit during the week.

Nevertheless, many of the women in this category consider their relationship to the prisoner a romantic one, and many of them are very loyal. Respondents were asked to indicate the frequency with which they visit. Of the 130 persons in the female friend category, 86 (66.1%) claim* to visit at least once a week and 84% visit at least every other week.

Table 12 lists the reported frequency of visits of female friends and compares their frequency with that of wives, who appear to be even more loyal. Seventy-seven percent claim to visit at least once a week.

---

*The word claim is used advisedly here. Self-reporting of frequency is not entirely accurate. Each visitor at Rural may visit only once a week, yet some claimed to come more often. Questionnaires were distributed on consecutive weekends at Rural, and while there were a number of familiar faces, the number of respondents who checked once a week was much greater. This may indicate an intention to visit more often or a perception of oneself as traveling to the prison all the time.

TABLE 12

FREQUENCY OF VISITS (WIVES AND FEMALE FRIENDS)

Frequency	Female Friends		Wives	
	No.	%	No.	%
More than once a week	25	19.2	10	16.4
Once a week	61	46.9	37	60.7
Every two weeks	23	17.7	7	11.5
Every month	8	6.2	4	6.6
Every two months	4	3.1	1	1.6
Every three months	1	0.8	0	0.0
Every six months	0	0.0	0	0.0
Once a year or less	3	2.3	1	1.6
No response	5	3.8	1	1.6
TOTAL	130	100.0	61	100.0

Together these two categories constitute fifty percent of the total sample and the most frequent visitors. They might well be treated as a single category, except for the casual friends mentioned above. There is, apparently, some overlap. Some of the women who checked the wife item have, in fact, a common-law relationship, not a legal one. Some of the female friends have the same relationship. They appear to have equal potential as resocializing agents and they demonstrate support during incarceration and, probably, an offer of support upon release.

Holt and Miller (1972) recommended that common-law wives be encouraged to visit on the same basis as legal wives, since the potential for parole success of prisoners in this relationship seems nearly as great as the potential for legally married prisoners whose spouses visit regularly (p. v).

Many institutions do not view this relationship as a promising one. Some permit girlfriends to visit less than other friends and relatives. Some limit the length of visit for girlfriends, but not for other visitors. (Data from survey reported in previous chapter.) These limitations appear to represent attempts by prison authorities to impose middle-class standards on lower-class, culturally different groups.

A distinction should, perhaps, be made between girlfriends and common-law wives. Some of the respondents in the female friend category appear to belong to a peculiar group of women who might be called "prison-attracted." Twenty-three (17.7%) of the female

friend respondents visit more than one prisoner. Some of these are involved in organizations which visit prisoners on a volunteer basis, but a few of the volunteers are border line prison-attracted.

The prison-attracted woman meets prisoners through other prisoners. They visit, telephone, and correspond with the men. Some drop one prisoner and visit another, and then turn to a third. Prisoners have reported this phenomenon. At Central, officers of prisoner organizations could receive outside calls during the day. Many of the callers were local women who had corresponded or visited with other prisoners. One might speculate that these women find it difficult to form relationships with persons outside the walls, and feel more appreciated by men who are not free to pursue other relationships. While the data here cannot be used for more than speculation, it does suggest an interesting area for sociological research.

Mothers constitute the next largest group of visitors; they are also the next most frequent visitors. Table 13 compares the frequency of blood relatives--parents, brothers and sisters.

Nearly a third of the mothers visit at least once a week. The total number of fathers and siblings who visit this frequently just exceeds the total number of mothers. To a certain extent the visiting frequency of fathers and siblings follows that of mothers. It may be that mothers are not accustomed to traveling alone and rely on other family members for transportation and

TABLE 13

FREQUENCY OF VISIT (PARENTS-SIBLINGS)

	Mothers		Fathers		Brothers		Sisters	
Frequency	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
More than once a week	10	18.2	1	3.7	2	8.3	0	0.0
Once a week	8	14.5	8	29.6	2	8.3	9	34.6
Every two weeks	20	36.4	8	29.6	7	29.2	2	7.7
Once a month	11	20.0	6	22.2	9	37.5	4	15.4
Every two months	2	3.6	0	0.0	1	4.2	4	15.4
Every three months	2	3.6	2	7.4	1	4.2	3	11.5
Two times a year	1	1.8	1	3.7	1	4.2	1	3.8
Once a year or less	1	1.8	1	3.7	0	0.0	0	0.0
No response	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	4.2	3	11.5
TOTALS	55	99.9[a]	27	99.9	24	100.1	26	99.9

[a]Percentages do not total 100 due to rounding.

company. No mothers arrived at Rural alone during the two weekends of the survey.

One factor which may relate to the frequency of visits is the age of the visitor. Table 14 lists the ages of the respondents. Not surprisingly, the largest number of visitors were between 20 and 30 (45%). The average age of prisoners at Central is 26, and at Rural, 24. Their spouses, siblings, and friends are likely to be in the same age range. Since Table 13 indicated that parents visit less frequently than wives and female friends, age may be a factor. One might expect older visitors to find traveling more difficult and to visit less often. Table 15 cross-tabulates age with frequency.

Of those persons who visit at least once a week, 19.7% are over forty years of age; 39% of those who visit every other week are over forty; and of those who visit once a month 38.3% are over forty. These changes in percentage do appear to indicate a relationship between frequency of visit and age of visitor, but other factors may play a greater role.

One of the chief concerns of the survey was to determine the extent to which the geographical isolation of the institution affects visitation. Central and Rural were chosen because one was accessible and the other isolated. The populations of the two institutions are similar and the number of visitors surveyed at each was nearly the same. Visitors' reports of frequency at each institution give some indication of the function of geographical

TABLE 14

AGE OF VISITORS

Age in Years	No.	Percent	Cumulative Adjusted Frequency (%)
No response	7	1.8	1.8
21 or less	45	11.7	13.6
22-25	109	28.5	42.0
26-30	63	16.4	58.5
31-40	54	14.1	72.6
41-50	57	14.9	87.5
51-60	33	8.6	96.1
61-over	15	3.9	100.0
TOTALS	383	100.0	100.0

TABLE 15

FREQUENCY OF VISIT BY AGE OF VISITOR

Frequency		Age							
		21 or less	22-25	26-30	31-40	41-50	51-60	Over 60	Total
At least once a week	No.	23	64	33	34	22	15	1	192
	%	12.0	33.3	17.2	17.7	11.4	7.8	0.5	99.9[a]
Every two weeks	No.	7	17	14	10	19	8	3	78
	%	9.0	21.8	17.9	12.8	24.4	10.3	3.8	100
Every month	No.	4	13	5	7	8	7	3	47
	%	8.5	27.7	10.6	14.9	17.0	14.9	6.4	100
Every two months	No.	4	3	5	2	5	0	2	21
	%	19.0	14.3	23.8	9.5	23.8	0.0	9.5	99.9[a]
Every three months	No.	2	5	1	1	1	2	3	100
	%	13.3	33.3	6.7	6.7	6.7	13.3	20.0	100
Twice a year	No.	2	1	0	0	0	1	2	6
	%	33.3	16.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	16.7	33.3	100
Once a year or less	No.	2	2	1	0	2	0	0	7
	%	28.6	28.6	14.3	0.0	28.6	0.0	0.0	100.1[a]

[a]Percentages may not total 100 due to rounding.

location with regard to frequency of visits. Table 16 compares the two prisons. Eleven respondents omitted this item.

Nearly eighty percent of the Central respondents visit at least every other week, while 67.2% of the Rural respondents visit this often. Though self-reporting of frequency may not be entirely reliable, the data in Table 16 do suggest that the geographical location of the institution does affect visiting frequency.

In order to more thoroughly assess geographical isolation, respondents were asked to indicate on the questionnaire their place of residence: city, county, and state. A number of prisoners do come from other states, and some had visitors during the survey period. In two neighboring states there are large cities directly on the border; thirty-three visitors come from these states, most from one of the two cities. Eleven visitors come from more distant states.

The county information gives a rough indication of the impact of geography of visitation. The county with the highest crime area contributed 15.7% of the respondents. This county accounts for more than twice as many new admissions to correctional facilities in the state as any other county in the state. Though it is state policy to assign prisoners to institutions close to their home community, and there is a prison near this county, offenders from this area are found in the other prisons.*

---

*The prison which would serve this county is the most crowded of the three-institution prison complex.

TABLE 16

FREQUENCY OF VISITS BY INSTITUTION

(N = 372)

		At Least Once a Week	Every Two Weeks	Once a Month	Every Two Months	Every Three Months	Every Six Months	Once a Year or Less	Total
CENTRAL	Number	110	43	17	12	7	2	1	192
	Percent	57.3	22.4	8.8	6.3	3.6	1.0	0.5	99.9[a]
RURAL	Number	84	37	32	9	8	4	6	180
	Percent	46.7	20.5	17.8	5.0	4.4	2.2	3.3	99.9[a]

[a]Percentages do not total 100 due to rounding.

This county and five others account for two-thirds of the annual admissions to state correctional facilities. Three of these counties are included in a list of the counties in which most of the visitors reside. Of the 313 visitors who make up the county sample, 78.2% come from 6 counties. Three of these provide large numbers of admissions to state facilities. Rural is located in another of the six; Central in yet another. Though the counties in which the prisons are located provide many visitors, the state's policy of placing offenders close to their home communities plays a part. It may also be true that because the visitors live near the institutions, they can visit more easily and more frequently.

The best indication of the effect of geographical location on visiting is the actual distance, in miles, which visitors travel for a visit. To determine this mileage, a recent map of the state was used to measure the shortest route, by automobile, between the institution and each city listed by respondents. Though Central can be reached easily by bus or train, and Rural is accessible by bus, it was assumed that bus and train routes cover essentially similar distances. In addition, the majority of visitors did travel by automobile: 85% of Rural visitors and 74% of Central visitors drove to the institution.

The mileage measurements are indicated in Table 17. They have been segmented according to an estimate of time spent driving,

TABLE 17

ONE-WAY MILEAGE, EACH INSTITUTION

Miles	Number of Visitors			Percent of Visitors		
	Central	Rural	Total	Central	Rural	Total
1- 13	27	3	30	13.9	1.6	7.8
14- 25	10	25	49	5.2	15.3	12.8
26- 50	81	39	110	42.0	20.5	28.7
51- 75	43	32	75	22.3	16.8	19.6
76-100	3	9	12	1.5	4.7	3.1
101-125	0	40	40	0.0	21.1	10.4
126-150	0	25	25	0.0	13.2	6.5
151-up	4	9	13	2.1	4.7	3.4
No response	25	4	29	13.0	2.1	7.6
TOTALS	193	190	383	100.0	100.0	99.9[a]

[a]Percentages may not add to 100 due to rounding.

where the average speed is fifty miles an hour. Thus a 13 mile drive takes about 15 minutes, a 25 mile drive 30 minutes, and so on, in half hour increments. Distances of more than 150 miles are outside the state. Though the table gives one-way mileage, it should be noted that the time invested in a round trip is probably the most important factor. Few of the Central respondents spend more than one and one-half hours to reach the institution. Indeed, 60% of the visitors to Central travel one hour or less, while at Rural 60% of the visitors travel more than one hour. These differences are clearly a function of the geographical location of the prisons. If a three hour round trip is viewed as a maximum comfortable driving time, 97% of the Central visitors invest less than three hours for a visit, while 43% of the Rural visitors spend more than three hours.

Table 16 (above) compared frequency at the two prisons. More than three-quarters of the Central visitors visit at least every two weeks (79.3%), while fewer than two-thirds of the Rural visitors come this often (61.0%). While this is not a major difference, it does suggest the importance of distance. A clearer picture may be gained by relating frequency to mileage. This data is presented in Table 18.

In order to reduce the quantity of data, mileages were encapsulated into twenty-mile units, with refinements at either end of the scale: 1-10, 11-20, 21-40, 41-60, etc. The 29

TABLE 18

FREQUENCY BY MILEAGE

Frequency	At Least Once a Week		Every 2 Weeks		Once a Month		Every 2 Months		Every 3 Months		Twice a Year		Once a Year or Less	
Mileage	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1- 10	17	9.4	3	4.2	0	0	2	10	0	0	0	0	0	0
11- 20	14	7.7	5	7.0	1	2.1	0	0	1	7.1	0	0	0	0
21- 40	39	21.5	12	16.9	15	31.9	3	15	2	14.3	0	0	0	0
41- 60	63	34.8	21	29.6	7	14.9	8	40	2	14.3	1	20	1	16.7
61- 80	21	11.6	13	18.3	10	21.3	2	10	1	7.1	0	0	0	0
81-100	1	.6	1	1.4	3	6.4	1	5	0	0	1	20	0	0
101-120	7	3.9	6	8.5	2	4.3	1	5	2	14.3	0	0	0	0
121-140	18	9.9	7	9.9	7	14.9	3	15	2	14.3	1	20	5	83.3
141-up	1	.6	3	4.2	2	4.3	0	0	4	28.6	2	40	0	0
TOTALS	181	100	71	100	47	100.1[a]	20	100	14	100	5	100	6	100

[a]Percentages may not total 100 due to rounding.

visitors who omitted this item were eliminated from the sample, as were the 10 respondents who omitted the frequency item (N = 344).

About three-quarters of those who visit at least once a week live 60 or fewer miles from the institution (73.0%). To account for three-quarters of those who visit every other week, another 20 miles is added, i.e., of those who visit every other week three-quarters live up to 80 miles from the institution (76.0%). The same is true of the next group; of those who visit once a month, three-quarters live from eleven to 100 miles from the prison. The other categories are too small to be of importance. This table suggests that the more frequently the visitor comes, the closer he or she lives.

Table 19 illustrates this three-quarters phenomenon more graphically by giving the cumulative adjusted frequency of the mileage-frequency correlation.

The twenty-mile increase represents (round trip) an increase of 48 minutes driving time, if average speed is 50 miles per hour. Tables 18 and 19 illustrate that those who visit most often tend to live relatively close. Table 20 provides data which illustrate that those who live closest visit most frequently.

If the 75% figure is used for Table 20 as it was in Table 19, this table indicates that 75% of those who live 1-10 miles from the institution visit at least once a week. For those who live 11-20 miles from the institution, the 75th percentile lies closer to every other week. The 75th percentile continues

TABLE 19

CUMULATIVE ADJUSTED FREQUENCY (%)
FREQUENCY BY MILEAGE

Frequency	Once a Week	Every 2 Weeks	Once a Month	Every 2 Months	Every 3 Months	Twice a Year	Once a Year
Miles							
1- 10	9.4	4.2	0	10	0	0	0
11- 20	17.1	11.2	2.1	10	7.1	0	0
21- 40	38.6	28.1	34.0	25	21.4	0	0
41- 60	73.4	57.1	48.9	65	35.7	20	16.7
61- 80	85.0	76.0	70.2	75	42.8	20	16.7
81-100	85.6	77.4	76.6	80	42.8	40	16.7
101-120	89.5	85.9	80.9	85	57.1	40	16.7
121-140	99.4	95.8	95.8	100	71.4	60	100.0
141-up	100.0	100.0	100.0	100	100.0	100	100.0

TABLE 20

MILES TRAVELED BY FREQUENCY OF VISIT

(Cumulative Adjusted Frequency - %)

	Miles								
Frequency	1-10	11-20	21-40	41-60	61-80	81-100	101-121	121-140	141-up
Once a week	77.3	66.7	54.9	61.2	44.7	14.3	38.9	41.9	8.3
Every 2 weeks	90.9	90.5	71.8	81.6	72.4	28.6	72.2	58.2	33.3
Once a month	90.9	95.3	92.9	88.4	93.7	71.5	83.3	74.5	50.0
Every 2 months	100.0	95.3	97.1	96.2	98.0	85.8	88.9	81.5	50.0
Every 3 months	100.0	100.1	99.9	98.1	100.1	85.8	100.0	86.2	83.3
Twice a year	100.0	100.1	99.9	99.1	100.1	100.1	100.0	88.5	100.0
Once a year or less	100.0	100.1	99.9	100.1	100.1	100.1	100.0	100.1	100.0

to lie in the less frequent categories as mileage increases.

As mileage increases the cost of travel increases, and this may affect the frequency of visits. The literature on the families of prisoners consistently reports financial hardship as one of the results of the incarceration (Morris, 1964; Schwartz and Weintraub, 1974; Schneller, 1974, et al). The greater the distance, the more expensive the trip; therefore, mileage was cross-tabulated with income.

A considerable number of respondents indicated that they were on welfare, a not uncommon situation for the families of prisoners. The income item was the most frequently omitted item on the questionnaire. Many visitors questioned the need for this information. Most who questioned it did complete it. Others did not raise the question but simply neglected to answer. Ninety-four respondents did not answer this question (24.5%), even though a specific figure was not requested. Table 21 lists the number and percent of visitors at each income level.

Half of the visitors had family incomes of less than $10,000 yearly. When the 94 who did not respond are omitted from the sample (N = 289), 70.2% earned $10,000 or less a year, while 36% earned $5,000 or less per year. Certainly the visitors in this survey fit the pattern established in the literature.

Many people at this income level do not own automobiles and must rely on relatives and friends for transportation to the

TABLE 21

INCOME OF VISITORS

Yearly Income	Number	Percent
(No Response)	94	24.5
$ 0-5,000	104	27.2
5,000-10,000	99	25.8
10,000-15,000	50	13.1
15,000-20,000	27	7.0
20,000-25,000	4	1.0
Over $25,000	5	1.3

institution or use public transportation. Train fare to Central from the highest crime area in the state is around $10.00 round trip. Clearly the geographical location of the institution in relation to the residence of the visitor can make visitation a financial problem, as well as a problem of time and logistics. Table 22 cross-tabulates mileage with income. Those who did not respond to these items were eliminated from the sample (N = 267).

No distinctions can be made on the basis of income or mileage. Essentially, two-thirds of each of the lower income groups travels 60 miles or less for a visit (64.5% of under $5,000, 67.1% of $5-10,000, 64.5% of $10-15,000). About one-fifth of each of these income groups travels over 100 miles (the degree of isolation determined in the previous chapter). No pattern of the hardships of distance and the financial situation of the family on visitation appears here. It should be noted that the state in which these prisons are located is a geographically small one. Due to the Department of Correction's policy of considering offender's residence in classification, the majority of visitors could not live very far from the institution.

Although it has been suggested that transportation to and from a visit creates problems for the families of prisoners who are financially pressed, a comparison of income with frequency of visit does not bear this out. Table 23 provides a cross-tabulation of frequency and income. Rather than indicating problems related

TABLE 22

INCOME BY MILES TRAVELED FOR VISIT

(N = 267)

Income	Under $5,000		5,000-10,000		10,000-15,000		15,000-20,000		20,000-25,000		25,000-up	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Miles												
0- 20	10	10.4	14	15.4	9	18.7	1	4.2	1	33.3	0	0.0
21- 40	25	26.0	19	20.9	6	12.5	5	20.8	2	66.7	1	20.0
41- 60	27	28.1	28	30.8	16	33.3	6	25.0	0	0.0	1	20.0
61- 80	12	12.5	13	14.3	5	10.4	2	8.3	0	0.0	1	20.0
81-100	2	2.1	1	1.1	2	4.2	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
101-120	4	4.2	6	6.6	3	6.3	4	16.7	0	0.0	2	40.0
121-140	12	12.5	10	11.0	6	12.5	5	20.8	0	0.0	0	0.0
141-up	4	4.2	0	0.0	1	2.1	1	4.2	0	0.0	0	0.0
TOTALS	96	99.9[a]	91	100.1[a]	48	100.0	24	100.0	3	100.0	5	100.0

[a]Percentages may not total 100 due to rounding.

TABLE 23

INCOME BY FREQUENCY OF VISIT

	$0-5,000		$5-10,000		$10-15,000		$15-20,000		$20-25,000		$25,000+	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Once a week or more	65	62.5	52	52.5	22	44.0	11	40.7	0	0.0	0	0.0
Every 2 weeks	14	13.5	19	19.2	14	28.0	6	22.2	1	25.0	5	100.0
Every month	9	8.7	12	12.1	4	8.0	5	18.5	3	75.0	0	0.0
Every 2 months	2	1.9	7	7.1	4	8.0	4	14.8	0	0.0	0	0.0
Every 3 months	5	4.8	3	3.0	3	6.0	1	3.7	0	0.0	0	0.0
Every 6 months	4	3.8	0	0.0	1	2.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Once a year or less	2	1.9	1	1.0	1	2.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
No response	3	2.9	5	5.1	1	2.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
TOTALS	104	100.0	99	100.0	50	100.0	27	99.9[a]	4	100.0	5	100.0

[a]Percentages may not total 100 due to rounding.

to income, Table 23 suggests that frequency may decrease as income increases. There are some possible explanations for such a trend. One is that in a state of relatively small size a visit to the prison may be a less expensive outing than many other possible weekend pastimes. This may be particularly true for families with children. The number of children who are permitted to accompany adult visitors is not limited in either Central or Rural; thus the expense of child care is not an especial problem. Of the 289 respondents who indicated their income, 47.8% did have children.

An additional factor may be the relationship to the prisoner of individuals at each income level. Of the 104 persons at the lowest income level, nearly two-thirds (66.3%) were the wives and girlfriends of prisoners. These two groups tend to be the most loyal (frequent) visitors (see Table 12 above). They are also often either on welfare or hold very low-paying jobs.

Though one might conclude that relationship is the most important variable related to visiting, it is also true that the visitors who were surveyed are visiting in a rather small state. The most distant institution in the state, Rural, is at most 140 miles from the highest crime areas of the state. Since such a distance represents less than three hours traveling time one way, Rural cannot be compared to institutions in other, larger states on geographical isolation. Central, on the other hand, is little

more than an hour away from any point in the state. The only data which indicate the impact of geographical isolation on visiting is the comparison of the two prisons as to frequency. (Table 16 above.) These data find visitors at Central reporting greater frequency than visitors at Rural.

In spite of the expense which travel to and from the institution is likely to entail, low-income visitors reported greater frequency of visits than high-income visitors. Since the majority of incarcerated families are from the lower socio-economic levels, this may be a matter of numbers. Perhaps as many as do visit, do not visit because of financial problems. These persons go uncounted.

In sum, the typical visitor to these two state prisons is a young woman, not a blood relative of the prisoner, whose earning power is low. She is likely to be black since nearly 80% of the prisoners at Central are black, and about 50% at Rural are black. She visits loyally, at least every other week, and arrives in a private car.

Because of the differences in accessibility between Rural and Central, clear differences appear in visiting patterns between the two institutions. These include mileage differences, frequency differences, and slight differences in the age of visitors. (Central visitors are slightly older.) It is the institutional differences which support, to some extent, the findings in the

nationwide survey reported in the previous chapter. Both Rural and Central draw large numbers of prisoners from the highest crime areas of the state, an indication that isolation measurements are not entirely accurate. It is also true that the counties which house the prisons provide many visitors and more frequent ones.

The two institutions clearly illustrate the relationship of age and visiting room capacity. Central, which is over 180 years old, had no space for contact visits until the death house was converted to a visiting room. This area now has a VRC of 24.5%. (However, the population of the institution is rising and as it grows the VRC decreases.) Rural, which was opened 8 years ago, has a 35% capacity, which increases in clement weather, as some lawn area is also used.

Because it can accommodate fewer persons, Central limits the length of the (contact) visit to one hour. However, since it has a two-day schedule it cannot be considered to be encouraging visitors. Rural compensates for its isolation by having a daily visiting schedule and by permitting an extended visit. Because they may stay for $5\frac{1}{4}$ hours, visitors to Rural appear willing to travel considerable distances fairly often. In addition, Rural does not place limitations on the number of visits each resident may have in a month. It does, however, limit the visitor to one visit per week. Many of the visitors to Rural

indicated that they would visit more often if it were allowed. Central restricts contact visits, but the non-contact (phone/screen) visiting area is available on weekdays, and no limits are placed on the number of these visits.

When the obstacles of distance, space and time are examined from the visitors' perspective, it appears that the prisoner's family and friends will visit in spite of the obstacles. Since the questionnaires were distributed over a brief period (two weekends at one institution, three at the other), infrequent visitors are underrepresented.

Those family members who do not visit at all remain unknown. Research might be undertaken to explore their reasons for not visiting.

The data presented here suggest that frequent visits are indicative of supportive relationships and family cohesion. If it is cohesion which governs frequent visitation, the research of Glaser (1964), Holt and Miller (1972), and others may indicate that parole success is related to the close-knit family. However, it remains to be seen whether family cohesiveness could be strengthened if visiting opportunities were expanded and visiting procedures eased. It may be that increased contact increases family cohesiveness. In addition increased contact provides role practice within the prisoner's family which may ease release adjustment.

Certainly the information on visitors discussed here is by no means definitive. Indeed it raises more questions than it answers. The study was intended, however, to be exploratory and to uncover some areas which require in-depth research. The next chapter summarizes the data and suggests some research areas.

CHAPTER VII. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS

The intent of the preceding chapters has been to examine the obstacles encountered by families and friends who visit incarcerated offenders and the degree to which efforts are made by correctional authorities to decrease these obstacles. Standard 2.17 of the correction's Report of the National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals (1975), which recommends encouraging visitors rather than merely tolerating them, has served as a basis for evaluating institutional policies related to visiting.

Information was gathered through questionnaires mailed to correctional institutions throughout the country and a visitor questionnaire distributed to visitors in two prisons.

Summary of Findings

Three factors--distance, space, and time--appear to be related to the logistical difficulties of visiting an imprisoned family member or friend. Since the literature indicates that the families of prisoners are usually under financial pressures (Schwartz & Weintraub, 1975; Schniller, 1975; et al.), distance was assumed to be a major factor; as distance increases, costs increase. However, the mileage measurements made for this study

indicate that correctional facilities may not be as geographically isolated as they would appear to be from the literature. Of the 168 responding institutions, 36.9% were less than 50 miles from those areas which are presumed to provide the majority of institutional residents. Only slightly more were 100 or more miles distant, 39.3%.

Though many institutions are not extremely isolated, distance does appear to affect visitor frequency. Reports of visitors of frequency at accessible Central Prison and isolated Rural showed that those who lived closest visited most often At both institutions. Comparisons of the two prisons showed frequency considerably higher at Central than at Rural. There did not, however, appear to be a correlation between frequency and income.

Since the distance traveled for a visit consumes time, it appears that visitors who must invest a considerable amount of time in travel would be affected by the length of the visit. The survey found that most of the institutions which can be characterized as isolated (100 or more miles) attempt to compensate for distance by increasing the length of the visit. Of these, 53.4% permitted visits of at least six hours in length. The data also showed a reverse trend; the closer the institution to the home areas of the majority of residents, the shorter the permitted length of the visit. The two prisons where visitors were polled

also follow this pattern; visits at Rural may last for five and one-half hours; visits at Central may last one and one-half hours.

While one of the compensations made by correctional authorities for the obstacle of time is to extend the length of the visit, another is to expand the hours available for visiting. Visiting schedules reported by respondents varied from Sunday for three hours (three hours per week) to daily for twelve hours (84 hours per week). The data showed that this variation could not be accounted for by type of facility or custody level. The factor which most closely correlated with schedule was visiting room capacity--the problem of space.

Where visiting room capacity is small relative to the institutional population, the visiting schedule tends to be generous; where it is large, the schedule tends to be restrictive. Of responding institutions with visiting room capacities of 10% or less, 89.5% had at least forty hours per week available for visits. The average number of hours available for visiting at institutions with visiting room capacities of at least 100% was 15 hours.

Since the space available for visiting is largely a matter of prison architecture, the factor which is most closely related to visiting room capacity is age. Of institutions constructed over fifty years ago, 70% had visiting capacities of no more than 25% of the total institutional population. Again the two prisons

where visitors were polled substantiate this finding; Central, which was constructed over 100 years ago, has a visiting room capacity of 15%, while Rural, opened in 1969, can accommodate more than 30% of its population in the visiting area.

Using compensating measures for the obstacles of distance, space and time, an Index was devised to evaluate visiting policies according to the National Advisory Commission's Standard for encouraging rather than tolerating visitors. The scale ranged from 0.0 to 10.0 with 0 indicating discouragement and 10 encouragement, and scores in the middle range (4-6) indicating tolerance. Of the 168 institutions surveyed, 34.8% scored below 4.0, 47% scores between 4.0 and 5.9, and 18.2% scored above 6.0. Clearly Standard 2.17 has not been widely adopted by the nation's correctional facilities.

Recommendations for Further Research

Resocialization

Although the research of Glaser (1964), Holt & Miller (1972) and others indicates that active family interest does contribute to parole success, there is a need to duplicate these studies in other regions and with larger numbers of prisoners. While the outcomes of such studies would not affect the changing view of visitation as a right rather than a privilege, they could affirm the resocializing impact of family and friends and in so doing

affect the institution's policies, programming, relationships with the community, and more.

Definitive studies of the resocializing impact of visitors are difficult without a large quantity of data. Since, for the most part, data in large amounts are not readily available, an alternative means of examining the resocializing impact of visitors should be sought. One possibility would be a comparison of parole success in two institutions with different visiting policies; one which encourages visits, one which does not. In both institutions the research of Holt and Miller (1972) could be replicated to examine the hypothesis that prisoners whose families are actively supportive during incarceration, as measured by visiting frequency, have significantly greater parole success than prisoners with few visits or none.

Some related hypotheses would include the following:

1. Prisoners in the institution which encourages visitors receive more visitors more frequently than prisoners in the institution which does not encourage visitors.
2. The marital stability of prisoners in the institution which encourages visitors is higher than it is for prisoners in the institution which does not.

3. Prisoners in the institution which encourages visitors have greater parole success than do prisoners in the institution which does not.

To control for distance an additional research possibility would be an examination of an institution which has changed its visiting policies. Again, the primary goal would be to assess the parole success of prisoners whose families showed "active" family interest under both policies. Some additional hypotheses which could be tested with a records search include:

1) Under the new policy proportionally more prisoners can be categorized as having active family interest.
2) The parole success of prisoners incarcerated under the changed visiting policies is greater than that of prisoners released under the former policies.

A search of records might also reveal some information relating to visiting and prisonization. One of the questions to be addressed here is the degree to which "active" family interest is related to length of sentence. It is hypothesized that measurable family interest will diminish over time even in the most cohesive families.

Since a significant number of prisoners do not receive visitors, studies of lay visiting programs might also shed some light on the phenomenon of resocialization through contact with the external community. These volunteer programs cannot always

meet the needs of all unvisited prisoners. The parole success of those who receive lay visitors on a regular basis could be compared with those who do not participate in the program.

Institutional Effects

A matter of special interest to the correctional institution is the degree to which institutional behavior is modified by more liberal visiting policies. In their study of California prisoners, Holt and Miller (1972) found no significant difference in institutional behavior (measured by number of disciplinary charges) between prisoners with active family support and those with little or none. Scudder (1954) felt prisoners were better behaved and more relaxed when he made visits more informal and pleasant. Conjugal visiting, according to Hopper (1965), reduced tension and increased order at Parchman. More studies in this area are needed.

It might be hypothesized that there is no significant difference in institutional behavior, measured by number of disciplinary reports, between visited and unvisited prisoners. To test this hypothesis, a sample of prisoners categorized as having active family interest could be matched with a sample categorized as having none. Number and seriousness of disciplinary reports received by each group over a period of time would then be compared.

Some institutions deny visits for unacceptable behavior or do not permit visits for inmates confined in disciplinary

quarters. If the institution has only weekend visits, disciplinary reports could be charted over a period of time to determine whether there is a pattern related to visiting days.

Another topic of interest to correctional practitioners involves measurements of their effectiveness. Since the effectiveness of institutional programs is often measured by the parole success of participants, institutional personnel may be interested in testing the resocializing impact of family participation in programs. It may be hypothesized that prisoners who are assigned to family participation sections of a program will have greater parole success than prisoners in regular sections.

Family Relationships

Further studies of the visitors themselves are needed to gain a full understanding of their resocializing influence upon prisoners. Studies of prisoners' families have concentrated almost exclusively on the wives of incarcerated men. The families of women prisoners should be studied, particularly the effect on their children and on their marital status. It would also be of use to study the effects of incarceration on the prisoner's parents and siblings. The survey of visitors reported in Chapter VI above indicates that forty per cent of the 393 visitors surveyed were relatives other than wives and children. Fenton (1959) suggested that one of the directions counselors should take in dealing with the families of prisoners is to explore

the family's contribution toward the causes of the prisoner's criminal behavior.

While studies of family dynamics might contribute to theories of crime causation, studies of supportive family relationships could contribute to an understanding of the resocializing impact of visitors upon the prisoner, and perhaps lead to the development of programs to promote family participation in the resocialization process. Instruments such as the Bales Interaction Process Analysis (Bales, 1950) could be modified for use in the correctional setting.

Further studies of family-prisoner relationships might be geared toward determining the most influential relationships. The visitor survey reported in Chapter VI revealed that one-third of all respondents were in the category "female friend." Of these women, two-thirds reported visiting at least once a week. Certainly these women could be characterized as having "active" interest. They provide emotional support and a promise of release support as well, yet seven of the institutions surveyed for this study indicated that special restrictions were placed on the visits of girlfriends. Since many prisoners have common-law relationships, these people should not be overlooked as potential sources of motivation, change, and support. Enduring common-law relationships have the same resocializing potential as many marriages. Holt and Miller (1972) suggested that they are equally

important and should be encouraged.

Studies of visitors might be addressed to testing the following hypotheses:

1) The parole success of prisoners who rely for support on girlfriends equals that of those who rely for support on wives.
2) The regular visits of wives have greater resocializing impact, measured by parole success, than regular visits of parents, siblings, and other relatives.
3) Regular "family" visits (i.e., spouse and children, parents and siblings) have greater resocializing impact, measured by parole success, than do visits by individuals.

The last hypothesis is related to the theoretical suggestion that practice in a role is necessary to successful performance in that role. If the prisoner has opportunities to practice the roles of parent, child, spouse, etc. during incarceration, his or her return to the family unit upon release may be smoother. This transition may contribute to successful completion of parole.

Further areas for study include analyses of the parole success of offenders whose families visit frequently. If the corrections agency is going to make use of visitors as resocializing agents, certain questions should be raised. Does frequent visiting decrease immersion into the prison subculture? Does practice in

conventional roles, such as parenting, increase the confidence of the prisoner and thus decrease the "release anxiety" syndrome? Is the parole success reported by Holt and Miller (1972) and Glaser (1964) primarily based on the assurance of family support upon release? The answers to such questions could determine the ways in which visitors might be counseled to understand their own effectiveness and the importance of cooperation with institutional staff.

Suggestions for Change

Whether or not the dynamics of the resocializing impact of visitors is understood, it appears from the initial research that policies which encourage and increase the prisoner's contact with family and friends will contribute to successful completion of parole. In addition, a new concept of visits as one of the prisoner's rights suggests that visiting policies be directed toward encouraging visitors.

The attitude of the correctional staff toward visits and visitors can contribute to the creation of an atmosphere which encourages or discourages visitors. Often line staff and other corrections personnel view visitation as bothersome and disruptive.*

---

*At Rural one officer, leaving his shift in the guntower, told me when he heard a visiting survey was in progress, "I know the answer to the visitor problem," and he patted the rifle he was carrying in a canvas case.

Another officer offered a less sanguine solution, "End them," he said, "They're a frill."

Since the duties of the staff are more easily carried out when activities run on an orderly schedule, personnel may resent disruptions of the established institutional routine.

Correctional staff also tend to view the visitor as a primary source of contraband, despite some evidence that fellow personnel may constitute an equivalent source (Davidson, 1974). In addition, those officers in charge of processing visitors may be insulted, or accused of harassment. (Sometimes they respond by becoming surly and, indeed, harassing visitors.)

To eliminate these difficulties, in-service training programs may be necessary. The staff as a whole, and visiting officers in particular, need to be convinced of the importance of visits. Guidelines should be developed for handling and processing visitors and officers could be encouraged to find ways of processing visitors more quickly and more fairly. Liaisons with nearby continuing education programs in colleges and universities could result in programs for personnel which would increase their understanding of visitors and provide training in interpersonal skills and counseling techniques. In addition, workshops might be conducted to explore ways of making maximum use of the visitor as a resocializing agent.

To eliminate, or at least reduce, contraband, many institutions require visitors to enter a metal scanner and require

a body search of prisoners when the visit is terminated. Some institutions check the backgrounds of all persons on the prisoner's visiting list, but this is both time-consuming and expensive.

Some institutions combine encouragement of visitors with background checks. Tennessee State Prison, the Youth Correction Center at Yardville, New Jersey, and others, for example, send letters to those on the new prisoner's visiting list which encourage them to visit, include the visiting schedule and visiting rules and regulations, and enclose a form which the potential visitor is asked to complete in order to be placed on the prisoner's visiting list. Such a form eases the burden of background checks by providing checkable information and by eliminating those who do not wish to visit. (Often, prisoners place names on their lists in hope of a visit, rather than in expectation of one.) When forms are returned, the institution could make random checks, check all names, or check only those about whom there is some doubt.

Occasionally visitors are refused admittance to the visiting area. They may arrive too late, they may not have proper identification; they may not be on the prisoner's visiting list. To eliminate this problem potential visitors should be made aware of visiting rules and regulations prior to their arrival at the institution. Some institutions mail these to all visitors on the new prisoner's visiting list; others encourage prisoners to do so. In one state, Virginia, corrections authorities can be relatively certain that visiting rules are mailed to potential

visitors by the prisoner. The visiting schedule, and rules, are printed on the back of the stationery supplied to residents for correspondence. This is a creative means of assuring the dissemination of this information. Where visitors are viewed as assisting in the resocialization efforts of the correctional facility, every effort should be made to assure that visitors do not make a futile trip to the institution.

An additional possibility in facilities where authorities are concerned with enlisting the families and friends of prisoners as resocializing agents is to place visiting under the aegis of treatment personnel rather than custody personnel. At Georgia Industrial Institute, the chaplain encourages visitation through letters. However, since the social service department frequently serves as the prisoner's link to the community, it might be possible for the director of social services to assume this responsibility. He might also assume responsibility for seeking funds to run buses to the institution from high crime areas or from nearest public transportation terminals, or enlist the help of citizens' groups in arranging transportation for visitors. The Quakers have been involved in such operations for several years in several areas. Under a federal grant, the New York Department of Corrections conducts a weekly bus trip for visitors to Auburn from New York City. This, too, is a way of encouraging visitation, and represents an effort to overcome the visiting obstacle of distance.

The obstacle of space is more difficult to solve. The size of the institution's visiting area is often a matter of

architecture, and it is both difficult and expensive to enlarge visiting rooms. However, some institutions do permit prisoners at certain custody levels to have freedom of the grounds for visits during the summer months. Another possibility is to make use of the education wing of the prison, particularly on weekends. Because educational programs are usually staffed by civilian personnel, they are usually located in areas close to "Center." With slight alterations in personnel deployment, educational facilities could be used for overflow visitors. It should be recognized, however, that in some institutions, the education area is the visiting area and is only used on weekends for visiting. This is the explanation for a number of institutions which report weekend visiting schedules only: there is no other "visiting room." In such cases, the obstacle of space can best be compensated for through increased schedules.

Another means of encouraging and easing visits would be to enlist the cooperation of civic or church groups in the local area to provide services for visitors. The services might include overnight lodging for visitors who travel considerable distances; child care facilities; serving as receptionists at the institution to ease the visiting process (tending children, watching packages, etc.); contributing time and materials toward making the lobby and/or visiting room itself pleasant and attractive; and volunteering as "lay visitors" to correspond with and visit prisoners who receive no letters or visits.

Volunteer visiting programs currently exist in many areas. In New Jersey, the Morrow Projects, a private organization, sponsors such a program known as MW2 (Man to Man - Woman to Woman). This program matches volunteers to prisoners and asks a one-year commitment from volunteers to visit and correspond with the selected prisoners. Where such programs exist (and are welcomed by authorities), it is necessary for the cooperating institutions to maintain data on visiting and to identify those prisoners who need visitors. The Morrow Projects estimates that 30% of the adult prisoners in New Jersey do not receive visitors. A survey of visiting in New Jersey (Correctional Master Plan, 1976) found that during the survey week, 33% of the state prisoners in New Jersey received no visitors.

The compilation of statistical data of any sort seems to have low priority in correctional systems. Nearly all keep a "jacket" or record for individual prisoners; however, very few use these records to compile a body of information on their populations and even fewer compile visiting information.

Although the concept of individualized treatment has been of interest to correctional administrators, it is in reality, impossible to achieve. Individual treatment would require a major investment in personnel and equipment. If computer data on the institutional population were easily available, the treatment needs of a majority of residents could be served. As long as the data were kept current, programs could be modified as the

characteristics of the population changed.

Such computerized data banks are not now in use in most systems and many institutions do not maintain statistical profiles of their populations. Of the 168 responding institutions in the survey reported here, nineteen (11.3%) reported that the average age of their residents was unknown or not available; a large number of respondents frankly estimated it. Sixty-three (37.5%) of the respondents could not supply information on the number of married residents, and many who did supply figures indicated that they were estimates. In a few cases respondents indicated that the figures given under size of population were approximations. This is particularly surprising, since in most correctional facilities a daily count is mandatory and a precise figure should therefore have been available on the day the form was completed.

Since statistical information on the average age of residents, marital status of residents, and even size of population is not readily available at many institutions, it is not surprising that accurate information on visiting is not easily obtained. One of the survey items requested the number of residents at the institution who receive no visitors. Sixty respondents (35.7%) indicated that this information was unknown or not available; thirty-two (19%) gave precise figures; the remainder listed fractions, percentages and numbers and indicated that these were estimates.

Though the majority of correctional organizations do not have computer storage access, it is recommended that those which do, and those which plan computerization, consider adding visitation data to their information systems. Such information could then be used to evaluate the effects of family visiting on institutional behavior, parole success, marital stability, etc.

If the resocializing impact of visitors is finally affirmed, treatment oriented institutions could make use of their impact in a variety of ways. One might be to increase opportunities for visiting in order to increase the institution's measure of success. In addition to expanding visiting schedules, treatment personnel could invite the prisoner's family to participate in treatment programs with the prisoner. Fenton (1959) suggested family participation in some programs: Alcoholics Anonymous, narcotics programs, and counseling programs could include family members in a variety of ways. Marriage counseling programs such as the one described by Neussendorf (1969) are also a possibility. Increased liaisons between the institution and community service agencies could help bring the prisoner and his or her family together more often, provide a vehicle for counseling members of the family during incarceration, and continue family treatment services upon the release of the prisoner.

Conclusion

A review of the literature reveals that the subject of visiting in correctional institutions has not been of interest to researchers. It is worthy of more attention. The available empirical evidence shows that regular visits by family and friends are related to the prisoner's parole success. In addition resocialization theory suggests the importance for prisoners of contact with the external community and the impact of family members as resocializing agents. Also the recent literature on the rights of prisoners includes the visit as one of these rights.

The descriptive data on the current status of visiting in correctional institutions reported in the preceding chapters suggest that many correctional authorities are not aware of the potential benefits of the visit nor of the potential legal aspects. It is hoped that this study will contribute to greater interest and awareness on the part of both practitioners and researchers.

APPENDIX A. QUESTIONNAIRES

VISITING SURVEY

Name of facility _____ Date _____

Size of population _____ Average age of population _____

Number of married residents _____

Visiting hours: _____ to _____ Days _____

Capacity of visiting area: No. of visitors ____ No. of residents _____

Are all visits contact visits? yes ___ no ___ (If no, please elaborate: e.g., phone, screen, weekends only)

Number of visits permitted per resident per month _____

Permitted length of visit _____

Number of visitors permitted one resident at one time _____

Are weekend visits usually limited? yes ___ no ___

Are all visitors on an approved list? yes ___ no ___

Are backgrounds and relationships checked? yes ___ no ___ randomly ___

Are children under 12 permitted? yes ___ no ___

Are visits scheduled in advance? yes ___ no ___

Does resident arrange his or her visits? yes ___ no ___

Are published rules and regulations mailed to visitors? yes ___ no ___

Number of residents with no visits _____

Number of residents with maximum possible visits _____

Is facility on or near a major highway? yes ___ no ___

Is facility on a bus route? yes ___ no ___

Is a taxi necessary from bus terminal? yes ___ no ___

Is facility near a train station? yes ___ no ___

Is a taxi ride necessary from train station? yes ___ no ___

Date _____

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR VISITORS

Please fill in the following information which will be used in a study of prison visiting. Your cooperation is appreciated.

1. Your relationship to the person visited:

Mother _____	Son _____	Sister _____
Father _____	Daughter _____	Male Friend _____
Wife _____	Brother _____	Female Friend _____

2. How often do you visit the person you are seeing today?

More than once a week _____
Once a week _____
Every two weeks _____
Every month _____
Every two months _____
Four times a year _____
Twice a year _____
Less than twice a year _____

3. Where do you live?

Name of city or town _____
Name of county _____
Name of state _____

4. How did you get here today?

Walk _____	Train _____
Private car _____	Plane _____
Bus _____	

5. If you lived closer would you visit the person you are seeing today more often?

Yes _____ No _____ Don't know _____

6.

Your age:	Age of person visited:
Under 21 _____	Under 21 _____
22-25 _____	22-25 _____
26-30 _____	26-30 _____
31-40 _____	31-40 _____
41-50 _____	41-50 _____
51-60 _____	51-60 _____
Over 60 _____	Over 60 _____

7. Your marital status:

		Marital status of visitee:	
Married	_____	Married	_____
Single	_____	Single	_____
Divorced	_____	Divorced	_____
Widowed	_____	Widowed	_____

8. Your family income:

$ 0 - 5,000 per year	_____
5,000 -10,000 per year	_____
10,000 -15,000 per year	_____
15,000 -20,000 per year	_____
20,000 -25,000 per year	_____
Over 25,000 per year	_____

9. Are you currently employed? Yes _____ No _____

   What job do you now hold? _____

10. Do you visit someone else here besides the person you are seeing today?

    Yes _____ No _____ How many? _____

Comments:

APPENDIX B. SUPPLEMENTARY DATA

State policy on Visiting Days Per Week (the majority of institutions in each state determine the category. Seven states are too mixed to categorize. Five states did not respond to survey: Alaska, Mississippi, Nevada, South Dakota, Wyoming).

TABLE 24

STATE VARIATIONS IN VISITING SCHEDULES

No. of Days						
1 (Sun. only)	2-3 (Sat., Sun.)	4 (Sat., Sun., Holiday)	5	6	7	Mixed
ALA	ARA	ARIZ	VT	CAL	DEL	CONN
	FLA	GA		COLO	IDA	N.J.
	S.C.	HA		NEBR	ILL	OHIO
	TEX	N.C.		N.M.	IND	ORE
		OKL			IOWA	TENN
		VA			KAN	UTAH
		WA			KY	WISC
		W.VA			LA	
					MASS	
					MAINE	
					MD	
					MICH	
					MINN	
					MO	
					MONT	
					N.H.	
					N.Y.	
					N.D.	
					PA	
					RI	

TABLE 25

INSTITUTIONS RANKED BY VISITING ROOM CAPACITY (MIDDLE RANGE)

Institution	Type	% Visiting Room Capacity	Age	Visiting Schedule: No. of Days Per Week	Visiting Schedule: Hours Per Day	Total Hours	No. Visits Per Month	Permitted Length of Visit	No. Visitors At One Time
74	P	11.3	100	7	12	84	4	3	unl.
87	P	11.5	107	7	6	42	20	3	unl.
104	P	11.5	131	7	7	49	5	6	unl.
125	P	12.4	111	7	6½	45½	22	6½	4
30	P	12.5	18	2	6	12	4-5	6	unl.
72	RTC	13.8	19	7	12½	87½	unl.	12	5
130	P	14.0	88	7	6	42	3	2	5
134	RTC	14.0	17	7	8	56	4	8	5
106	RTC	15.1	100	7	6½	45½	4	6½	4
58	P	15.3	89	7	4	28	4	4	3
162	P	16.0	38	2	9	18	4	1½	5
12	RTC	16.3	30	5	6	30	4	-	unl.
124	RTC	16.4	68	6	8	48	2	2	4
13	RTC	16.5	22	5	7	35	-	-	unl.
111	P	16.7	20	7	4	28	4	3	6
154	W	16.8	45	2	7½	15	4	1	4
53	RTC	17.0	105	5	9	45	unl.	-	4-6
112	P	17.2	52	7	6	42	4	6	5

TABLE 25 (continued)

Institution	Type	% Visiting Room Capacity	Age	Visiting Schedule: No. of Days Per Week	Visiting Schedule: Hours Per Day	Total Hours	No. Visits Per Month	Permitted Length of Visit	No. Visitors At One Time
99	P	17.4	46	7	6	42	unl.	6	3
105	RTC	17.4	76	7	6½	45½	unl.	6½	4+
149	RTC	17.8	31	2	7½	15	8	1	4
98	P	18.9	162	7	6½	45½	-	6½	4
29	W	19.4	21	2	6	12	4-5	6	4
95	P	19.6	20	5	7	35	4	2	3
42	FC	20.0	31	2	6	12	unl.	1½-3	unl.
152	FC	20.0	-	2	6	12	8	1	4
90	P	21.5		7	6	42	8	2	6
138	P	22.7	3	3	2½	7½	2	2½	4
153	CB	22.8		2	8	16	8	8	unl.
37	P	22.9		2	6	12	4	2	4
33	P	23.2		2	6	12	4-5	6	unl.
151	RTC	23.4		2	6	12	8	1	4
14	FC	25.0		7	6	42	unl.	-	unl.
164	RTC	25.0		7	6	42	8	3	8
128	RTC	25.2		5	6	30	unl.	-	4
10	P	25.9		7	7	49	18	-	4
34	P	26.0		2	6	12	8	2	1
159	RTC	26.1		7	5½	38½	40	3	unl.

TABLE 25 (continued)

Institution	Type	% Visiting Room Capacity	Age	Visiting Schedule: No. of Days Per Week	Visiting Schedule: Hours Per Day	Visiting Schedule: Total Hours	No. Visits Per Month	Permitted Length of Visit	No. Visitors At One Time
25	P	26.7		7	-	-	4-5	1	3
107	P	26.7		7	6	42	4	6	3
82	RTC	27.3		5	4	20	4	4	3
115	P	27.6		7	8	56	-	8	5
91	P Contact/Screen	29.6		2/7	7/6	14/42	5/unl.	1	4
120	CB	30.1		2	6	16	4-8	4	4
20	RTC	30.7		3	8	24	4	8	3
77	RTC	30.7		7	5	35	10	2½ wk dys/wk ends	2
32	P	31.1		2	6	12	4	6	4
133	P	31.6		7	7½	52½	5	7½	5-10
11	P	33.3		5	5½	27½	4	-	4
131	W	33.9		7	7	49	unl.	3	5
19	P	35.3		5	4½	22½	unl.	-	3
158	RTC	35.4		2	6½	13	8	6	4
8	FC	36.4		2	7	14	8	7	unl.
71	CB	36.4		7	8	56	unl.	8	unl.
110	P	37.2		2	3	6	-	3	4
26	P	41		2	6	12	4-5	6	unl.
41	P	42		2	7	14	10	1	3
147	P	42.1		3	5	15	8-12	1½	unl.

TABLE 25 (continued)

Institution	Type	% Visiting Room Capacity	Age	Visiting Schedule: No. of Days Per Week	Visiting Schedule: Hours Per Day	Visiting Schedule: Total Hours	No. Visits Per Month	Permitted Length of Visit	No. Visitors At One Time
114	W	42.6		7	7½	52½	-	7½	unl.
18	P	43		5	6½	32½	unl.	-	unl.
56	RTC	43.3		7	5½	38½	13	2 3/4	4
27	P	45.9		2	6	12	4-5	6	-
22	RTC	45.9		4	4 3/4	19	16	2	3
85	FC	46.2		7	6	42	6	6	unl.
143	W	46.3		5	4½	22½	unl.	4½	4
81	RTC	47.7		7	7	49	6	7	unl.
146	P	48.4		1	6	6	4	1½	unl.
126	W	48.8		7	5½	38½	unl.	5½	7
97	P	49.6		7	7	49	5	7	5
155	CB	50		3	2	5	12	2	2
102	W	50		7	6	42	5	6	4
16	P	50		3	6	18	unl.	5½	10
38	P	51		2	6	12	4	2	4
28	P	51.8		2	6	12	4-5	6	4
47	P	53.1		7	6½	45½	4	5	1
63	W	53.2		7	8	56	1 per visitor	4	9
51	CB	53.3		4	3	12	unl.	3	unl.

TABLE 25 (continued)

Institution	Type	% Visiting Room Capacity	Visiting Schedule: No. of Days Per Week	Visiting Schedule: Hours Per Day	Total Hours	No. Visits Per Month	Permitted Length of Visit	No. Visitors At One Time
93	RTC	56.7	1	4½	4½	4	1	unl.
96	P	57.5	7	7½	52½	15	7½	4
122	CB	58.8	3	5½	16½	unl.	7	3
36	RTC	58.8	2	3	6	8	2+4	4
2	P	59.2	2	8	16	4	6	4
92	P	59.3	2	5	10	8	5	8
139	P	61	2	5	10	6	5	4
68	P	61.5	4	4½	18	16	1/3	4
65	CB	64	2	4	8	2 per visitor	2	9
9	P	66.7	2	4	8	2-4	4	4
86	FC	68.8	7	6	42	unl.	6	4
109	P	69.9	2	3	6	8	1-3	3-5
136	P	73.7	7	4	28	15	2	3
88	W	78.1	5½[a]	7½	37½	-	7	unl.
127	FC	80.6	2	3	6	8	3	10
101		83.3	7	7½	52½	unl.	14	5
165	W	83.3	3	6	18	8	3	6
39	P	85.7	2	4	8	16	2	2
137	P	92.2	2	6	12	4	6	unl.

[a]M-F and 1st Saturday and 3rd Sunday.

TABLE 26

MILES TRAVELED BY FREQUENCY OF VISIT

	1 - 10		11 - 20		21 - 40		41 - 60		61 - 80		81 - 100		101 - 120		121-140		141 - up	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
At least once per week	17	77.3	14	66.7	39	54.9	63	61.2	21	44.7	1	14.3	7	38.9	18	41.9	1	8.3
Every 2 weeks	3	13.6	5	23.8	12	16.9	21	20.4	13	27.7	1	14.3	6	33.3	7	16.3	3	25.0
Once a month	0	0	1	4.8	15	21.1	7	6.8	10	21.3	3	42.9	2	11.1	7	16.3	2	16.7
Every 2 months	2	9.1	0	0	3	4.2	8	7.8	2	4.3	1	14.3	1	5.6	3	7.0	0	0
Every 3 months	0	0	1	4.8	2	2.8	2	1.9	1	2.1	0	0	2	11.1	2	4.7	4	33.3
Twice a year	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1.0	0	0	1	14.3	0	0	1	2.3	2	16.7
Once a year	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	11.6	0	0
TOTALS	22	100	21	100.1	71	99.9	103	100.1	47	100.1	7	100.1	18	100	43	100.1	12	100

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Alexander, Myrl E., "Corrections in Transition," in H. S. Perlman and T. B. Allington (eds.), The Tasks of Penology: A Symposium, Lincoln, Nebraska, University of Nebraska Press, 1969.

American Friends Service Committee, Struggle for Justice: A Report on Crime and Punishment in America, New York, Hill and Wang, 1971.

Bailey, Walter C., "Correctional Outcome: An Evaluation of 100 Reports," Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology & Police Science (June 1966), 57:2:153-160.

Barnes, Harry Elmer and Negley K. Teeters, New Horizons in Criminology, 3rd Edition, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1959.

Beck, Bernard B., "Organizational Goals and Inmate Organization," American Journal of Sociology, 61(5), March 1966, pp. 522-534.

Becker, Howard S., The Outsiders, New York, The Free Press, 1963, expanded edition.

Becker, Howard S., "Personal Change in Adult Life," Sociometry 27(1):40-53), March, 1964.

Bettelheim, Bruno, "Individual and Mass Behavior in Extreme Situations," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 38(4), October, 1943, pp. 417-452.

Bowlby, John, "Self-Reliance and Some Conditions that Promote It," in Robert Gosling (ed.), Support, Innovation and Autonomy, London, Tavistock Publications, 1973.

Braswell, Michael and Paul DeFrancis, "Conjugal Visitation: A Feasibility Study," Georgia Journal of Corrections, 1(4), 171-180, 1972.

Brim, Orville G. Jr., "Personality As Role Learning," in Ira Iscoe and Harold Stevenson (eds.), Personality Development in Children, Austin, University of Texas Press, 1969 (p. 127-159).

Brim, Orville G. Jr. and Stanton Wheeler, Socialization After Childhood: Two Essays, New York, John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1966.

Burns, Neal M. and Douglas Kimura, "Isolation and Sensory Deprivation," in Neal M. Burns, Randall M. Chambers and Edward Handler (eds.), Unusual Environments and Human Behavior, Glencoe, Illinois, The Free Press, 1963, pp. 167-192.

Carothers v. Follette, 314 F. Supp. 1014 (S.D.N.Y., 1970).

Carter, Robert M., Richard A. McGee, and E. Kim Nelson, Corrections In America, New York, J. B. Lippincott Co., 1975.

Census of State Correctional Facilities, 1974, & Advance Report, National Prisoner Statistics, Special Report Number SD-NPS-SR-1, Washington, D.C., U.S. Government Printing Office, July, 1975.

Cleaver, Eldridge, Soul on Ice, New York, McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1968.

Clemmer, Donald, The Prison Community, New York, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1940.

Cloward, Richard A., "Social Control in the Prison," in Cloward, Cressey, et al, Theoretical Studies in Social Organization of the Prison, Pamphlet 15, New York, Social Science Research Council, 1960, pp. 20-48.

Conrad, John P., Crime and Its Correction, Berkeley, California, University of California Press, 1970.

Cooley, Charles H., Social Organization, Glencoe, Illinois, The Free Press, 1956.

Correctional Master Plan Data, Vol. I: "Profile of State Institution Offenders 1969-75," Correctional Master Plan Project, Department of Institutions and Agencies, State of New Jersey, February 23, 1976.

Cottle, Thomas J., "Angela: A Child-Woman," Social Problems, 23(4), April, 1976, pp. 516-523.

Crawford, William, Report on the Penitentiaries of the United States, 1834: reprint edition, Montclair, New Jersey, Patterson Smith, 1969.

Cressey, Donald R., "Limitations on organization of treatment in the modern prison," in Cloward, Cressey, et al, Theoretical Studies in Social Organization of the Prison, Pamphlet 15, N.Y. Social Science Research Council, 1960.

Crosthwaite, A., "Punishment for whom? the prisoner or his wife?", International Journal of Offender Therapy, 19(3), pp. 275-84, 1975.

Davidson, R. T., Chicano Prisoners: The Key to San Quentin, New York, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1974.

Directory of the American Correctional Association, College Park, Maryland, American Correctional Association, 1976.

Duren v. Procunier, No. C-72-1370 SW, (N.D. Cal. July 18, 1972).

Federal Bureau of Investigation, Crime in the United States--1975, Washington, D.C., U.S. Department of Justice, 1976.

Fenlon, Sister Maureen, "An innovative project for wives and families of prisoners," FCI Treatment Notes, 3(2), pp. 1-12, 1972.

Fenton, Norman, The Prisoner's Family, Palo Alto, California, Pacific Books, 1959.

Friedman, Sidney and I. Conway Esselstyn, "The adjustment of children of jail inmates," Federal Probation, December 1965, pp. 71-76.

Garabedian, Peter G., "The natural history of an inmate community in a maximum security prison," The Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology and Police Science, 61(1), March, 1970, pp. 78-85.

Garfinkel, H., "Conditions of Successful Degradation Ceremonies," American Journal of Sociology, 61, January 1956, pp. 420-424.

Glaser, Daniel, The Effectiveness of a Prison and Parole System, Indianapolis, The Bobbs-Merrill Company, Inc., 1964.

Goffman, Erving, Asylums: Essays on the Social Situation of Mental Patients and Other Inmates, Garden City, New York, Anchor Books, 1961.

Gunn, Robert L. and H. Edgar Pearman, "The Essence of Mental Hospitals," Mental Hygiene, 53(3), 1969, pp. 422-427.

Guthrie, E. R., The Psychology of Learning, Revised Edition, Gloucester, Massachusetts, Peter Smith, 1960.

Hassler, Alfred, Diary of a Self-Made Convict, Chicago, Henry Regnery Company, 1954.

Hayner, Norman S., "Attitudes toward conjugal visits for prisoners," Federal Probation, March 1972, pp. 43-49.

Hersen, Michael, "Independent living as a threat to the institutionalized mental patient," Journal of Clinical Psychology 925(3), 1969, pp. 316-318.

Hildebrand, Richard S., "The Anatomy of Escape," Federal Probation, March 1969, pp. 58-66.

Holt, Norman and Donald Miller, Explorations in Inmate-Family Relationships, California Department of Corrections Research Report #46, 1972.

Hood, Roger and Richard Sparks, Key Issues in Criminology, New York, McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1970.

Hopper, Columbus B., "Conjugal Visiting at the Mississippi State Penitentiary," Federal Probation 29(2), June, 1965, pp. 39-46.

Hopper, Columbus B., "A Study of Conjugal Visiting, Social Organization, and Prisonization in the Mississippi State Penitentiary," unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Florida State University, 1964.

Irwin, John, The Felon, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1970.

"Is Rehabilitation Dead?", Corrections Magazine, 1(5), May/June, 1975, pp. 3-7, 10-12, 21-32.

James, William, Psychology, New York: Henry Holt, 1892, cited by Nieman, L. J. and Hughes, J. W., "The Problem of the Concept of Role," Social Forces, December, 1951, pp. 141-49.

Kassebaum, G., D. Ward, and D. Wilner, Prison Treatment and Parole Survival, New York, John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1971.

Kiesler, Charles A. and Sara B. Kiesler, Conformity, Reading, Massachusetts, Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 1970.

Lemert, Edwin M., Human Deviance, Social Problems, and Social Control, Englewood Cliffs, N.J., Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1967.

Lemert, Edwin M., Social Pathology, New York, McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1951.

Leopold, Nathan, "What is wrong with the prison system?", in Harvey S. Perlman and Thomas B. Allington (eds.), The Tasks of Penology: A Symposium, Lincoln, Nebraska, University of Nebraska Press, 1969, pp. 21-46.

McCleery, Richard, "Communications patterns as bases of systems of authority and power," in R. A. Cloward, D. R. Cressey, et al., Theoretical Studies in Social Organization of the Prison, Pamphlet 15, Social Science Research Council, 1960, pp. 49-77.

Maccoby, Eleanor, "Role taking in Childhood," Child Development 30, 239-252, June, 1959.

Maccoby, Eleanor, "The Taking of Adult Roles in Middle Childhood," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 63, 493-503, November 1961.

McCorkle, Lloyd and Robert Korn, "Resocialization Within Walls," The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences, Vol. 293, May 1954, pp. 88-98.

Malcolm, Andrew H., "For one convict freedom is another word for fear," The New York Times, Wednesday, November 20, 1974, pp. 45, 51.

Manual of Correctional Standards, Third Edition, College Park, Maryland, American Correctional Association, 1966.

Markley, Carson W., "Furlough programs and conjugal visiting in Adult Correctional Institutions," Federal Probation 37(1), 19-26, 1973.

Mead, George Herbert, Mind, Self, and Society, C. W. Morris (ed.), Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1934.

"A Model Act to Provide for Minimum Standards for the Protection of Rights of Prisoners," Crime and Delinquency, 18, 1 (January, 1972): 4-14.

Morris, Pauline, Prisoners and Their Families, New York, Hart Publishing Company, Inc., 1965.

Nagel, William G., The New Red Barn: A Critical Look at the Modern American Prison, New York, The American Foundation, Inc., 1973.

National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals, Corrections, Washington, D.C., U.S. Government Printing Office, 1975.

Neiman, Lionel J. and James W. Hughes, "The Problem of the Concept of Role--A Re-Survey of the Literature," in Herman Stein and Richard Cloward (eds.), Social Perspectives on Behavior, New York, The Free Press, 1958, pp. 177-185.

Neussendorfer, Joseph, "Marriage group-counseling inside," American Journal of Correction 13(4): 33-34, 1969.

New York Times, "Killing is Common in Leesburg, Freed Inmate Says," 3 June, 1976, pp. 21.

New York Times, "A Rare Inside Look at Green Haven Prison, Troubled but Innovative State Institution," 17 August 1976, pp. 62.

Ohlin, Lloyd E., Sociology and the Field of Corrections, New York, Russell Sage Foundation, 1956.

Ohlin, Lloyd E., The Stability and Validity of Parole Experience Tables, Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Chicago, 1954, cited in Daniel Glaser, The Effectiveness of a Prison and Parole System, Indianapolis, Bobbs-Merrill Co., Inc., 1964.

Park, Robert E. and E. W. Burgess, An Introduction to the Science of Sociology, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1921.

Parsons, Talcott, "Role Conflict and the Genesis of Deviance," in H. D. Stein and R. A. Cloward (eds.), Social Perspectives on Behavior, New York, The Free Press, 1958.

Parsons, Talcott, Sociological Theory and Modern Society, New York, The Free Press, 1967.

Pearl, Arthur, "The Halfway house: The focal point of a model program for the rehabilitation of low-income offender," in F. Riesman, J. Cohen, and A. Pearl (eds.), Mental Health for the Poor, New York, The Free Press, 1964, pp. 497-508.

Perrow, Charles, Complex Organizations: a critical essay, Glenview, Illinois, Scott, Foresman Company, 1972.

Presidents Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, Task Force Report: Corrections, Washington, D.C., U.S. Government Printing Office, 1967.

Prettyman, E. B. Jr., "The Indeterminate Sentence and the Right to Treatment," The American Criminal Law Review, 11(1), Fall, 1972, pp. 7-37.

Pyron, Bernard, "Form and Diversity in Human Habitats," Environment and Behavior, 4(1) March, 1972, 87-120.

Robison, James and Gerald Smith, "The Effectiveness of Correctional Programs," Crime and Delinquency, January, 1971, pp. 55-64.

Rubin, Sol, The Law of Criminal Correction, St. Paul, Minnesota, West Publishing Company (1963).

Ruff, George E., "Psychological and Psychophysiological Indices of Stress," in Neal M. Burns, Randell M. Chambers, and Edward Hendler (eds.), Unusual Environments and Human Behavior, Glencoe, Illinois, The Free Press, 1963, pp. 33-59.

"San Quentin: IT'S A NICE PLACE TO VISIT," Los Angeles Times, 21 March 1976, Part II, pp. 1-5.

Sarri, R. C., "Organizational Patterns and Client Perspectives in Juvenile Correctional Institutions: A Comparative Study," Ph.D. dissertation, University of Michigan, 1962.

Schneller, Donald P., "Prisoners' Families: A study of some social and psychological effects of incarceration on the families of Negro prisoners," Criminology 12(4): 402-412, February 1975.

Schrag, Clarence, "Leadership Among Prison Inmates," American Sociological Review 19(1), February, 1954, pp. 37-42.

Schwartz, Barry, "Deprivation of Privacy as a 'Functional Prerequisite': The case of the prison," Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology and Police Science, vol. 63(2), June 1972, pp. 229-239.

Schwartz, Barry, "Peer vs. Authority effects in a correctional community," Criminology 11(2), August 1973, p. 233-257.

Schwartz, Mary C. and Judith F. Weintraub, "The Prisoner's Wife: A study in crisis," Federal Probation (Washington, D.C.), 38(4), pp. 20-26, 1974.

Scudder, Kenyon, "The Open Institution," in The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Scientists, 293, May 1954, pp. 79-87.

Sewel, William H., "Some Recent Developments in Socialization Theory and Research," in The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, vol. 349, September 1963, pp. 163-181.

Street, David, "The Inmate Group in Custodial and Treatment Settings," American Sociological Review, 30(1), February 1965, pp. 40-55.

Street, David, Robert Vinter, and Charles Perrow, Organization for Treatment, New York, The Free Press, 1966.

Sykes, Gresham M., "Criminals and Non-Criminals Together: A Modest Proposal," Prison Journal 48(2), 14-16, 1968.

Sykes, Gresham M., The Society of Captives: A Study of a Maximum Security Prison, Princeton, New Jersey, Princeton University Press, 1958.

Sykes, Gresham M. and Sheldon Messinger, "The Inmate Social System," in Cloward, Cressey, et al., Theoretical Studies in Social Organization of the Prison, Pamphlet 15, Social Science Research Council, 1960.

Teeters, Negley K., "Prison Visiting in American Prisons: A Preliminary Note," Prison Journal, 20(1), 1940.

Thomas, Piri, Down These Mean Streets, New York, Alfred A. Knopf, 1967.

Trenton (N.J.) Times, "Warden out to clean up Lewisburg," 15 September, 1976, p. A9.

Washington Post v. Kleindienst, 357 F. 2d 709 (Prison Law Reporter 141, 219, 337) (D.D.C. 1972).

Wheeler, Stanton, "Role Conflict in Correctional Communities," in D.R. Cressey (ed.), The Prison: Studies in Institutional Organization and Change, New York, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1961.

Wheeler, Stanton, "Socialization in Correctional Communities," American Sociological Review, 26 October 1961, pp. 699-712.

Weintraub, Judith F., "The Delivery of Services to Families of Prisoners," Federal Probation, December 1976, pp. 28-31.

Wierig, George J. Jr., and Richard J. Robertson, "Social Connectedness and Community Adjustment," Journal of Clinical Psychology, Vol. 28(1), January 1972, pp. 30-31.

Wolfgang, Marvin E., "Measuring Prison Adjustment," in N. Johnston, L. Savitz, and M. E. Wolfgang (eds.), The Sociology of Punishment and Correction, New York, John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1962.

Zemans, Eugene and Ruth Shonle Cavan, "Marital Relationships of Prisoners," Journal of Criminal Law Criminology and Police Science, vol. 49(1), 1958.

Zimbardo, Philip G., "Pathology of Imprisonment," Society, 9(6), April 1973, pp. 4, 6, 8.

Zimbardo, Philip G., "The Mind is a Pirandellian Prison," New York Times Magazine, April, 1972, pp. 38-58.