

Winter 1978

## Socialization Patterns and Social Roles: A Replication

Robert G. Leger

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

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

---

### Recommended Citation

Robert G. Leger, Socialization Patterns and Social Roles: A Replication, 69 J. Crim. L. & Criminology 627 (1978)

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

## SOCIALIZATION PATTERNS AND SOCIAL ROLES: A REPLICATION\*

ROBERT G. LEGER\*\*

### INTRODUCTION

Patterns of individualized adaptations to environments of custodial organizations—known collectively as inmate social types—have been important foci of a wide variety of research efforts. These efforts have ranged from descriptive case studies of high custody organizations<sup>1</sup> to more sophisticated analyses concerned with the relationship of these role types to a variety of factors (*e.g.*, such as parole performance, socialization patterns and background analyses). Studies in this latter category have given rise to a set of generalizations centered around the construct of inmate social type. Many of these generalizations are based on research efforts which have focused, not on role incumbents who achieve a given status in the inmate group by virtue of their behavior, but upon individuals whose background characteristics are consistent with typologies of role types or whose attitudinal predispositions are congruent with those which actual role incumbents are believed to maintain. All too frequently, researchers employ these indirect identification schemes with little concern as to the validity of the location procedure. This paper attempts to replicate and critique one of these research efforts: Garabedian's analysis of socialization patterns of various role types.<sup>2</sup>

In considering Garabedian's analysis, this paper has three principal purposes. First, as Garabedian's research constitutes a logical extension of Wheeler's analysis of socialization patterns of members of the general inmate population to incumbents of various social roles, a principal task is to replicate the more important findings of the Wheeler study.<sup>3</sup>

\* This research was supported by NSF grant P351628-000. The author is indebted to John R. Stratton for his comments on an earlier version of this paper. This is a revised version of a paper presented at the 1976 Annual Meeting of the American Sociological Association, New York.

\*\* Assistant Professor of Sociology, Eastern Tennessee State University; Ph.D. (Sociology), 1974, University of Iowa.

<sup>1</sup> D. CLEMMER, *THE PRISON COMMUNITY* (1958); E. GOFFMAN, *ASYLUMS* (1961); G. SYKES, *THE SOCIETY OF CAPTIVES* (1958).

<sup>2</sup> Garabedian, *Social Roles and Processes of Socialization in the Prison Community*, 11 *SOC. PROB.* 139 (1963).

<sup>3</sup> Wheeler, *Socialization in Correctional Communities*, 26 *AM. SOC. REV.* 697 (1961).

Garabedian replicated Wheeler and furnished strong support for the anticipatory socialization hypothesis.<sup>4</sup> However, Wheeler and Garabedian were concerned with only one dimension of the inmate normative system—"Conformity to staff norms." Consequently, the present research effort extends that of Wheeler by considering not only two other distinct dimensions of inmate society—"Solidarity with others" and "Isolation from others"—but also two measures of criminal reference group orientation.

A second intention of this research is to replicate the Garabedian study. This analysis parallels that outlined above for the Wheeler study. Finally, the present effort offers a critique of Garabedian's study by concentrating primarily on the indirect nomination procedure employed to locate social type role incumbents. This critique reveals that Garabedian's attitudinal nominators lack validity since they do not locate *actual* role incumbents. Additionally, Garabedian's nominating instrument itself is inadequate in a theoretical sense as the attitude items employed to locate social types do not measure the specifically hypothesized theoretical dimensions.

### PROCEDURE

All residents (N = 410) of a medium security institution located in a midwestern state were invited to take a questionnaire on "inmate attitudes" for which they were paid a sum of two dollars. The questionnaires were administered at the institutional school during six evening sessions spanning a period of two weeks. Out of the 410 inmates, 364 took the questionnaire for a response rate of 88%.

Demographically, the average age of the sample was 22.6 years; modal length of sentence was 8 to 10 years with over one-half the sample receiving sentences in this category. The average socio-economic status, using an inmate's father's occupation coded into an ordinal scale following Reiss,<sup>5</sup> was

<sup>4</sup> Garabedian, *supra* note 2. The present replication is warranted by contradictory evidence developed by Atchley and McCabe. See Atchley & McCabe, *Socialization in Correctional Communities: a Replication*, 33 *AM. SOC. REV.* 774 (1968).

<sup>5</sup> A. J. REISS, *OCCUPATIONS AND SOCIAL STATUS* 263-75 (1961) Appendix B, Table B-1.

57.5. Two-thirds of the sample were convicted for one of the following crimes—breaking and entering, robbery, larceny, forgery or auto-theft. Slightly more than one-third of the sample (34%) was non-white.

#### *Socialization Measures*

Both Garabedian and Wheeler employed as a socialization measure a series of five hypothetical conflict situations in which inmates were asked to agree or disagree with the actions of a fictional character.<sup>6</sup> As all of these items reflected high staff consensus,<sup>7</sup> the inmates' agreement or disagreement with the items determined their degree of "conformity to staff role expectations." Garabedian's original socialization measure, herein designated "conformity to staff norms," is retained intact for this research.

As Kassebaum, Ward and Wilner have indicated, however, Garabedian's attitude set represents only a single dimension of the inmate code.<sup>8</sup> Another important dimension which should also vary according to duration of confinement is inmates' "expressed solidarity with others." Therefore, a series of items was developed in the present research to measure this factor. Finally, a third important dimension is the inmates' degree of "isolation from others." Accordingly, items were included to assess this factor. Thus, this research extends the analyses of Wheeler and Garabedian by examining socialization patterns of inmates and role types for two other dimensions of involvement in the inmate group.

These latter two scales were constructed as follows: A series of 18 items of a Likert format designed to measure various dimensions of the inmate code were subjected to factor analysis. Initially, the principal component method with iterations was employed. A total of five factors were isolated. Employing Varimax rotation, the factors were rotated so as to maximize the item-factor correlations while simultaneously insuring orthogonality of factors. The first three factors were judged to be

theoretically interpretable accounting for 83% of the common factor variance.<sup>9</sup>

#### *Reference Group Measures*

Central to Wheeler's investigation and an important determinant for Garabedian of socialization patterns for certain social types, is the concept of anticipatory socialization. As this concept is based upon inmates' reference group orientation, it is theoretically relevant to determine the impact of career phase and the number of months spent in prison on the inmates' identification with "general criminal others."<sup>10</sup> Additionally, it is important to question whether these factors affect inmates' associational preferences with other criminals. Two scales, "criminal identification" and "associational preference," were thus included to investigate these lines of inquiry.<sup>11</sup> On all five scales used in this

<sup>9</sup> The first factor contained 6 solidarity items. Item-factor correlations are found in parentheses. Percent of variance explained equals 42%. Sample items are: 1. "You have to do what you can to help other inmates even when it might get you into trouble." (.49). 2. "When inmates stick together it is a lot easier to do time." (.53). 3. "In prison a good rule to follow is to share any extra goods with your friends." (.49).

The five items comprising factor 2 were all of the hypothetical conflict situation variety (percent of variance explained equaled 27%). All of these items appeared to indicate respondents' degree of anti-authority attitudes. Interestingly, items used in Garabedian's socialization measure were shared by this factor and factors 4 and 5. However, for comparative purposes, Garabedian's measure is retained for this research.

The 4 items comprising factor 3 were identical to those used by Kassebaum, Ward, and Wilner to measure isolation from others. Percent of variance explained equaled 14%. Sample items are: 1. "In prison I try to keep pretty much to myself." (.48). 2. "The best way to do time is to mind your own business and have as little to do as possible with other inmates." (.59). All items were of a Likert format with five responses available ranging from "strongly agree" to "strongly disagree." On all items the most pro-inmate response received five points. The most pro-authority response received one point.

<sup>10</sup> Stratton, *Differential Identification and Attitudes Toward the Law*, 46 Soc. Forces 256 (1967).

<sup>11</sup> Glaser and Stratton discuss these scales. See D. GLASER, *THE EFFECTIVENESS OF A PRISON AND PAROLE SYSTEM* (1964); Stratton, *supra* note 10. While Glaser and Stratton never specifically tested their scales for validity against a criterion group such as staff, they did test these indices against factors which should relate strongly to "criminal identification" such as number of prior commitments. They found that the greater the number of prior institutional commitments, the stronger the individual's identification with "general criminal others." For other variables tested, see GLASER, *id.* at 562-75.

<sup>6</sup> Garabedian, *supra* note 2, at 141; Wheeler, *supra* note 3 at 699-700.

<sup>7</sup> To meet validity requirements, Wheeler selected "staff" as a criterion group and used only attitude items with which this group expressed strong agreement. Subsequent analyses revealed that the resulting "conformity to staff norms" measure was exceptionally efficient in discriminating between inmate and staff attitudes.

<sup>8</sup> G. KASSEBAUM, D. WARD & D. WILNER, *PRISON TREATMENT AND PAROLE SURVIVAL* 153-59 (1971).

research, the higher the mean score, the more proximate the response.

#### *Career Phase and Length of Time Served*

Inmates' "career phase" was determined by asking two questions on the questionnaire—"How long have you been in this institution?" and "How much time do you have remaining to be served?" The initial career phase is represented by all inmates who have been in the institution six months or less. The late career phase includes all inmates who have six months or less remaining to be served. All other inmates were considered to be in the middle career phase. "Career phase" is important because the concept of anticipatory socialization is based on the inmates' perception of which particular phase of their institutional career they are in.

"Length of time served" is operationalized by calculating the number of months the inmate has been in prison. This is important from the perspective of the concept of prisonization because it has been hypothesized that the longer the period of time the inmate spends in the institution, the greater the impact of prison culture upon that individual.

#### SOCIALIZATION IN CORRECTIONAL COMMUNITIES: THE WHEELER STUDY

Wheeler detected two socialization patterns operating in a "western state reformatory." The first approximated Clemmer's prisonization hypothesis.<sup>12</sup> Clemmer believed that the norms of inmate society were designed to require loyalty to other inmates as well as induce in these individuals opposition to the values of the staff—a group which represented a "rejecting society." "The consequences of exposure to the inmate society were summed up by the concept of prisonization . . . the taking on in greater or lesser degree of the folkways, mores, customs and general culture of the penitentiary."<sup>13</sup> Under the hypothesis, the process of assimilation of these norms was seen as directly related to the length of time served in the institution. Furthermore, prisonization allegedly affected all inmates, even the "Square Johns" who maintained a pro-staff value orientation.

Wheeler demonstrated that while prisonization processes operate within the institution, a second socialization pattern, the anticipatory socialization or U-shaped curve, also existed. When they arrive

at the institution, inmates still maintain an essentially conventional normative orientation. After exposure to the institutional culture over a length of time, however, their value orientation begins to reflect that of the group which is now most important to them—the inmate society. This result is exactly what Clemmer hypothesized.

The crucial phase occurs when the inmate begins to become aware of his imminent release. According to the anticipatory socialization hypothesis, the individual begins to anticipate his release back into conventional society. As a result of this anticipation, his reference group orientation shifts from the group within the walls to the group which he now considers to be most important—the conventional society. This change in reference group orientation is accompanied by a corresponding change in the individual's normative orientation.

Table 1 presents proportions of conformists and mean scores for all inmates by number of months spent in prison.<sup>14</sup> Wheeler found support for the prisonization hypothesis in the decline of the pro-

<sup>14</sup> On Tables 1 and 2, fifty-nine inmates who were nominated as social type role incumbents were deleted. Also deleted were 2 inmates who failed to indicate number of months spent in prison. "Proportions of conformists" for all scales were determined by following the procedure outlined by Garabedian. Garabedian arbitrarily deemed the 33% of the sample evidencing the highest degree of endorsement of staff norms as conformists (those scoring between 6 and 10 on his scale). He then proceeded to examine fluctuations in the proportions of respondents in this high conformist category alone. This procedure is insufficient to draw conclusions about socialization patterns. A basic assumption of Clemmer and Wheeler is that inmate normative orientation varies according to duration of confinement and anticipatory socialization respectively. We must assume this implies that for each career phase, the group mean must fluctuate also. Garabedian and Wheeler obviously believe that if the proportion of conformists varies, then there should be a corresponding variation in the mean score for that particular group. This is an invalid assumption since a decline in proportions of conformists over career phase may simply indicate a narrowing of the range of scores with no actual effect on the group average. This is theoretically significant in itself as a narrowing of the range would indicate greater consensus on the part of the group. To remedy this situation, group means should be reported as well as proportions of conformists. For this research, "conformists" were those inmates scoring 7 or less on the isolation from others scale, 11 or less on associational preference, 11 or less on criminal identification, 17 or less on expressed solidarity with others and 12 or less on the conformity to staff norms measure. Therefore, the means reported in tables 1-3 are broken down by career phase or length of time served for those conformist groupings only.

<sup>12</sup> D. CLEMMER, *supra* note 1.

<sup>13</sup> Wheeler, *supra* note 3, at 697.

TABLE 1  
SOCIALIZATION AND REFERENCE GROUP MEASURES BY LENGTH OF TIME SERVED  
(Standard Deviations Appear In Parentheses, Proportions of Conformists Are Expressed As Percents)

Scale	Number of Months in Prison			Chi-Square (2df)
	0-6	7-12	13 or More	
Expressed Solidarity with Others	38%	29%	41%	2.86
	18.8 (3.7)	19.2 (4.2)	18.1 (4.5)	
Conformity to Staff Norms	33%	24%	28%	2.03
	14.6 (3.5)	14.8 (3.3)	14.7 (3.7)	
Isolation From Others	33%	30%	37%	.92
	10.5 (3.3)	10.4 (3.6)	9.5 (3.3)	
Associational Preference	35%	25%	30%	1.97
	12.8 (3.9)	13.7 (3.4)	13.6 (4.1)	
Criminal Identification	34%	37%	31%	.65
	12.5 (3.4)	12.5 (3.1)	13.1 (3.1)	
N=	126	76	101	

TABLE 2  
SOCIALIZATION AND REFERENCE GROUP MEASURES BY PHASE OF INSTITUTIONAL CAREER  
(Standard Deviations Appear in Parentheses, Proportions of Conformist Are Expressed As Percents)

Scale	Career Phase			Chi-Square (2df)
	Initial	Middle	Late	
Expressed Solidarity with Others	38%	34%	41%	.76
	18.8 (3.7)	18.7 (4.4)	18.4 (4.3)	
Conformity to Staff Norms	33%	25%	35%	2.30
	14.6 (3.5)	14.9 (3.7)	13.8 (3.2)	
Isolation From Others	33%	35%	24%	1.64
	10.4 (3.3)	9.9 (3.5)	10.4 (3.4)	
Associational Preference	35%	27%	31%	1.73
	12.8 (3.9)	13.8 (3.9)	12.5 (2.8)	
Criminal Identification	34%	32%	41%	.91
	12.5 (3.4)	12.9 (3.0)	12.4 (3.4)	
N =	126	148	29	

portions of conformists as time served in the institution increased. As Table 1 indicates, however, the strongest tendency for respondents to demonstrate pro-inmate orientations occurs 7 to 12 months after arrival at the institution. Among inmates who have been in the institution for the longest time, there is an apparent trend toward a more conventional orientation—high proportions of conformists, lower mean scores. This pattern is weakest for the conformity to staff norms scale as there are slight differences among means. Additionally, the criminal identification scale does indeed approximate the prisonization pattern as individuals who have served the greatest amount of time tend to identify with criminals to a greater extent than those prisoners in the initial career phase. Nonetheless, differences in means are slight.

It appears that at least for this research, the prisonization socialization pattern generally does not operate.<sup>15</sup>

<sup>15</sup> On the chance that the time span for the middle phase was too brief (7 to 12 months), "time served in prison" was recorded as follows: 0 to 6 months, 7 to 24 months and 25 months and over. Sample sizes for each group were: initial group—126; middle group—138; last group—39. The computations in Table 1 were then repeated. No change occurred in the patterns presented in Table 1. Additionally, the sample was dichotomized into recidivists (N = 125) and non-recidivists (N = 129). (Institutional records were incomplete or not available for 49 inmates.) Recidivists were those inmates who had prior confinements either in juvenile or adult institutions. For non-recidivists, the patterning of mean scores and proportions of conformists were identical to those in Table 1. For recidivists, patterns were similar except for the associational preference and criminal identification

Table 2, which breaks the inmate population down according to phase of institutional career, provides strong support for Wheeler's anticipatory socialization hypothesis. As the pattern of proportions of conformists and mean scores reveals, there are strong tendencies for inmates to hold more conventional orientations during the initial and late phases of their institutional careers. The most pro-inmate responses occur in the middle career phase. Only one scale, isolation from others, is exceptional to the overall trend. This latter distribution of scores is representative of Wheeler's counter-adaptive pattern since the highest involvement occurs during the initial and late phases with a tendency towards isolation in the middle phase.<sup>16</sup>

#### SOCIAL ROLES AND SOCIALIZATION PROCESSES: THE GARABEDIAN STUDY

From Wheeler's examination of socialization patterns of members of the general inmate population, it is a logical step to consider socialization patterns of various inmate role types. In his research, Garabedian considered five social types—Politicians, Square Johns, Outlaws, Right Guys and Dings, a residual category for unclassifiable inmates.<sup>17</sup> Because incumbents of each of these role types supposedly maintain certain attitudes which set them apart from other inmates, Garabedian decided to employ these attitudes as a means of identification. Accordingly, he constructed five sets of Likert format attitude items with three items per set, each of which was to identify one of the role types above.<sup>18</sup> All inmates

scales. Duration of confinement had practically no effect on these dimensions. As expected, on all scales recidivists reflected a more pro-inmate orientation (high mean scores) than did first-timers.

<sup>16</sup> See Wheeler, *supra* note 3, at 709, for a discussion of counter-adaptive and other socialization patterns.

<sup>17</sup> Garabedian, *supra* note 2, at 144.

<sup>18</sup> Items used by Garabedian to identify incumbents of various social roles are: *Politician Items*: 1. "You've got to have confidence in yourself if you're going to be successful." 2. "There's a little larceny in everybody, if you're really honest about it." 3. "Who you know is more important than what you know, and brains are more important than brawn." *Square John Items*: 4. "I generally feel guilty when I do wrong." 5. "The only criminals I really know are the ones here in the institution." 6. "Most people try to be law-abiding and true." *Outlaw Items*: 7. "'Might is right' and 'every man for himself' are the main rules of living regardless of what people say." 8. "You have to take care of yourself because nobody else is going to take care of you." 9. "It makes me sore to have people tell me what to do." *Right Guy Items*: 10. "The biggest criminals are protected by society and rarely get

responding to his questionnaire then received a score for each of the five sets. Those scoring highest on a particular set were classified as incumbents of the role described by the set. Ties were handled by "classifying the inmate in favor of the score which was furthest from the absolute mean of its distribution."<sup>19</sup> For the present research, ties were considered to be unclassifiable as these individuals endorsed attitudes indexing two or more social types. Ninety-five inmates were omitted because of ties, leaving a sample of 269. Additionally, because the social type "Ding" was used by Garabedian as a residual category, it was felt that the heterogeneity of individuals in this category would make any analysis meaningless. Therefore, this role type was dropped.

Garabedian detected several socialization patterns.<sup>20</sup> For Right Guys and Square Johns the adaptive, U-shaped curve pattern prevailed; for Outlaws, it was the prisonization pattern; for Politicians it was the stable conformity pattern. Table 3 reveals the results of the present replication for four social types. Note that the Conformity to Staff Norms measure is the one employed in Garabedian's original research.

As Table 3 reveals, the replication was markedly unsuccessful. For two social types, Outlaws and Square Johns, there is virtually no relationship between Garabedian's findings and those of the present study. For the social type of Right Guy, although the socialization measures clearly reflected prisonization, there is also a trend in the distribution of scores for the criminal identification and associational preference scales toward the adaptive, U-shaped curve socialization pattern. Finally, socialization patterns for Politicians provided the highest degree of agreement between the two studies. Even in this instance however, the patterns were not identical as the scores in the present research begin high (pro-inmate response) and end low (more conventional responses). Garabedian's findings were completely opposite.<sup>21</sup>

The failure of this replication can be directly linked to inadequacies inherent in the attitudinal nominators used by Garabedian to locate social type role incumbents. Criticism of Garabedian's

to prison." 11. "Inmates can trust me to be honest and loyal in my dealings with them." 12. "Police, judges, prosecutors and politicians are just as crooked as most of the people they send to prison."

<sup>19</sup> Garabedian *supra* note 2, at 145.

<sup>20</sup> *Id.* at 146.

<sup>21</sup> *Id.*

TABLE 3

SOCIALIZATION AND REFERENCE GROUP MEASURES BY PHASE OF INSTITUTIONAL CAREER FOR GARABEDIAN SOCIAL TYPES  
(Standard Deviations Appear In Parentheses, Proportions Of Conformists Are Expressed As Percents)

Scale	Right Guys Career Phase			Outlaws Career Phase		
	Initial	Middle	Late	Initial	Middle	Late
Expressed Solidarity with Others	45%	25%	0%	25%	45%	0%
Conformity to Staff Norms	18.1 (4.7)	19.8 (3.8)	20.9 (2.4)	19.0 (1.4)	17.1 (3.7)	18.0 (0.0)
Isolation from Others	25%	19%	11%	0%	15%	0%
Associational Preference	15.2 (3.3)	15.5 (3.0)	14.7 (2.6)	17.8 (4.0)	16.2 (3.8)	16.0 (0.0)
Criminal Identification	40%	38%	11%	50%	65%	0%
N =	10.7 (4.0)	10.2 (3.5)	12.1 (4.1)	9.8 (4.8)	8.3 (2.6)	9.0 (0.0)
	30%	8%	33%	25%	30%	0%
	13.0 (4.1)	15.9 (3.2)	12.7 (2.4)	15.8 (3.6)	13.6 (4.0)	15.0 (0.0)
	40%	27%	44%	25%	35%	0%
	11.8 (3.6)	13.3 (3.1)	11.9 (4.8)	13.8 (3.6)	13.2 (4.2)	17.0 (0.0)
	20	48	9	4	20	1

  

Scale	Square Johns Career Phase			Politicians Career Phase		
	Initial	Middle	Late	Initial	Middle	Late
Expressed Solidarity with Others	75%	40%	100%	28%	39%	35%
Conformity to Staff Norms	18.0 (2.7)	18.6 (2.6)	15.0 (1.4)	19.0 (3.8)	18.3 (4.5)	19.3 (5.6)
Isolation from Others	50%	80%	50%	38%	40%	41%
Associational Preference	12.5 (3.3)	10.2 (2.4)	16.5 (6.4)	14.3 (3.7)	13.9 (4.1)	13.8 (3.5)
Criminal Identification	25%	20%	0%	33%	37%	35%
N =	11.8 (3.3)	9.2 (3.0)	10.0 (0.0)	10.4 (3.2)	9.6 (3.5)	9.4 (3.5)
	50%	80%	100%	41%	37%	41%
	10.3 (3.9)	9.6 (2.3)	6.0 (1.4)	12.3 (3.9)	12.7 (4.0)	12.2 (3.9)
	50%	60%	50%	44%	41%	41%
	12.3 (3.3)	10.8 (2.6)	14.5 (5.0)	12.0 (3.6)	12.3 (3.0)	12.6 (3.4)
	4	5	2	64	75	17

indirect nomination procedure will focus on two general areas—as well as on the fact that the attitude items used in the nominations are inadequate indices of the hypothesized theoretical dimensions. Garabedian claimed he was able to classify 73% of his sample into the five social type categories. Yet, this figure is far too high to present a realistic picture of the proportion of the inmate population who are *in fact*, social type role incumbents. Rather, it appears that Garabedian was attempting to identify individuals who simply had attitudinal predispositions toward the various behaviors associated with the social types. Logically we would assume that among these predisposed individuals we would find the *actual* role incumbents. Thus, a comparison of actual role incumbents to those identified through Garabedian's attitudinal nominators would provide an excellent source of validity for the latter technique. Table 4 presents the number of behaviorally nominated social types who are also identified through Garabedian's attitudinal nominators.<sup>22</sup>

<sup>22</sup> Only two social roles are common to the present research site and that of Garabedian's. These are the role

As Table 4 reveals, there is little correspondence between the attitudinal indicators and the behavioral nominations for Right Guys and Outlaws. There is, however, a relatively high degree of correspondence between the two sets of indicators for the social type of Politician-Wheeler-Dealer. This

types "Right Guy" and "Outlaw." Additionally, as Garabedian's identification items for the "Politician" reflect a pragmatic, manipulative self-orientation, these items should successfully locate incumbents of a third role, the "Wheeler Dealer," who engage in loan-sharking and manipulation of scarce goods and commodities.

Incumbents of these roles were identified as follows: a sample of 13 correctional officers who were in continuous contact with inmates were asked to name individuals who were known to the inmate group as *actual* role incumbents. These nominations were validated by two inmates with whom the researcher had become acquainted during the course of the study. Inmate questionnaires were secretly coded to allow individual identification. However, respondents were assured that no one connected with the institution would be allowed access to the questionnaires and this guarantee was met. Response rates were: 19 out of 21 "Outlaws" took the questionnaire for a response rate of 90%; "Right Guys," 4 out of 4 for a rate 100%; "Wheeler Dealers," 15 out of 19 for a rate 79%.

TABLE 4

NUMBER OF BEHAVIORALLY NOMINATED SOCIAL TYPES WHICH CORRESPOND TO GARABEDIAN'S ATTITUDINAL SOCIAL TYPE INDICATORS

(The Proportion of Behaviorally Identified Social Types Also Identified Attitudinally is Expressed in Percentages)

Social Types	Number of Behaviorally Nominated Individuals	Number Identified Through Attitudinal Indicators	Number of Behaviorally Nominated Individuals Who Were Identified Through Attitudinal Indicators
Outlaw	19	25	5 (20%)
Right Guy	4	77	0 (0%)
Politician—Wheeler-Dealer	15	156	11 (7%)

TABLE 5

CORRELATION MATRICES OF ATTITUDE ITEMS INDEXING SOCIAL TYPES<sup>1</sup>

Politicians (N = 156)			Square Johns (N = 11)				Outlaws (N = 25)			Right Guys (N = 77)					
Items	1	2	3	Items	4	5	6	Items	7	8	9	Items	10	11	12
1	1.00	.07	.09	4	1.00	.28	.24	7	1.00	-.10	.15	10	1.00	.29	.18
2		1.00	.20	5		1.00	.32	8		1.00	.08	11		1.00	.25
3			1.00	6			1.00	9			1.00	12			1.00

<sup>1</sup> Item numbers correspond to those found in footnote 18. These analyses were repeated using the entire sample for each of the four sets of items. Inter-item correlations were slightly lower on the average for each role type.

is possibly due to the fact that 156 individuals were classified as Politicians. This large sample size may contain a high proportion of Wheeler-Dealers simply by chance. But, it is noteworthy that the replication of socialization patterns was most successful for this role type. It appears, with perhaps a single exception, that the indirect nomination procedure employed by Garabedian fails to include individuals known to the inmate group behaviorally as role incumbents.

Additionally, if attitudinal items are used as indicators of specific behavioral dimensions, then they should meet certain criteria. Obviously, if *each* item in a set reflects "a component of the attitudinal organization of a given role type,"<sup>23</sup> then it may safely be assumed that these items should be highly correlated with one another. Table 5 reveals, however, that inter-item correlations are generally low for all social types. It is important to note also that attitude items which purportedly reflect components of specific attitudinal dimensions should, when factor analyzed, load on the same factors. The twelve items were subjected to factor analysis using the principal component method with iterations. Four factors were isolated. These four factors (Varimax rotation) are presented in Table 6.

The only items which load on a single factor are those indexing the social type of Square John. Items 4, 5 and 6 load uniquely on factor 3. Factor

TABLE 6

VARIMAX ROTATED FACTOR MATRIX FOR 12 ATTITUDE ITEMS USED TO NOMINATE INCUMBENTS OF FOUR SOCIAL TYPES

Variable Number <sup>1</sup>	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4
1	.20	.24	-.09	-.29
2	.48	.04	-.16	-.14
3	.16	.23	-.12	-.20
4	-.22	.02	.23	-.06
5	.07	-.18	.68	.10
6	-.19	.19	.27	-.17
7	.48	-.23	.03	.25
8	.40	.05	.06	.04
9	.19	-.01	-.05	.51
10	.54	.11	-.10	.02
11	.01	.77	-.02	.00
12	.48	.06	-.20	.29

<sup>1</sup> Variable numbers correspond to attitude items in footnote 18. Percent of variance explained by each factor is as follows: factor 1, 44%; factor 2, 30%; factor 3, 15%; factor 4, 11%.

3 appears to be constituted only of these three attitude items. As such, this factor has a theoretically interpretable meaning. It represents attitudes which reflect conventional, law-abiding values.

Unfortunately, the situation concerning the remaining social types is not as clear. Items indexing attitudes of Politicians (1, 2 and 3) load on factors 1, 2 and 4, loading negatively on factor 4. Outlaw items, (7, 8 and 9) fare a little better as they are

<sup>23</sup> Garabedian, *supra* note 2, at 144.



shared by factors 1 and 4 only. Finally, Right Guy attitude items, (10, 11 and 12) appear to load most highly on factors 1 and 2.<sup>24</sup>

The inter-item correlations and the factor analysis indicate that, except for the social type of Square John, attitude items representing the remaining social types appear to index dimensions quite apart from one another.<sup>25</sup> This reduces to the fact that researchers employing these attitudinal nominators are examining socialization patterns of individuals who simply score highest on a set of attitude items. These items are essentially non-related in most instances and are theoretically meaningless from the perspective of the identification of social type role incumbents.

#### CONCLUSION

While many research efforts have employed various indirect measures of behavior to locate inmate social types such as background characteristics<sup>26</sup> or the use of attitude items,<sup>27</sup> none have demonstrated

<sup>24</sup> It is interesting to note that factor 1 (Table 6) does appear to have a theoretically interpretable meaning in that the five items which load most strongly on this factor all appear to measure a cynical orientation, especially concerning one's orientation towards life and conditions in society. Agreement with these items would indicate that the criminal has internalized a set of rationalizations which allow him to commit criminal acts. Items loading on the remaining factors, 2 and 4, however, do not convincingly present any clear theoretical interpretations.

<sup>25</sup> Of course, if this factor analysis had been performed on Garabedian's sample, the resulting factors might have contained only items indexing the particular attitudinal dimensions under concern. Unfortunately, Garabedian fails to report any form of item analysis or more basically any attempt at ascertaining the validity of his nomination procedure.

<sup>26</sup> D. GARRITY, *THE EFFECTS OF LENGTH OF INCARCERATION UPON PAROLE ADJUSTMENT AND ESTIMATION OF OPTIMAL SENTENCE: WASHINGTON STATE CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTIONS* (1956); G. KASSEBAUM, D. WARD & D. WILNER, *supra* note 8; Wellford, *Factors Associated with Adoption of the Inmate Code: A Study of Normative Socialization*, 58 J. CRIM. L. C. & P. S. 197-203 (1967).

<sup>27</sup> Garabedian, *supra* note 2; Glaser, *supra* note 11;

any concern as to whether these techniques are successful in locating *actual* role incumbents. The present research has illustrated the dangers inherent in the use of indirect nomination procedures through an unsuccessful replication of Garabedian's analysis of socialization patterns of various social types. As has been noted, this failure was directly attributable to inadequacies in Garabedian's nominating instrument: the three item nominating sets do not locate actual role incumbents or even index the various theoretical dimensions which underline the behavior of the role types. Garabedian's study is thus reduced to an assessment of socialization patterns of individuals who simply scored high on the largely non-related items. This has ramifications for the theoretical rationale used to explain the various socialization patterns he found in his research. Since Garabedian's theoretical rationale was based on the questionable assumption that the nominating instrument accurately located role incumbents, any explanation of socialization patterns by linking the pattern to the behavior of a certain social type becomes meaningless.

The present study furnishes strong support for Wheeler's anticipatory socialization hypothesis.<sup>28</sup> The period of highest involvement in the inmate group, the middle career phase, was also the point at which responses to the various scales were most pro-inmate. The middle career phase was also the period of inmates' highest identification with criminal others and preferences for associating with these individuals. This is important in that these two dimensions are reflective of inmates' reference group orientation. As the anticipatory socialization hypothesis is based on the concept of anticipating memberships in reference groups, it is significant that these two measures supported the U-shaped curve socialization pattern.

---

Zingraff, *Prisonization as an Inhibitor of Effective Resocialization*, 13 CRIMINOLOGY 366-88 (1975).

<sup>28</sup> Wheeler, *supra* note 3.