

Index

Note: Material in figures or tables is indicated by italic page numbers.

- adaptation and assimilation
 - into prison community.
 - See also* culture of prisons;
 - social effects of incarceration
 - on social networks
 - inmate–officer relationships,
 - 57–61, 199–200
 - prisonization, 95
 - social relationships and collective norms, adoption of, 7
 - Stanford Prison Experiment,
 - 1–3, 8, 20
 - Alabama, chain gangs in, 33
 - Alexander, Chuck, 148, 195
 - apprentice officers “natural”
 - experiment (California).
 - See also* causal effects, estimation; correctional officers; inmate “natural” experiment; social effects of prison work
 - apprenticeship program,
 - overview, 87–90
 - assessments of inmate socialization to prison, 144
 - attitudes toward
 - inmates, 144, 170
 - attitudes toward
 - rehabilitation, 141–144
 - causality, problems establishing,
 - 86–90, 140–141
 - demographics of apprentice
 - correctional officers, 90
 - experiment design, 80, 86–90
 - generalizability of research
 - design, 90, 91
 - importation model, 140
 - relationships with
 - supervisors, 144–145
 - self-selection of career context,
 - 86–87, 141
 - specification of mechanisms, lack
 - of, 91–93
 - willingness to contact union about
 - problems, 144–145
 - work/role model, 140–141
- Arizona, punitive criminal justice, 34, 38
 - associational activity, importance in society, 45–46
 - average treatment effect (ATE),
 - estimation, 79–80
 - average treatment effect for the treated (ATT), estimation, 80

- Beaumont, Gustave de, 15, 122
 Bedford Stuyvesant (Brooklyn, NY), 167–169
Bell v. Wolfish (1979), 40
 Black Muslims, 50
Body Count (DiIulio), 31–32
 bonding as exclusive social capital, 63
Bowling Alone (Putnam), 13, 165, 187
 bridging as inclusive social capital, 63
- California
 determinate sentencing, 70
 gangs, 72
 parolee geographical concentration, 152
 politics of crime control, 69–72
 public safety realignment reforms, 174, 185–186
 “punitive turn,” 70
 recidivism rates, 117–118, 119
 spending for criminal justice, 71–72
- California Code of Regulations, Title 15, Crime Prevention and Corrections.
See Director’s Rules
- California Correctional Officer Survey (CCOS), 73–74, 194–197, 207–217
- California Correctional Peace Officers’ Association (CCPOA).
See also correctional officers
- California Correctional Officer Survey and, 195, 197
 military style uniforms for on-duty officers, 37–38
 misconduct by correctional officers, 60–61
 officers’ willingness to contact union about problems, 133–136
- Peacekeeper* magazine, 208
 political power and membership growth, 148–149
 promotion of solidarity among members, 62, 149
 punitive approach to crime control, 70
 right to carry concealed weapons while off-duty, 37–38
 support of realignment reforms, 185
- California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (CDCR)
 budget, 69
 classification of inmates, 81–83, 218, 219–224
 classification scores and recidivism, 117–119, 218, 222–224
 classification scores and security level assignment, 80–83, 218, 222–224
 consensual/mixed model of prisons, 37–38
 correctional facilities, 73, 205–207
 correctional officers
 apprenticeship, 87–90
 correctional officers recruitment, 87
 design capacity of prisons, 71, 191
 gang designation form, 227
 gang treatment programs, 177
 gangs, 72, 77–78, 177
 incarceration rates, 68
 length of average prison stay, 11
 lockdowns, 78
 misconduct by correctional officers, 60–61
 overcrowding in prisons, 71
 overview of corrections system, 69–72
 prison culture variation across security levels, 75–78, 92
 prison design variation and security levels, 74–75

- prison healthcare system, 72
 prison population, 68
 Prison University Project (PUP),
 191–194, 199, 201–203, 204
 realignment reforms,
 174, 185–186
 recidivism rates, 117–118, 119
 rehabilitation and education
 programs in prisons, 69
 release rates of prisoners, 11,
 119, 152, 156
 renaming, 185
 screening process for officer
 candidates, 87
 security level assignment, 219–222
 variation across California
 facilities by security level, 76
 variation in prisons, 72–74,
 205–207
 violence, variation by security
 level, 77–78
 causal effects, estimation.
 See also apprentice officers
 “natural” experiment, inmate
 “natural” experiment
 average treatment effect (ATE),
 estimation, 79–80
 average treatment effect for
 the treated (ATT),
 estimation, 80
 Neyman-Rubin-Holland causal
 model, 79
 overview, 20, 78–80
 CCOS. *See* California Correctional
 Officer Survey
 CCPOA. *See* California Correctional
 Peace Officers’ Association
 civil rights, prisoners’ rights
 movement, 50–51
 classification of inmates.
 See also Correctional
 Offender Management
 Profiling for Alternative
 Sanctions
 in California, , 81–83, 218,
 219–224
 classification scores and recidivism
 (California), 117–119,
 218, 222–224
 descriptive and predictive
 COMPAS scales, 100,
 219–224
 history of prison classification, 41
 prison variation and, 16,
 19, 47, 69
 risk assessment tools, 41
 Cleaver, Eldridge, 50, 191
 coercive mobility, 163
 collective norms. *See* norms
 collective problem solving, 21, 161
 communities. *See also* fractured
 communities
 Americans’ dissatisfaction with
 criminal justice, 183–184
 attitudes of people with personal
 experience with corrections,
 182–183, 184
 coercive mobility, effects
 on, 163–164
 collective efficacy, 160,
 164–165
 collective problem solving in,
 21, 161
 community attitudes survey
 in Los Angeles County,
 153–154, 228–233
 community cooperation
 and ex-prisoner
 concentration, 159–161
 community disorganization
 theory, 163–165
 community organization and
 return of prisoners, 154–156,
 157–158, 159–161
 concentrated surveillance in
 low-income and urban
 neighborhoods, 151
 economic impact of parolees, 161
 effect of ex-prisoners on
 generalized trust in
 communities, 11, 151,
 156, 158–159

- communities (*cont.*)
 effect of ex-prisoners on social trust in communities, 11, 156, 159–161
 mediation model, ex-prisoner concentration and community empowerment, 159–161
 negative feedback loops in, 151–152, 162
 norms passed from parolees to communities, 162
 oppositional norms, diffusion in communities, 163
 parolees' social ties in communities, 162
 community disorganization theory, 163–165
 COMPAS. *See* Correctional Offender Management Profiling for Alternative Sanctions
 consequences of incarceration. *See* social effects of incarceration
 Correctional Offender Management Profiling for Alternative Sanctions (COMPAS)
 criminal cognitions relative to incarcerated peers, 113–114
 Criminal Cognitions Scale and norms of violence and aggression, 109–111
 Criminal Cognitions Scale, criminal history and, 109–111
 Criminal Cognitions Scale, effects of prisoner classification on, 109–111
 Criminal Cognitions Scale, items in, 108–110
 Current Violence Scale scores, 84, 224
 descriptive and predictive scales, overview, 100, 219–224
 gang affiliations, 107–108, 114–115
 predictive validity, 117
 social isolation
 measurement, 101–103
 Social Isolation Scale, criminal history and, 103–104, 224–225
 Social Isolation Scale, items in, 102
 Social Isolation Scale, robustness tests, 105–106
 Social Isolation Scale, sense of belonging and, 104–105
 Social Isolation Scale, social networks and, 104–105
 social networks, effects of prisoner classification on, 107–108
 social networks measurement, 100
 validity tests, 100–101
 correctional officers.
See also apprentice officers
 “natural” experiment;
 California Correctional Peace Officers' Association; social effects of prison work
 apprenticeship (California), 87–90, 126
 correctional professionalization movements and, 184
 demographic and attitudinal characteristics and prison types, 19–20
 direct occupational experience and officers' attitudes, 125
 divorce and, 126–127
 formal training, 87, 124–125, 146–147
 minimum job requirements (California), 87
 misconduct by, 60–61
 numbers of, 8–9
 officers killed in the line of duty, 127
 overtime work, 186
 prison reform and, 184–186
 public perception of, 58

- recruitment (California), 87
- research, overview, 17–18
- risks of violence and injury, 10, 18, 127–129
- role stress, role shift, and role ambiguity, 184–185
- safety equipment and security-related training, 18, 186
- screening process for officer candidates (California), 87
- self-selection of career context, 86–87, 141
- staff retention and recruiting problems, 184, 186
- workplace persona, 196
- work-related problems, resources for solving, 133–136
- correctional officers' union (California). *See* California Correctional Peace Officers' Association
- cost of criminal justice
 - California, 71–72
 - justice reinvestment strategies, 180
 - nonmonetary costs, 161, 171–172
 - per capita spending, 171
 - per-inmate cost of prisons, 170
- crime rates and incarceration rates, 24–25
- criminal cognition
 - criminal cognitions relative to incarcerated peers, 113–114
 - Criminal Cognitions Scale and norms of violence and aggression, 109–111
 - Criminal Cognitions Scale, criminal history and, 109–111
 - Criminal Cognitions Scale, effects of prisoner classification on, 109–111
 - Criminal Cognitions Scale, items in, 108–110
- criminogenic attitude adoption and social networks, 8, 99, 112–113
 - as peer effect, 111–115
 - recidivism risk factor, 117
- criminogenic effects of
 - incarceration. *See also* social effects of incarceration
 - punitive or high-security prisons, 8, 95, 97, 99, 109, 113
 - social networks and, 8, 99, 112–113
- cultural transmission of
 - deviance, 163–164
- culture of prisons. *See also* prison gangs; social effects of incarceration; violence
 - consensual/mixed model, 37–38
 - effect on correctional officers, 8
 - formal institutions, weakness of, 58–59, 64
 - formal prison regime, 47
 - hierarchies and informal self-government, 48, 51
 - importance of studying, 47
 - increased crimes caused by, 8
 - informal prison culture, overview, 47–48
 - inmate–officer relationships, effects of, 57–61
 - interconnectivity between rehabilitation programs and violence, 92–93
 - paradox of modern prisons and, 12
 - prison peer groups, effect on recidivism, 55
 - quality of confinement measures, 38
 - responsibility model, 36–37
 - social effects, overview, 7, 12
 - sociological research studies of, 48
 - variation across security levels, 75–78, 92
 - variation between states, 36–40
- de Tocqueville, Alexis, 15, 45–46, 122
- departures. *See* release and parole

- deterrence model of crime control.
See also incapacitating and warehousing role of prisons; social effects of incarceration
 background and scholarly studies, 94–95
 decline of rehabilitative ideal, 28–29
 historical background, 28
 principle of less eligibility, 29
 deviance, cultural transmission of, 163–164
- DiIulio, John
Body Count, 31–32
Governing Prisons, 36–38, 92
 quality of confinement measures, 38
- Director's Rules (California Code of Regulations), 72, 74–75, 219
- Dukakis, Michael, 27
- education programs in prisons
 California, 34–35, 69
 higher education programs, 34–35
 overview, 34–36
 Pell Grants, 34–35
 Prison University Project (PUP), 191–194, 199, 201–203, 204
 student characteristics and attitudes, 192–193
 variation across prisons, 39–40
 variation in, 35–36
 vocational education programs, 35, 69
- eligibility, principle of less, 29
- family ties
 difficulty maintaining in prison, 106–107, 164, 170
 inmates as parents, 54
 officers' stress and family relationships, 145–146, 196
 officers' work–family conflict, 10, 126–127, 137–140, 145–146
 formal prison regime, description, 47
- fractured communities.
See also communities
 causes, 43
 densely-knit, tightly-bounded social groups, 43, 46–47, 165–166
 Los Angeles County, 11
 overview, 43, 46–47
 punitive prisons, 43, 150
 returning ex-prisoners and, 11, 151, 159, 165–166
- gangs in prison. *See* prison gangs
- generalized trust. *See* trust, generalized
- Goldwater, Barry, 26
Governing Prisons (DiIulio), 36–38, 92
- harsher prisons. *See* punitive prisons
- health and mental health issues of parolees, 161
- high-security prisons. *See* security-level designation
- Hobbes, Thomas, 44
- Horton, Willie, 27
- importation model, 140
- incapacitating and warehousing role of prisons. *See also* deterrence model of crime control; “punitive turn”
 background and scholarly studies, 94
 development of approach, 6
 new penology and, 29–30
 unemployment and poverty, relationship to, 14, 161
- incarceration rates. *See also* prison population
 in California, 68
 concentrated surveillance in neighborhoods and, 151
 crime rate and, 24–25
 de-carceration, 174
 decreasing rates, 174, 180

- proportion who have ever been in prison, 5
- race and, 3–4, 5, 169
- in United States, 3
- variation by geographic area, 4–5
- variation by state, 36
- incarceration, social effects
 of. *See* social effects of incarceration
- inmate classification.
See classification of inmates
- inmate “natural” experiment (California). *See also* apprentice officers “natural” experiment; causal effects, estimation; social effects of incarceration
- classification cutoff point, 80–83, 84–86
- classification scores and security level assignment, 80–83, 218, 222–224
- experimental design, overview, 80
- generalizability of research design, 90–91
- illustration of, 83
- regression discontinuity design, 83–84
- specification of mechanisms, lack of, 91–93
- isolation, feelings of.
See also social effects of incarceration
- correctional officers, 197
- punitive prisons, 8
- social isolation, measurement, 101–103
- Social Isolation Scale, criminal history and, 103–104, 224–225
- Social Isolation Scale, items in, 102
- Social Isolation Scale, robustness tests, 105–106
- Social Isolation Scale, sense of belonging and, 104–105
- Social Isolation Scale, social networks and, 104–105
- Jackson, George, 50, 191
- Jimenez, Mike, 148, 195
- jungle gym in Bedford Stuyvesant, 168–169
- Kansas, justice reinvestment strategy, 180
- Leviathon* (Hobbes), 44
- Lewen, Jody, 191–192, 199, 201–202. *See also* Prison University Project
- Locke, John, 12, 45
- Los Angeles County, 11, 152–154, 228–233
- Louisiana, incarceration rates, 36
- Louisiana, prison release rates, 156
- Maine, incarceration rates, 36
- Maine, prison release rates, 156
- Martinson, Robert, 30, 32
- mass incarceration effects on elections and voting, 172
- fiscal burden associated with, 172
- as public policy, 14–15.
See also (incarceration rates)
- Massachusetts, gang treatment programs, 177
- Massachusetts, prison release rates, 156
- mediation model, 159–161
- medical model of corrections, 28, 31.
See also rehabilitation
- Michigan, incarceration rates, 4–5
- Michigan, responsibility model of prisons, 36–37
- Minnesota, incarceration rates, 36
- mitigating prison effects, 173–179.
See also prison reform
- modern American prison, the, 32–36

- New Jersey, per-inmate cost of prisons, 170
- new penology
 conceptualization of criminals as evildoers, 30–32
 modern American prison, the, 32–36
 risk management, 6, 29–30, 41
- New York, incarceration rates, 5
- New York, per-inmate cost of prisons, 170
- Neyman-Rubin-Holland causal model, 79
- Nixon, Richard, 26
- “no frills” prison movement, 33–34
- nonviolent first-time prisoners, numbers of, 54–55
- norms
 crime prevention in communities, 164–165
 Criminal Cognitions Scale and norms of violence and aggression, 109–111
 decentralized inmate norms in 1950s, 53
 downward leveling norms, 163
 norms passed from parolees to communities, 162
 oppositional norms, diffusion in communities, 163
 punitive prisons, impact of, 7, 170
 social relationships and collective norms, adoption by inmates, 7
 social relationships and collective norms in prisons, 86
 stigmatization of ex-convicts, 56–58, 162
 stigmatization of welfare recipients, 56
- Novey, Don, 148
- overcrowding in prisons, 71, 175–176
- “pains of imprisonment,” 95, 124
- paradox of modern prison culture, overview, 12
- parents as inmates, 54
- parole. *See* release and parole
- Pell Grants, 34–35
- Pennsylvania, incarceration rates, 4
- playground jungle gym in Bedford Stuyvesant, 168–169
- politics of crime control.
See also prison reform
 public policy “punitive turn”
 accountability of prisons, concerns about, 181–182
 Americans’ dissatisfaction with criminal justice, 183–184
 attitudes of people with personal experience with corrections, 182–183, 184
 California, 69–72
 choices society makes, 203–204
 conceptualization of criminals as evildoers, 30–32
 Democratic Party’s punitive policy, 26–27
 evolving conservative position on reform, 180–181
 fundamental roles of political institutions, 12, 44–45
 government role in fostering social connections, 188
 modern American prison, the, 32–36
 national interest in 1950 and 1960s, 6, 26
 “no frills” prison movement, 33–34
 politics of punishment, 6–7, 25–28, 29–31, 34, 70, 179–181
 prison reform, political feasibility, 179–184
 Republicans as law and order party, 26
 state power, theories of, 44–46
 symbolic politics of crime control, overview, 26–32
 principle of less eligibility, 29
- prison design
 design capacity of California prisons, 71, 191

- politics and, 6
- security-level and design
 - variation, 74–75
- variation, 16–17
- prison gangs. *See also* culture of prisonsocial networks
 - attempts to control gangs, 176–177
 - bonding and sense of social belonging in, 63
 - California, 72, 77–78
 - gang designation form (CDCR), 227
 - gang treatment programs, 177
 - isolation of gang members, 176–177
 - lack of generalized trust, 64–65
 - oppositional nature of, 52–53
 - recidivism risks, 117
 - response to weak formal institutions, 66, 92–93
 - rise of, 51–53
 - security-level designation and, 107–108, 114–115
 - segregation of gang members, 177
 - solitary confinement, 176–177
 - violence and, 52–53, 92
- prison population.
 - See also* incarceration rates in California, 68
 - comparison of United States and other countries, 3
 - crime rate and, 24–25
 - decreasing prison population, 174, 180
 - growth of prison population, 3, 24, 156
 - nonviolent first-time prisoners, numbers of, 54–55
 - number of inmates in America, 3–5, 24–25
- prison reform. *See also* classification of inmates; politics of crime control; Prison University Project; “punitive turn”
 - accountability of prisons, concerns about, 181–182
 - attempts to control gangs, 176–177
 - correctional officers and, 184–186
 - correctional professionalization movements, 184
 - de-carceration, 174
 - evolving conservative position on reform, 180–181
 - justice reinvestment strategies, 180
 - mitigating prison effects, overview, 173–179
 - new penology, 6, 29–36, 41
 - “no frills” prison movement, 33–34
 - officers’ role stress, role shift, and role ambiguity, 184–185
 - political feasibility, overview, 179–184
 - prisoners’ rights movement, 1960s to 1980s, 50–51
 - pro-social programs for inmates, 178–179
 - realignment reforms (California), 185–186
 - reducing prison violence, 175
 - rehabilitation philosophy in 19th century, 28
 - sentencing reforms, 174
 - “What Works? Questions and Answers About Prison Reform” (Martinson), 7, 30, 32
- Prison University Project (PUP), 191–194, 199, 201–203, 204. *See also* education programs in prisons
- prisoners’ rights movement, 1960s to 1980s, 50–51
- prisonization, 95
- psychological effects of incarceration, overview, 15–16

- public policy. *See also* politics of crime control; “punitive turn”
 affecting interactions
 through incentives and supports, 58–62
 choices society makes, 203–204
 construction of social groups, 56–58
 mass incarceration as public policy, 14–15
 state influence on composition of networks, 54–56
 state influence on context of social interaction, 56
- punitive prisons. *See also* security-level designation
 characteristics of correctional officers, 19–20
 characteristics of inmates, 19
 criminogenic effects of incarceration, 8, 95, 97, 99, 109, 113
 effect on generalized trust, 7, 150
 focus on order and control, 16
 increased crimes caused by, 8
 loneliness and, 8
 particularized trust among inmates, 8
 production of crime, 119–122
 recidivism and, 8, 19, 116–119
 signals to prisoners about their status, 61
 social effects of, 7–11, 119–122, 150, 173
 social effects on correctional officers, 8, 9–10
 “punitive turn.” *See also* politics of crime control
 in California, 70
 California Correctional Peace Officers’ Association and, 70
 conceptualization of criminals as evildoers, 30–32
 Democratic Party’s punitive policy, 26–27
 effects on sentencing and incarceration, 27–28
 modern American prisons and, 32–36, 173
 Nixon’s “tough on crime” campaign, 26
 “no frills” prison movement, 33–34
 politics of punishment and, 6–7, 25–28, 29–31, 34, 70, 179–181
 Republicans as law and order party, 26
 as shift in culture of corrections, 16
- PUP. *See* Prison University Project
- quality of confinement measures, 38
- race and crime control
 implicit strategy of Republican Party, 26
 incarceration rates and race, 3–4, 5, 169
 indeterminate sentencing, 30
- recidivism
 background and scholarly studies, 95–97, 116–117
 causality, 8
 classification scores and (California), 117–119
 criminal cognitions as risk factor, 117
 institutional environments and, 21
 negative feedback loops in communities, 151–152, 162
 predictive validity of COMPAS measures, 117
 prison gangs and, 117
 prison peer groups, effect of, 55
 punitive prisons and, 8, 19, 116–119
 rates in California, 117–118, 119
 rates in United States, 119–120

- security-level designation and, 95–97, 116–119
- reform of criminal justice system. *See* prison reform
- regression discontinuity design, 83–84
- rehabilitation
 - California, 69
 - correctional officers' attitudes, 9, 124, 130–131, 141–144
 - decline of rehabilitative ideal, 28–29
 - decreased funding, 7, 34, 174
 - education programs in prisons, overview, 34–36
 - explanations of criminal behavior, 30–31
 - inmate stress and violence reduction through, 124
 - interconnectivity between rehabilitation programs and violence, 92–93
 - lower-security prisons and, 16
 - medical model, 28, 31
 - new penology and, 6
 - person-centered model, 21
 - prison reforms in 19th century, 28
 - ratio of service staff to inmates, 39–40, 43
 - signals to prisoners about their status, 61
- release and parole
 - coercive mobility, effects on communities, 163–164
 - collective efficacy, effect on, 160, 164–165
 - community attitudes survey in Los Angeles County, 153–154, 228–233
 - community cooperation and ex-prisoner concentration, 159–161
 - community organization and return of prisoners, 154–156, 157–158, 159–161, 163–164
 - economic impact on communities, 161
 - effect on generalized trust in communities, 11, 151, 156, 158–159
 - effect on social trust in communities, 11, 156, 159–161
 - ex-prisoner concentration, variation in, 4–5, 10, 151–153, 156–157
 - health and mental health issues of parolees, 161
 - lasting effects of prison on behavior, 200
 - mediation model, ex-prisoner concentration and community empowerment, 159–161
 - negative feedback loops in communities, 151–152, 162
 - norms passed from parolees to communities, 162
 - parolee concentration, analysis by zip code, 11, 152–153, 157
 - parolee geographical concentration in California, 152
 - parolee geographical concentration in Los Angeles County, 152–153
 - parolee geographical concentration nationally, 156–157
 - parolees' social ties in communities, 162
 - rates in California, 11, 119, 152, 156
 - rates in other states, 156
 - Social Capital Benchmark Survey, 153–154, 228–233
 - social effects of ex-prisoners, 162–164
 - riots, 51, 92, 97
- San Quentin State Prison, overview, 191

- SAT test scores, 81
 Schwarzenegger, Arnold, 71, 185
 security-level designation.
See also classification of inmates; punitive prisons; social effects of incarceration
 attitudes toward inmates and corrections and, 129–133, 170
 characteristics of inmates and, 19, 69
 classification scores and (California), 80–83, 218, 222–224
 criminal cognition, effects on, 109–111, 112–114
 criminogenic effects of incarceration and, 95, 99
 dangerousness of inmates, officer assessments of, 131
 gang associations and, 107–108, 114–115
 inmate–officer relationships and, 131–132
 isolation, feelings of, 103–104
 officers’ risks of violence and injury, 128–129
 officers’ willingness to contact union about problems, 10, 133–136, 144–145
 prison culture variation across security levels, 75–78, 92
 prison design variation and, 74–75
 prison socialization, officer assessments of, 132, 144
 prison’s detrimental effect on inmates, officers’ assessment, 132–133
 psychological stress and security level, 138
 recidivism and, 95–97, 116–119
 rehabilitation, officers’ attitudes toward, 130–131, 141–144
 variation across California facilities by security level, 76
 variation in prison and, 16–17
 violence, variation by security level (California), 77–78
 work–family conflict and, 138–140
 sentencing
 determinate sentencing in California, 70
 effects of “punitive turn,” 27–28
 indeterminate sentencing laws, 27, 28, 30
 sentencing reforms, 174
 “three strikes” policies, 27
 truth-in-sentencing policies, 27–28, 33
 social capital
 bonding as exclusive social capital, 63
 bridging as inclusive social capital, 63
 contingent value of, 187–188
 crime prevalence determinant in communities, 165
 “dark side” of social capital, 13–14, 163
 declines in, 187
 definitions and overview, 187
 pro-social purpose in social networks, 13, 187
 Social Capital Benchmark Survey, 153–154, 228–233
 social contract and criminal justice, 12, 15
 social effects of incarceration.
See also criminogenic effects of incarceration; deterrence model of crime control; incapacitating and warehousing role of prisons; inmate “natural” experiment; social isolation, feelings of
 causal effects, overview, 20, 78–80
 coercive mobility, 163–164
 detrimental effect on inmates, officers’ assessment, 132–133

- distrust of government, 172
- how institutions make
 - citizens, 21–23
- inmate outcome measurement
 - by COMPAS survey, 100, 219–224
- inmate–officer relationships,
 - effects of, 57–61
- lasting effects of prison on
 - behavior, 200
- mitigating prison effects,
 - 173–179
- overview and scholarly studies,
 - 94–97, 123, 203
- political consequences of having a
 - criminal record, 172
- prisons as social institutions, 173
- prisons as socializing institutions,
 - 48, 170–173, 193–194
- psychological effects,
 - overview, 15–16
- punitive prisons, social effects of,
 - 7–11, 119–122, 150, 173
- recidivism, 116–119
- relationships with family and
 - friends outside prison, 106–107, 164, 170
- social networks, effects of prisoner
 - classification on, 107–108
- Stanford Prison Experiment,
 - 1–3, 8, 20
- suicide, 196, 199
- social effects of prison work.
 - See also* apprentice officers
 - “natural” experiment;
 - correctional officers
 - attitudes toward inmates
 - and corrections, 129–133, 144, 170
 - dangerousness of inmates, officer
 - assessments of, 131
 - direct occupational experience and
 - officers’ attitudes, 125
 - divorce and, 126–127
 - identity formation and social role
 - in prison, 58
 - informal socialization and officers’
 - attitudes, 125–129
 - inmate–officer relationships, 60, 131–132, 199–200
 - isolation, feelings of, 197
 - officers’ role stress, role shift, and
 - role ambiguity, 184–185
 - officers’ willingness to contact
 - union about problems, 10, 133–136, 144–145
 - overtime work, 186
 - overview, 55–56, 123–124
 - prison socialization, officer
 - assessments of, 132, 144
 - prison’s detrimental effect
 - on inmates, officers’
 - assessment, 132–133
 - psychological stress and family
 - relationships, 145–146, 196
 - psychological stress and safety
 - perceptions, i, 136–137, 147, 186, 197
 - psychological stress and security
 - level, 138
 - psychological stress and work
 - environment, 197–198
 - psychological stress, health
 - effects, 147
 - punitive prisons, social effects
 - of, 8, 9–10
 - rehabilitation, officers’ attitudes
 - toward, 9, 124, 130–131
 - relationships with peers, 196
 - relationships with supervisors
 - and management, 133–136, 144–145
 - social effects of punitive
 - prisons, 8, 9–10
 - social relationships and collective
 - norms in prisons, 86
 - staff retention and recruiting
 - problems, 184, 186
 - suicide, 147, 196, 199
 - work–family conflict, 10, 126–127, 137–140, 145–146
 - workplace persona, 196

- social institutions, prisons as, 173
 social isolation, feelings of.
 See also social effects of incarceration
 correctional officers, 58, 61–62
 punitive prisons, 8
 social isolation,
 measurement, 101–103
 Social Isolation Scale,
 criminal history and,
 103–104, 224–225
 Social Isolation Scale,
 items in, 102
 Social Isolation Scale, robustness
 tests, 105–106
 Social Isolation Scale, sense of
 belonging and, 104–105
 Social Isolation Scale, social
 networks and, 104–105
 social networks.
 See also prison gangs
 collective efficacy and, 159
 community disorganization theory
 and, 163–165
 community organization and
 return of prisoners, 154–156,
 157–158, 159–161, 163–164
 correctional officers, social effects
 of environment, 55–56
 criminogenic attitude adoption
 and, 8, 99, 112–113
 effect on Social Isolation Scale
 (COMPAS), 104–105
 effects of prisoner
 classification, 107–108
 family ties, difficulty maintaining
 in prison, 106–107, 164, 170
 government role in fostering social
 connections, 188
 loneliness and, 8
 measurement with COMPAS
 survey, 100
 nonviolent first-time prisoners,
 community ties, 54–55
 parolees' social ties in
 communities, 162
 prison peer groups, effect on
 recidivism, 55
 social capital and, 13, 187–188
 state influence on composition of
 networks, 54–56
 state influence on context of social
 interaction, 56
 social trust, effect of ex-prisoners
 in communities, 11,
 156, 159–161
 socializing institutions, prisons as,
 48, 170–173, 193–194
 spending for criminal justice.
 See cost of criminal
 justice
 Stanford Prison Experiment,
 1–3, 8, 20
 state influence
 composition of social
 networks, 54–56
 context of social interaction, 56
 role in fostering social
 connections, 188
 social attitudes, 14, 54–56
 Supreme Court and criminal justice,
 26, 40
 symbolic politics of crime control,
 overview, 26–32
 Take Back Our Streets Act, 33
 Texas
 control model of prisons,
 36–37
 incarceration rates, 36
 incarceration rates and geographic
 location, 5
 justice reinvestment
 strategy, 180
 tradition of being “Texas
 Tough,” 38–39
 “three strikes” policies, 27
 trust, generalized
 effect of ex-prisoners in
 communities, 11, 151,
 156, 158–159
 effect of harsher prisons, 7, 150

- lack of in prison gangs, 64–65
 - social context for
 - development, 21, 60
 - social ties and community involvement, 13
 - undermining by welfare policies, 56
- trust, particularized, in harsher prisons, 8
- trust, social, effect of ex-prisoners in communities, 11, 156, 159–161
- variation in prison management
 - across states and regions, 16, 36–40
 - California correctional facilities, 72, 73, 205–207
 - characteristics of correctional officers, 19–20
 - classification of inmates and, 16, 19, 47, 69
 - education programs in prisons, 35–36
 - intra-state variation, 40–43
 - prison design, 17
 - quality of confinement measures, 38
 - ratio of service staff to inmates, 39–40, 43
 - security-level designation and, 16–17
 - variation across California facilities by security level, 76
- violence. *See also* culture of prisons
 - conditions that cause prison violence, 175
 - correctional officers' risks of violence and injury, 10, 18, 127–129
 - Current Violence Scale scores, 84, 224
 - increased crimes caused by punitive prisons, 8
 - institutional response to, 76, 78, 92–93, 133
 - interconnectivity between rehabilitation programs and violence, 92–93
 - prison gangs and, 52–53, 92
 - rates of violence in prison, 98
 - rates of violent crimes, 24
 - reducing prison violence, 175
 - safety equipment and security-related training of officers, 18, 186
 - street culture in urban ghetto, 65
 - variation by security level (California), 77–78
- Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act (1994), 34
- vocational education programs in prisons, 35, 69
- welfare policy, 18, 56, 172
- West Virginia prison release rates, 156
- “What Works? Questions and Answers About Prison Reform” (Martinson), 7, 30, 32
- Wolff v. MacDonnell* (1974), 40
- work/role model, 140–141