THE SOCIAL-PSYCHOLOGICAL GRIEF ENVIRONMENT OF MALE PRISON INMATES:

William T. Edwards, M.A.
Morehead State University, 1999

Abstract

Little empirical attention had been given to the nature of grief and bereavement as experienced by prison inmates. This study investigates the social-psychological grief environment of male prison inmates in a medium security facility using the disenfranchised grief perspective. A survey research design was used to collect data from a volunteer participant sample of 157 self-identified grieving and 106 non-grieving inmates. General demographic and background data were collected from subjects in both groups in addition to information regarding non-grief related external (outside prison contacts) and internal social-supportiveness, norms of emotional expressiveness within the prison environment, and psychological distress as measured by the Brief Symptom Inventory (BSI). Grief respondents were asked additional questions concerning their grief experience, recognition of their grief by others, and social-supportiveness during their bereavement. Five indexes were developed to measure levels of social-ritual, external social-supportive, internal social-supportive, intrapsychic, and total disenfranchised grief based upon the current theoretical and clinical literature, and sensitized to the prison grief environment. A multidimensional complicated grief index for prisoners was also developed using clinically and empirically established manifestations of difficult, chronic, or inhibited grief in order to explore the relationship between complicated grief and disenfranchised grief for this
particular population. Findings on the BSI were correlated with findings of
disenfranchised grief to assess whether specific dimensions of disenfranchised grief in
prison inmates was associated with higher emotional or psychological distress.
Between-group t-tests were used to determine whether differences with regard to
psychological distress existed between the grief and non-grief group.

Significant percentages of the grief sample exhibited high levels of social-ritual,
social-supportive, intrapsychic, and total disenfranchised grief. External and internal
social supportive disenfranchisement, intrapsychic, and total disenfranchisement were
all associated with higher levels of complicated grief and psychological distress in grief
group respondents. Between-group t-tests upon the subscales of the BSI yielded
consistently higher mean scores for grieving subjects. In addition, grieving inmates
found to exhibit high levels of total disenfranchised grief also displayed significantly
higher percentages of psychological distress than seen in the non-grief sample upon a
variety of symptoms including anxiety, hostility, somatization, and depression. The
high overall psychological distress found in the non-grief sample indicate that pre-loss
levels of psychological distress in the prison population under study are already quite
high, and that such persistently high levels of distress unrelated to grief add
considerable importance to the findings of even higher psychological distress in those
inmates exhibiting high levels of disenfranchised grief.
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Chapter 1

Introduction

Problem Statement

The death of a loved-one is an intense, complicated, and often an emotionally difficult experience—one that is universally shared throughout human society. Contemporary American society uses a variety of socially approved activities and supportive measures to address the social and personal challenges survivors face when someone close to them dies. Religious and funeral rituals are often utilized to provide a culturally familiar and meaningful structure to early grief and bereavement. The bereavement role generally affords survivors with the recognition of their grief by others, and often includes specific expressive and functional privileges geared toward relieving them from normative patterns of emotional management and the day-to-day responsibilities that may otherwise inhibit coping and recovery.

While considerable empirical attention has been given to the broader social and emotional manifestations of grief and bereavement in general society, there has been little interest in the social-situational and social-psychological grief environment of those incarcerated. Being imprisoned limits one's ability to participate in culturally traditional and familiar pre-death and post-death interactional and social rituals, but it does not shield one from the common and inevitable reality of having to deal with a loved-one's loss.

Little is known about the inmate experience with grief, or which aspects of their external social network and the prison environment are most influential with regard to mourning, emotional expressiveness during bereavement, and coping strategies. What is immediately apparent, however, is that prisoners face loss within a unique and relatively unexplored grief environment that limits or even restricts their access to and
participation in traditional activities and patterns of socialization associated with bereavement. As such, this study explores grief and bereavement in prison inmates using the disenfranchised grief perspective (Doka, 1989).

Theoretical Perspective

Doka describes disenfranchised grief as "grief that persons experience when they incur a loss that is not or cannot be openly acknowledged, publicly mourned, or socially supported" (P. 4). In disenfranchised situations, a significant loss has been experienced; however, the griever is granted limited or no opportunity to publicly mourn or to receive social support (Walls, 1995).

Doka (1989) and Kauffman (1989) identify two foci for conceptualizing disenfranchised grief. The first, which Doka terms the social context, is where grief and bereavement are determined by "grieving rules," which are sets of norms created by society in general, or by groups within society. The second, which Kauffman has labeled the "intrapsychic dimension," concerns aspects of disenfranchised grief that may not necessarily be societal but arise from within the self. For the purposes of this study, we have further developed the social context to include three dimensions specifically applicable to the prison environment (see discussion below). These include the social-ritual dimension, the external (outside prison) social support dimension, and the internal (inside prison) social support dimension.

Much of this study reports descriptive information regarding the nature of grief and bereavement among prisoners. However, the disenfranchised grief perspective offers a particularly useful perspective in conceptualizing and operationalizing an exploratory study of inmate grief and bereavement while also identifying areas deserving further investigation.
Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to examine the nature of grief and bereavement among prison inmates. The concept of disenfranchised grief is used to orient the research toward the critical processes and phenomena associated with the prison grief experience, while measures of complicated grief and psychological distress are also utilized for comparative analysis.

The descriptive portion of the study examines the extent to which mourning inmates exhibit evidence of disenfranchisement within three specific disenfranchised grief dimensions. Social-ritual disenfranchised grief includes one's disenfranchisement from ritualized or commonly utilized practices related to early mourning like funeral planning and attendance, or participation in religious services. Social-supportive disenfranchisement may occur when one's grief is unrecognized, or when one is offered no transitional bereavement role in which to express grief or receive the support and sympathy of others. The intrapsychic grief dimension pertains to emotional characteristics and feelings that inhibit one's participation in, and support from, commonly utilized mourning practices and social support. For example, a disenfranchised grieve may exhibit attributions of self-blame or intense shame related to the relationship they had with the decedent.

The analytical portion of the study will determine if evidence of disenfranchised grief is associated with findings of complicated grief and psychological distress, and whether grieving inmates exhibit higher levels of psychological distress than their non-grieving cohorts.
Chapter 2

Review of the Literature

This literature review includes three sections. The first focuses on the disenfranchised grief perspective. The second examines complicated grief and bereavement and the male normative model of bereavement and coping. The third synthesizes the first two sections with reference to their theoretical applicability to inmate populations.

Disenfranchised Grief

The review of the literature pertaining to disenfranchised grief has been organized into the following sections: (a) an overview of the concept of disenfranchised grief and its use in previous research; (b) social-ritual disenfranchised grief; (c) social-supportive disenfranchised grief; and (d) intrapsychic disenfranchised grief.

According to Pine (1989), increasingly complicated social-organizational and social-structural changes within and throughout contemporary social systems have "created an underclass of griever whom we describe as disenfranchised from the normal grieving process" (P. 14). Doka (1989) defines disenfranchised grief as grief that persons experience when they suffer a loss that is not or cannot be openly acknowledged, publicly mourned, or socially supported. He suggests that disenfranchised grief may occur when a relationship had little or no social legitimacy (e.g. relationships between adulterous partners, gay lovers, close friends, or co-workers), when the loss itself is not recognized or is under-recognized by others (as in the case of miscarriages, or the death of a pet), or when the capacity of the griever to grieve is in question. This last category may include the very young, the very old, or the developmentally disabled.
Doka (1987) suggests that the tasks associated with bereavement can be complicated in nontraditional relationships for a variety of reasons that include aspects of the social and psychological grief environment. As discussed briefly in the introduction, Doka (1989) and Kauffman (1989) identify two major foci for conceptualizing disenfranchised grief. Doka describes one foci as the social context in which grief and bereavement occur, and which is determined by socially constructed "grieving rules" created by cultural norms. Kauffman identifies the second major foci as the "intrapsychic dimension," which concerns aspects of disenfranchised grief that may not necessarily be societal, but arise from within the self. Both of these dimensions will be further conceptualized and elaborated upon in the following sections.

Previous research has used the concept of disenfranchised grief to explore the grief of AIDS survivors (Rosen 1989), the bereavement of mentally handicapped individuals (Lavin, 1989), the grief experienced during romantic adolescent break-ups (Kaczmarek, 1991), and the experience of incest victims upon the death of the perpetrator (Dyer and Miller, 1996). Other topics have included the disenfranchised grief experienced within socially restricted or regulated environments (Rowling, 1995), and the "hidden grief" of close friends as survivors (Sklar and Hartley, 1990).

The Social-Ritual Dimension

It has been well established that the grieving process often begins before actual loss occurs (Leming and Dickinson, 1994) and has been termed "anticipatory grief." Rando (1988) noted that the amount, degree and type of involvement the bereaved has with the decedent prior to their death influences the tasks the bereaved will face following the loss. According to Doka (1987), research among the relatives of the
dying has shown that involvement in the care of the dying eases the acceptance of death for loved-ones. He also notes that such care of the dying person "can facilitate later grief adjustment [for] survivors" (P. 14).

Disenfranchised grievers are often excluded from an active role in the care of the dying (Doka, 1987; 1989). Additionally, they may be left out of the information "loop" pertaining to the loved-one's deteriorating condition, and as a consequence, may not expect the death when it occurs. Doka (1984; 1987; 1989) also notes that disenfranchised grievers were often reluctant to visit hospitals or sick beds for fear of initiating an embarrassing encounter with family members. For such individuals, exclusion from the dying process may make the reality of the loss harder to accept when it finally occurs.

Once a loved-one dies, those individuals socially recognized as "legitimate" grievers rely upon traditional sources of solace including formal grief rituals and religion. As Dwyer and Miller (1996) note, socially sanctioned losses and transitions surrounding the death of a loved-one are normally accompanied by rituals such as funerals and religious services. The importance of such rituals within the bereavement process can not be understated. As Kollar (1989) suggests, "Rituals are socially approved and transmitted patterns of living that manifest and affect our deepest concerns" (P. 273). Additionally, Zupanick (1994) points out that death rituals validate a person's loss while permitting the affirmation of the person's grief by his or her community.

Funeral rites (including the ability to assist in funeral planning) allow the bereaved to pass through the period of adjustment with a defined social role (Pine, 1989). Doka (1989) cites several studies in which the planning of the funeral as well as participation in it eased immediate adjustment to a death, and had significant therapeutic potential.
for resolving grief. Similarly, the traditional support and solace religious institutions provide for many individuals help facilitate the grieving process in culturally acceptable ways.

For the disenfranchised griever, however, there is an absence of such rituals (Kollar, 1989), and as such, these traditional and formal sources of solace may actually complicate rather than facilitate their grief work (Doka, 1987). When grievers feel unwanted in such social settings, they are denied the emotional benefit to such participation, while at the same time, they are left without validation for their loss, and with no culturally acceptable conduit for expressing grief. As Kollar suggests, "It is as if a sign were posted: Don't cry here" (P. 276).

Doka (1989) also reports that many disenfranchised grievers have a strong sense of alienation from religious sources of solace. Additionally, Murphy (1988) notes that the amount of support and help a person receives from his or her religious community certainly has been shown to enhance grief resolution for socially recognized grievers. For disenfranchised grievers, however, traditional religious sources of support may be yet another area from which they are excluded.

The Social-Support Dimension

An equally important dimension of disenfranchised grief concerns a lack of social support for the bereaved, which in turn, relates strongly to the exclusion and alienation described in the social-ritual discussion. For our purposes, the term "social support" will describe the comfort, assistance and information one receives through both formal and informal contacts with individuals or groups (Wallston, Alagna, DeVellis, and DeVellis, 1983). Additionally, an individual's support network will be defined as a set of personal contacts through which the individual maintains his or her social identity.
and receives emotional support, material aid and services, information, and new social 
contacts (Walker, MacBride, and Vachon, 1977). Finally Walker et al. (1977) also 
offer a usable conceptualization of emotional support by describing it as "behavior 
which assures an individual that his personal feelings are understood by others and 
considered normal in his situation" (P. 36). Using this definitional framework helps us 
to specify how deficits in social support affect the nature and severity of 
disenfranchised grief when such grief is under-recognized or not recognized at all, 
when the bereaved individual is offered or afforded no role in the bereavement 
process, or when there is no transitional role for the disenfranchised griever to assume.

When grief is unrecognized or is not publicly acknowledged, the process of 
adjustment for the bereaved becomes complicated (Doka, 1987). Likewise, when 
others fail to recognize grief, (or recognize it as deviant) the griever cannot receive the 
support and comfort from friends upon which socially recognized grievers depend 
(Thornton, Robertson and Mlecko, 1991). Such recognition is important within the 
bereavement process because, when grief is socially recognized, the bereaved parties 
are afforded a wide range of emotional expression. In American society (as in most 
societies) the role of "griever" has a certain status that is recognized by the larger 
community, and which carries certain social rights. Often, socially recognized grievers 
are given "permission" to openly express their emotions and pain. Additionally, they 
may be given time off from work, or excused from certain social responsibilities 
(Doka, 1987). Disenfranchised grievers, on the other hand, are not afforded a 
transitional role in which to express their grief and receive the support and sympathy 
of others (Thornton, Robertson, and Mlecko, 1991).

Several studies (Maddison and Walker, 1967; Raphael and Middleton, 1987; and 
Vachon and Stylaianos, 1988) have shown that inadequate social support or a deficient
social network is empirically associated with high distress during the course of bereavement as well as with poor bereavement resolution. According to Knisely and Northouse (1994), subjective appraisal of one's social support network has been shown to be the strongest predictor of depression index scores. Additionally, these same authors found that degrees of psychological distress, regardless of their intensity, did not provoke an increase in efforts to obtain support from one's social network. This suggests that those with significant psychological preconditions or post-death psychological symptoms may be at a particular risk for complicated bereavement when they lack a social support network.

Jacobs (1993) suggests that coping effectively with a loss depends in part on the social resources available and nonsupportiveness has been linked to poor outcome of bereavement. Jacobs notes that the Vachon et al. (1982) study confirmed the observation that a perceived deficit in social support was associated with persistent psychological distress two years after bereavement.

While social-supportive disenfranchisement is easily conceptualized, researchers (Jacobs, 1993; Grant et al, 1998; O'Conner and Brow, 1984) have noted the difficulty in accurately measuring social supportiveness. They raise the issue of whether a subject's perceived nonsupportiveness arises more from personality factors or from real deficiencies in social resources. These concerns suggest that new research should address both objective and subjective components of social supportiveness since, as Jacobs (1993) reported, "the evidence on the role of perception of deficits in the social environment in shaping the bereaved individual's adaptation to a loss is mixed" (P. 105).
The Emotional And Intrapsychic Dimension

Kauffman (1989) has articulated the intrapsychic and emotional characteristics associated with disenfranchised grief. He notes that wherever social disenfranchisement exists, there are corresponding phenomena taking place on the intrapsychic level. However, Kauffman also suggests that an individual may disenfranchise or collaborate in his/her own disenfranchisement. In such cases, the source of the disenfranchisement may not necessarily be societal, but as Kauffman (1989) notes, "may arise from within the self" (P. 25).

Shame and guilt are two especially persistent manifestations of disenfranchised grief. Kauffman (1989) found that shame is a major source of intrapsychic disenfranchisement, and that shame can arise as a specific form of self-disenfranchisement. As he further elaborates, "The most common example of this intrapsychic dimension of disenfranchised grief is for one to feel shame in the face of normal guilt," and that "...shame [may] conceal one's sense of utter helplessness in the face of the death of another. Helplessness and powerlessness are closely linked to feeling ashamed, inferior, and inadequate" (P. 27).

Both Kauffman (1989) and Doka (1989) found that the general nature of the relationship may often contribute to feelings of guilt. The griever may feel the relationship itself was a factor in the death (Doka, 1989), or, as Sklar and Hartley (1990) noted, the bereaved may experience significant guilt over things left unsaid or not done. Schuchter and Zisook (1987) found that bereavement guilt frequently occurs in the form of survival guilt, or in a sense of responsibility for the death or suffering of the decedent. In addition, Weinberg (1995) investigated the relationship between distressing events, attributions of self-blame, and psychological recovery in a random sample of 1350 nonacademic employees and employed graduate students at a
major midwestern university. Of the 244 subjects who reported the death of a loved-one as "the most distressing event they had experienced," twenty percent felt that their behavior contributed to the death. Weinberg also found that self-blame in these subjects was linked to evidence of poor long-term adjustment.

A final consideration regarding the intrapsychic and emotional dimension of disenfranchised grief is the reasonable assumption that certain personality traits are likely to predate any grief experience, and as such, measurements pertaining to this dimension present a considerable challenge to researchers who wish to eliminate any preexisting or moderating variables from a given study. Unfortunately few studies, including this one, are able to establish baseline personality and emotional characteristics of subjects prior to the occurrence of the event under study.

**Complicated Grief and Bereavement**

Kollar (1989) noted that grief is an emotional response to the loss of a significant other while bereavement is the role one is expected to play in response to the loss of a loved one, and that bereavement emphasizes what others expect us to do when we have lost someone we are expected to have loved. As such, Kollar viewed social expectations as central to bereavement. Sanders (1989) described bereavement as the psychological process of mourning over time until resolution. For our purposes, we will adopt a definition of bereavement that includes both of these social and psychological components.

Abnormal grief (also known as complicated, morbid, or pathological grief) refers to marked changes from the normal pattern of functioning when one is unable to resolve grief (Stroube and Stroube, 1987). As Prigerson et al. (1995) suggested: "Complicated grief is the failure to return to pre-loss levels of performance or states of emotional
well-being [and] for a considerable minority of bereaved persons, emotional and behavioral disturbances persist and prevent the return to normal functioning" (P. 23).

Doka (1987) believed that the process of normal grief resolution and bereavement can be disrupted by various factors, including the lack of social support, and appropriate mourning. He noted that many special difficulties (discussed earlier in this review) complicate bereavement for disenfranchised grievers. As Doka says: "It is harder to accept the reality of loss if one is excluded from the dying process, restricted from the funeral rituals, inhibited from acknowledging the loss, or even receives delayed knowledge of the death" (P. 465).

Complicated grief has been linked to maladjustment and psychiatric problems (Stroube and Stroube, 1987). These same authors go on to include three major reactions to grief associated with complicated grief including grief that is chronically prolonged, "chronic grief," grief that occurs after an extensive delay, "delayed grief," and the absence of appropriate grief expression, "inhibited grief." Stroube and Stroube (1987) found these pathological reactions to manifest themselves in specific psychological symptoms, including anxiety, tension, restlessness, insomnia, self-reproachful ideas, and angry outbursts, as well as a variety of somatic symptoms and deteriorating physical health.

Other studies (Horowitz, et al, 1981; Kauffinan, 1989; Scharlach and Fuller-Thompson, 1994; and Sklar and Hartley, 1990) have reported a wide range of reactions associated with unresolved or complicated grief. Subjects in these studies of complicated or disenfranchised grief reported strong feelings of guilt, shame, anger, embarrassment, sadness, depression, hopelessness, numbness, and isolation. Recently, Prigerson et al. (1998) published a list of criteria for determining the presence of
traumatic grief which include feelings of futility, emptiness, excessive irritability, and anger related to a death experience among the symptoms already listed above.

Many factors associated with the nature of the grief experience have been used to try and understand the bereaved individual's response to the death of a loved-one. In summarizing the literature on various approaches used in characterizing the death experience, Jacobs (1993) included factors such as whether the death was timely or untimely, sudden or anticipated, traumatic or nontraumatic.

While there is a plethora of information about complicated grief available from several disciplines, all seem to indicate that its occurrence is best identified in terms of its severity and not necessarily its symptomology. Even though uncomplicated grief and bereavement may be an intense emotional experience, the social-situational constraints involved in the disenfranchised griever's experience can make grief chronic (Doka, 1987).

**The Male Normative Model of Bereavement and Coping**

A study pertaining to the grief and bereavement of male prisoners should include consideration for typical gender-specific patterns of addressing and experiencing grief and bereavement. We recognize the work of Moss, Rubinstein, and Moss (1997) in contributing to the literature in this area. They note that most literature on bereavement as well as the popular conceptions of grief and grief work stress the need for social support during times of loss, and the value of talking about the experience and sharing feelings. To that end, Moss, Rubinstein, and Moss (1997) suggest that the normative model of bereavement is feminized, and does not adequately account for men's experiences. Furthermore, they found that men display resistance to feelings,
while their need for mastery (which is socially and culturally constructed) causes them to minimize their expression of grief after suffering a loss.

In their research, which examined male respondent grief and coping upon their father's death, Moss, Rubinstein, and Moss (1997) found that respondents used multiple strategies to control expression of feelings, which in turn helped support their socially and culturally constructed sense of self. The authors noted that their subjects expressed their emotions intrapsychically, and their coping efforts were directed towards their fears of losing control, being at the mercy of strong and overpowering emotions, and succumbing to emotional weakness. Furthermore, Moss, Rubinstein, and Moss (1997) found that the male respondents preferred active, problem-solving and tension-reducing ways of coping more than emotionally oriented outlets. Finally, these authors note that men use a variety of coping strategies to reduce the effects of feelings that include masking, diverting, using metaphors, and employing cut-offs in interactional settings. They referred to these as examples of "control through modeling." As Moss, Rubinstein, and Moss (1997) explain: "...when publicly modeling their control of feelings, men are protecting others and themselves from facing the potential power of emotions" (Pp. 267-8).

In addition, both Moss, Rubinstein, and Moss (1997) and Glaser and Straus (1965) believe that acceptable coping strategies are structured around normative models of interaction, and this notion can be readily applied to a grieving individual's sociocultural environment. Jacobs (1993) takes a similar position, suggesting that understanding and describing various processes of adaptation and coping must specify not only the tasks at hand, but also the environmental resources available to the bereaved individual.
The concept of "surface acting" (Goffman, 1959) adds yet another interesting dynamic to male emotional expression, because in surface acting, according to Hochschild (1983), "we deceive others about what we really feel, but we do not deceive ourselves" (P. 33). This suggests that, while various coping strategies may be organized and chosen in order to maintain successful interactions within a given normative environment, such strategies won't necessarily resolve internalized grief. Hochschild (1983) also describes a concept he calls "feeling rules," in which certain rules give social pattern to our acts of emotional management. Most important to our discussion, Hochschild suggests that feeling rules address problems of placing, because being in the right place to grieve involves being in the presence of an audience ready to receive one's expressions. Hochschild further notes that "males especially may have to wait for ceremonial permission to feel and express....[and] in this sense, men may need ceremonies more than women..." (P. 68).

**Theoretical Applicability to Inmate Population**

A number of recent studies use the disenfranchised grief perspective to examine different varieties of loss. Some look at loss other than death (Zupanick, 1994; Dwyer and Miller, 1996; Robak and Weitzman, 1995), while others explore disenfranchised grief over death in different social and institutional environments (Rowling, 1995; Murphy and Perry, 1988; Sklar and Hartley, 1990; Hocker, 1989; and Doka 1989). Using these studies and many of the other research efforts discussed earlier, we synthesized many of their findings and observations in order to tentatively apply them to the cultural and institutional environment of the prison inmate. Most of the research thus far has approached disenfranchised grief qualitatively and with small samples. In addition, no comparative prevalence studies of disenfranchised grief in which to use as a baseline for the current study could be found. However, the findings of existing
studies can nonetheless be applied as sensitizing concepts for the current quantitative study which examines the cultural and institutional environment of the grieving prison inmate.

Murphy and Perry (1988) studied the disenfranchised grief of homosexual lovers following the death of their partner from AIDS. Their findings parallel many of the problems one expects to discover in prisoners. For example, these authors found that many male homosexuals grieving over the loss of their lover had already experienced, to various degrees, the withdrawal of parents, relatives, and friends because of their sexual orientation, making the current loss that much more difficult because such individuals did not recognize the legitimacy of their grief. Likewise, the decedent's family may have excluded the grieving lover in any number of ways from both formal and informal grief rituals. Murphy and Perry (1988) note that the family of the decedent often take all his belongings, and that the bereaved lover "is left with only memories...[and] express profound sadness at their inability to perform the rites of holding onto and letting go of their loved one's clothes, books, photographs, and personal belongings" (P. 460). Because the family of the decedent often didn't recognize or acknowledge (and therefore, socially sanction) the relationship their son had with the bereaved lover, he was often excluded from funeral preparations, funeral services, and religious services as well.

The findings in this study are expected to show that many of these same issues are important to the grief experience of prisoners. Although prisoners often maintain various connections and levels of contact with free society in general (Thomas, 1977) and with their family and friends in particular, we expect to find that many prisoners may already be estranged from their families by nature of their criminal act and subsequent incarceration prior to the loss of the loved one. Their situation may be an
embarrassment to their families, and because of this, they may be consciously or unconsciously left out of, or restricted in, information about the dying family member, funeral arrangements, and, by extension, participation in the funeral ritual to the extent that they are able to under prison regulations. Prisoners may have no opportunity to either receive emotional support from or provide support to other family members upon the death of a loved one. They may not have a chance to receive or keep mementos or pictures of the decedent. Finally, other family members may harbor sentiments that the prisoner's crime and subsequent incarceration were factors in the illness and death of the decedent, influencing their pre-death and post-death behavior towards the bereaved prisoner.

While several studies and articles have outlined the importance of the funeral ritual in grief adjustment (Doka, 1984; Sklar and Hartley, 1990; Hocker, 1989; Kollar, 1989; and Walker, MacBride and Vachon, 1977), prisoners are not afforded many of the functional attributes that funerals provide. For example, in the Kentucky prison system where this study was undertaken, while prisoners who suffer the loss of an immediate family member may go to see the body of the decedent and possibly meet with family members for a short period of time, such visitations are never permitted during actual funeral services, and inmates with medium custody levels or higher must be both handcuffed and transported in leg irons, and remain in that state during the entire trip to, during, and from the funeral visit. It is our contention that such organizational and structural conditions, necessary as they may be, may taint the functional nature of the funeral ritual for inmates who choose to attend. Furthermore, there may be an interrelational component to such conditions in regard to the inmate's family. The inmate's presence during the actual funeral may present unnecessarily overwhelming emotional pain during an already difficult time. We further believe that an inmate's
decision not to attend a funeral visit may reflect a prisoner's self-disenfranchisement, in
that he may wish to refrain from adding to the family's heartache by showing-up in
shackles, or further burdening them with the reality of his circumstances during an
already stressful time.

In another sense, the formal and procedural rules and regulations of the prison may
set limits upon the emotionally expressive possibilities for all involved. Hochschild
(1983) suggests that institutions (like prisons) manage emotions through specific
institutional mechanisms that control both the nature of the emotional expression as
well as the setting in which it occurs. Goffinan (1961) also is helpful in understanding
socialization in this particular environment. He used the concept of "personal economy
of action" to indicate how minute segments of an inmate's line of activity may be
subjected to regulations and judgments by staff which rob the individual of an
opportunity to balance his needs and objectives in a personally efficient way. In
addition, Goffinan noted that the routinized functioning and security of the prison
depends upon stringent emotional and interpersonal restrictions between prisoners and
staff. For these reasons, we intend to explore the institutional and regulatory
environment as it impacts upon the grief and bereavement experience for inmates.

It is well documented (Sykes and Messinger, 1961; Barak, 1983; Thomas, 1977;
Clemmer, 1940; and Goffinan, 1961) that prison inmates exist in both a highly
structured institutional environment as well as within a prison subculture. Thomas
(1977) suggested that members of the formal organization (the prison) provide
inmates with rules and schedules which prescribe the place, time, and manner in which
they may engage in even the most mundane behavior. However, he also suggested
that the prison subculture provides inmates with specific norms and values that in turn
provide them with some measure of control and autonomy within, and often in spite
of, institutional constraints. While somewhat mitigated by the current demographic and situational realities in today's prisons (Barak, 1983), Clemmer's (1940) concept of "the inmate code" remains useful in describing the inmate normative environment as being a relatively organized normative system of folkways, mores, customs, and values.

While this normative environment is expected to vary from prison to prison, it will nonetheless be one of the important dimensions to the prison grief experience. As Pine (1989) notes, "each culture faces death with its own definition of appropriate social-emotional reactions...it provides the occasion for socially conditioned grief reactions and mourning practices" (P. 19). Furthermore, Raphael and Middleton (1987), in paraphrasing Osterweiss, Solomon and Green (1984), noted the importance of cultural prescriptions upon the bereavement response as well as its outcome. For these reasons, we speculate that the prison sub-culture may exert significant control over an inmate's emotional expressiveness when faced with the death of a loved-one. Both the grieving inmate and his non-grieving cohorts may exhibit "control through modeling" (Moss, Rubinstein, and Moss, 1997) as a way to protect themselves from facing the potential disruptive power of emotions that may subvert prison cultural values and norms of toughness, masculinity, and aversion towards behaviors perceived as weak, effeminate, or otherwise unmanly. As such, a prisoner's grief may become disenfranchised within his immediate social environment, and by those individuals who otherwise make-up his internal social support network.

Doka (1987) and Thornton, Robertson, and Mlecko (1991) have discussed the importance of grief recognition by others as well as their role in sanctioning specific social and emotional transformations during bereavement. Shuchter and Zisook (1987) explain that during a person's bereavement experience friends can offer practical help
and emotional support by sharing the pain and allowing it's free expression. As such, the prison sub-culture may, in appropriating specific norms regarding emotional expression in general, grossly constrain a grieving prisoner's ability or inclination to share feelings associated with a loved one’s passing with other inmates. By declining to share such feelings, the inmate may play a crucial role in his own disenfranchisement.

The normative prison environment, as well as common characteristics of male prisoners themselves, are likely to contribute to intrapsychic disenfranchisement in the grieving inmate. Sappingon (1996) noted that tendencies to blame others, to dwell on problems, or to blame oneself were associated with poor cognitive coping strategies in prisoners. Furthermore, Faine (1973) found that the most important characteristic of inmates is their high vulnerability to the evaluations of others in their group. As such, Faine noted the significance of how prison interaction can, in turn, influence the self-attitudes of individual prisoners. For grieving inmates, evidence of intrapsychic disenfranchisement may be strongly correlated with the degree to which a prisoner can or is willing to identify with, and participate in, the prescriptions embedded in the inmate code.

Another interesting aspect to grief within specific institutional and cultural settings was explored by Rowling (1995). She found that teachers, upon facing the death of a student, experienced role conflict between their professional role of “teacher” that ties them to certain behaviors and attributes of professionalism, leadership, and control, versus their personal needs as griever. Rowling noted that the teachers in her study felt that emotionally expressive behavior within the school setting would convey messages to the students that would weaken the teacher's professional standing.
A similar duality may in fact exist for prisoners faced with the need to express their grief over the loss of a loved one. They may wish or even need to express their grief in ways that match mainstream culture, particularly if they’ve experienced a loss of a loved-one prior to incarceration, and are acclimated to relying upon both the formal and informal rituals and supportive interactions that “outside” cultures utilize. Within the prison environment however, their role as “inmate” may constrain or even prohibit many familiar emotional expressions that normally accompany grief in non-prison settings.

Another form of self-disenfranchisement in teachers noted by Rowling (1995) was a perception that their competence to deal with adolescent students was closely related to their self-perceived competence in dealing with their own emotions. Similar perceptions may be found in prison inmates, since they may internalize and equate notions of competence and restraint with their ability to maintain their achieved status as respected inmates within the prison normative environment.

Research Questions and Hypotheses

The disenfranchised grief perspective offers a particularly useful framework for examining the subjective grief experience of prison inmates, and whether disenfranchised grief in prisoners is empirically associated with complicated grief and psychological distress.

Descriptively, the research will assess the extent of disenfranchised grief among a prison population while considering the following questions: (1) Do institutional and organizational practices and constraints as well as the normative inmate subculture promote a disenfranchised grief environment for prisoners? (2) To what extent do inmate grievers perceive their grief as being recognized and supported by both external
and internal social contacts? (3) To what extent do mourning prisoners exhibit intrapsychic symptoms of disenfranchisement, like guilt or shame over the loss they've suffered?

The analytical portion of the study will examine: (1) Which dimensions of disenfranchised grief, if any, are associated with established notions of complicated or unresolved grief and psychological distress; and (2) whether grieving inmates, as a group, exhibit higher levels of psychological distress than non-grieving inmates. Specifically, the research will test the following three hypotheses:

Hypothesis 1. Disenfranchised grief is positively associated with complicated grief.

Hypothesis 2. Disenfranchised grief is positively associated with psychological distress.

Hypothesis 3. Grief subjects exhibit higher levels of psychological distress than non-grief subjects.
A survey design method was used to collect data from a non-probability sample of male prison inmates. The sample was composed of two specific groups: the grief group, whose subjects reported experiencing the death of a loved-one within three years of the study while incarcerated; and the non-grief group, who reported no such loss while incarcerated during the same time period.

Two questionnaires (one for each group) were designed to collect data. General demographic and background information was collected in order to assess the generalizability of each group to the known prison population, as well as to examine the level of between-group homogeneity. Data from both groups pertaining to non-grief related external and internal social support and interactions were gathered for comparative purposes, as were data from some grief-related items that did not involve a specific grief experience. In addition, both questionnaires included the Brief Symptom Inventory (BSI) (Derogatis, 1993) which is a self-report psychological symptom inventory offering a global index of distress (GSI) and distress levels on nine specific symptom dimensions. Grief respondents were asked an additional series of questions concerning their grief experience in order to construct composite measures of disenfranchised grief and complicated grief.

After the study's variables are described in the following section, a plan of analysis is presented, followed by a description of sampling procedures and sample characteristics.
Variables

Since a quantitative grief and bereavement study on prison inmates had not been done prior to this research, indexes measuring the various dimensions of disenfranchised grief applicable to the unique grief environment of prisoners were not available. A similar problem was encountered with regard to the currently available established measures of complicated or difficult grief and bereavement, since the wording of some of the items contained in such measures were not reliably applicable to the inmate grief experience.

In order to address this deficiency, measures were constructed to sensitize the concepts of disenfranchised grief and complicated grief to the prison population under study. After data collection, the construct validity of each index, with the exception of the DG-SR index (see discussion of this index for further explanation) was assessed using principle axis confirmatory factor analysis to determine if the items in each index formed distinct (with eigenvalues of .90 or greater) clusters of phenomena or symptoms corresponding to the theoretical and conceptual notions initially used to construct each index. Items with factor loadings significantly lower than the scale's average coefficient after varimax rotation were dropped unless a strong theoretical justification for their continued inclusion could be given.

Disenfranchised grief was measured using a composite index consisting of four specific dimensional indexes, each designed to provide an intensity measure of a grief subject's social-ritual, external social-supportive, internal social-supportive, and intrapsychic disenfranchised grief. All dimension indexes in this section are equally weighted additive indexes, with higher index scores indicative of higher disenfranchisement. For each of the dimensional indexes described below (indexes 2
through 5), items were summed, divided by the index's highest possible score, and the result multiplied by 100 to yield a possible final score between 0 and 100. Cases with more than one missing item on a given index were excluded from analyses involving that particular index. If only one item was missing, an index item score halfway between 0 and the highest possible item score was given for the missing item during index calculation.

1) **Total Disenfranchised Grief Index (DG-TOT):** Index scores on the following four dimensional indexes were summed, and divided by four to provide a composite measure of overall disenfranchised grief. The mean score was 49.9, while actual scores ranged between 18 and 77.

2) **Social-Ritual Disenfranchised Grief Index (DG-SR):** A seven item index measuring respondent participation in, or disenfranchisement from, ritualized or commonly utilized practices that normally occur immediately before or after a loss, including anticipatory grieving, funeral and religious service participation, and the receipt of condolence cards and momentos of the decedent from other family members. Actual scores ranged from 14 to 100, with a mean score of 57. A Chronbach's alpha reliability coefficient was not computed for this index.1 (see Appendix B for complete index description and scoring procedures)

---

1Although the items used in the DG-SR index share a strong theoretical connection, each concerns a line of activity or a situational construct independent of one another. For example, while the possibility of not receiving letters of condolence and an inability to attend a funeral visitation because of institutional or security regulations are both valid sources of social-ritual disenfranchisement, neither are meaningfully related to the other in terms of statistical correlation. As such, a Chronbach's alpha coefficient was not a sufficient measure of the index's validity. However, the wide range of actual scores suggest significant sensitivity to the variety of subjective grief experiences of the sample under study.
3) **External Social-Supportive Disenfranchised Grief Index (DG-ES):** A 17 item index that measures the quality and quantity of the respondent's external (outside the prison) relationships and contacts following the death of their loved-one. Actual scores ranged from 0 to 94, with a mean score of 44.9. The alpha reliability coefficient for the index was .82. (see Appendix C for description of index items and scoring procedures)

4) **Internal Social-Supportive Disenfranchised Grief Index (DG-IS):** The 17 items in this index measures the quality of the respondent's relationships and interactions with other inmates, prison staff, and religious staff. Included items also measure the respondent's affective experiences and personal perceptions regarding the prison normative social-supportive environment. Actual scores ranged from 2 to 88, with a mean score of 54.0. The alpha reliability coefficient for the index was .79. (see Appendix D for a complete description of index items and scoring procedures)

5) **Intrapsychic Disenfranchised Grief Index (DG-IP):** An 8 item index containing subjective appraisal or affective experience measures dealing with feelings about the loss suffered, as well as grief related guilt and shame. Some of the items in this index were drawn from the BSI (Derogatis 1993), and the Texas Revised Inventory of Grief (Faschingbauer, DeVaul, and Zisook 1978). Actual scores ranged from 0 to 95, with a mean score of 42.0. The alpha reliability coefficient for the index was .74. (see Appendix E for a complete description of index items and scoring procedures)

In addition to the disenfranchised grief indexes described above, a complicated grief measure was constructed for use with prison inmates, while the Brief Symptom Inventory (BSI) was used to measure psychological distress in both grief and non-grief subjects.
6) **Complicated Grief Index for Prisoners (CGIP):** An 18 item index structurally developed using applicable criteria for traumatic/complicated grief as outlined in Prigerson et al's (1998) work in this area. Items from the BSI (Derogatis, 1993) and the Texas Revised Inventory of Grief (Faschingbauer, DeVaul, and Zisook, 1978) were included based on their item content and applicability to the criteria used to develop the index. The index was designed to provide a global estimate of the intensity of complicated grief while producing a wide range of scores, with higher scores indicating the presence of maladjustment or difficulties within the respondent's grief experience. Scores on each item were added together and divided by the highest possible score, with the resulting figure multiplied by 100 to yield a total score between 7 and 100 (seven items in the index had a minimum available value of 1). Actual scores ranged from 9 to 94, with a mean score of 46.1. The alpha reliability coefficient was a very high .87. (see Appendix F for a complete description of index items and scoring procedures)

7) **The Brief Symptom Inventory (BSI):** Developed by Derogatis and Spencer (1982), the BSI is a widely used self-report measure of psychological distress in research studies and in clinical practice. The 53-item inventory produces a global severity score (referred to as the GSI), and nine symptom sub-scale scores: Somatization (SOM), Obsessive-Compulsive (O-C), Interpersonal Sensitivity (I-S), Depression, (DEP), Anxiety (ANX), Hostility (HOS), Phobic Anxiety (PHOB), Paranoid Ideation (PAR), and Psychoticism (PSY). For those analyses which examine the relationship between disenfranchised grief and psychological distress, the Interpersonal Sensitivity
(I-S) sub-scale was excluded and the GSI index modified to reflect this exclusion due to a shared item conflict with a disenfranchised grief index.

The sub-index alpha reliability coefficients for the combined current sample ranged from a low of .64 on the Psychoticism sub-scale to a high of .88 on the Somatization sub-scale. Several validation studies have been conducted with the BSI (Derogatis and Spencer, 1982), establishing the construct validity for this inventory with other populations.

**Plan of Analysis**

The analysis will first examine univariate statistics that describe and characterize the general inmate grief experience with regard to who died, and how notification of the death occurred. These figures are included in the sample characteristics table and discussion in this chapter. Next, a descriptive analysis assessing total disenfranchised grief and each of its dimensional indexes will be presented in chapter four in order to determine if inmate grievers exhibited evidence of disenfranchised grief.

Also in chapter four, hypothesis number one (see page 22) will be tested using correlational analyses between disenfranchised grief index findings and complicated grief index findings. Correlational analysis will also be used to test the second hypothesis which considers the relationship between disenfranchised grief and psychological distress as measured by the disenfranchised grief indexes and the Global Severity Index and symptom subscales of the BSI. Finally, hypothesis three will be examined using between-group t-tests to determine whether inmate grievers exhibit higher levels of psychological distress than their non-grieving cohorts.
Sample

In early December of 1998, letters requesting volunteers for the study were mailed to every inmate (N = 1670) housed at a Correctional Complex in rural Kentucky. The prison is a medium security institution housing inmates convicted of all classes of offenses, and who are serving sentences ranging from several months to life without parole. The recruitment letters briefly outlined the purpose of the study, the voluntary nature of the participation being requested, and the researcher's interest in recruiting both grieving and non-grieving inmates. Each letter asked the inmate to indicate whether a loved-one had died while he was incarcerated within a time period of three years. Of the 1670 letters mailed, a total of 353 responses indicating a desire to participate in the study were returned to researchers, with 225 self-reporting as having suffered the death of a loved-one.

Shortly after receiving these replies, survey packets were mailed to all volunteer participants. Each packet contained the appropriate questionnaire based on whether the respondent reported himself as a griever or non-griever, complete instructions, a consent form, return envelopes, and a pen to use to complete the forms. Of the 225 survey packets mailed to potential grief group respondents, 171 were returned. Of these, 14 were invalid, mainly due to the respondent having chosen to participate in the wrong group. Within the remaining 157 grief questionnaires, eight were found to have a missing page due to a collation process error, and while still included in the study, missing index items from this page for two of the six indexes used in the study invalidated these cases for those particular index-related analyses.
Of the 128 survey packets mailed to potential non-grief group respondents, 113 questionnaires were returned, with seven of these found to be invalid. Non-grief participants answered all questions except for an occasional missed item.

Socio-Demographic Characteristics of Sample

As shown in Table 3.1, the average age of the combined sample was 33 years, with a range of 18 to 67 years of age. Sixty-nine percent of respondents were Caucasian.

Table 3.1

SOCIODEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF SAMPLE
(in percent unless otherwise indicated)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(Percent)</th>
<th>(Years)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Age of Sample</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Caucasian</td>
<td>69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent African American</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MARITAL STATUS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>(Percent)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single, Never Married</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced or Separated</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EDUCATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education</th>
<th>(Percent)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than High School Education</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed High School (or) G.E.D.</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At Least Some College (or) Degree</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SENTENCE/OFFENSE CHARACTERISTICS * **

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offense Type</th>
<th>(Percent)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Median Sentence Length**</td>
<td>11.8 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Portion of Sentence Served</td>
<td>5.5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violent Offense(s)</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Offense(s)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Offense(s)</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug or Alcohol Related Offense(s)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Percentages derived from each inmate’s most serious criminal offense resulting in their current incarceration.

** Life sentences were given a value of 25 years for this calculation.
while 28% were African American. Forty-nine percent reported being single and never married, 9% were married, 39% divorced or separated, and 3 percent were widowed at the time of the study. Twenty-nine percent had less than a high school education, 38% had completed high school or had earned a GED, and 23% reported having at least some college.

The median sentence length was 11.8 years (life sentences were given a value of 25 years in this calculation) while the average portion of the sentence served was 5.5 years. Fifty-five percent of the sample were serving a sentence for a violent offense, 10% for sexual abuse or assault, 20% for property crimes, and 10% for drug or alcohol related offenses.

Between-group comparisons on the above demographic and background variables showed few statistically significant differences between griever and non-griever groups overall. However, the mean age of the grief group was slightly older than for the non-grief group (33.8 versus 31.9), and the percent of sentence served was slightly larger for the grief sample as compared to non-grievers (37.9 versus 30.6). This difference is readily explained when one considers that older inmates are more likely to have older parents and grandparents than younger inmates. Additionally, the longer one is incarcerated, the higher the probability that he will experience the death of a loved-one while imprisoned.

In addition to between-group comparisons, combined group percentages for several variables were compared against known population parameters supplied by prison officials at the time of the study in order to draw appropriate conclusions about the overall representativeness of the two samples to the prison population under study.
Table 3.2
PERCENTAGES OF RACE, CRIME CATEGORIES, AND AGE IN SAMPLE COMPARED TO KNOWN POPULATION DATA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Percent of Sample (n = 263)</th>
<th>Known Pop. (n = 1670)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>69.2</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violent Crime*</td>
<td>55.3</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Assault*</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Crime*</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Age</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*percentages derived from each inmate's most serious criminal offense resulting in their current incarceration.

As Table 3.2 shows, our sample is moderately overrepresentative of Caucasian inmates while African Americans are somewhat underrepresented. Overall, and despite the moderate age and racial differences discussed above, between-group sociodemographic homogeneity as well as sample-to-population homogeneity was high. Additionally, the large number of respondents (n = 263) which comprised 16% of the entire population under study, allows cautious generalization of the findings to this population despite the use of non-probability sampling.

Grief Group Subsample: Dimensions Of The Grief Experience

As shown in Table 3.3, twenty-two percent of grief respondents reported the loss of a biological parent, while 3.8% reported losing a step-parent. Fourteen percent of respondents were grieving the death of a sibling, 27% a grandparent, 5.7% an
Table 3.3
DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS OF GRIEF EXPERIENCE (as reported by respondent)
(in percent unless otherwise indicated)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RELATIONSHIP OF DECEDENT TO SUBJECT</th>
<th>(Percent)</th>
<th>(Years/Months)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Biological Parent</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step-parent</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sibling</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grandparent</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aunt or Uncle</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close Personal Friend</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NATURE OF DECEDENT'S ILLNESS AND DEATH</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean Age of Decedent:</td>
<td></td>
<td>54.6 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Died of Lengthy or Terminal Illness</td>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Died of Sudden Illness</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Died of Old Age</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Died of Accident or Crime</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Died of Suicide</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decedent Ill Prior to Death</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Reported Illness length</td>
<td></td>
<td>17.5 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Death was Unexpected by Respondent</td>
<td>67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Death When it Occurred</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WHEN RESPONDENT'S LOSS OCCURRED</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Within 6 Months of Data Collection</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 7 and 18 Months</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 19 and 36 Months</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONDENT'S LOCATION WHEN LOSS OCCURRED</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prison Where Study was Conducted</td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elsewhere in the State Prison System</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City or County Jail</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Location Not Specified</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HOW RESPONDENT NOTIFIED OF DEATH</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>By Prison or Jail Chaplain</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By Prison or Jail Staff Member</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>While Talking on Phone With Relative</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By Letter from Relative</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>During Relative's Visit to Institution</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
offspring, 12.1% an aunt or uncle, 9.6% a close personal friend, and 5.0% as "other". Interestingly, only one (0.6%) respondent reported their loss as a spouse. The mean age of the person who died was 54.6. The youngest deceased loved-one was a newborn infant, while the oldest was a person of 96.

Forty-six percent of the grief group reported their loss as resulting from a lengthy or terminal illness, 27.6% from a sudden illness, 9.0% from old age, 12.2% from an accident or crime, and 5.1% from suicide. Fifty-seven percent indicated that the person who died was ill prior to their death, with a mean reported illness length of 17.5 months. Additionally, sixty-seven percent reported the death event as unexpected, while 33% expected the death when it occurred.

This study limited its grief respondent recruitment to those inmates having lost a loved-one within three years of the research announcement. Eighteen percent reported their loss as occurring within six months of data collection, 34% between 7 and 18 months, and 47.7% between 19 and 36 months.

Fifty-five percent of grief respondents experienced their loss while incarcerated at the prison where the study was conducted, while 24% were located elsewhere in the state prison system at the time their loved-one's death occurred. Seventeen percent were in a city or county jail when the loss was suffered.

Grieving prisoners in the study were informed of their loss through five specific means. Thirty-two percent were informed by a prison or jail chaplain, 11% by a prison staff member, 44% while talking to a relative on the phone, 8% through the receipt of a letter, and 5% by a family member or friend during a visit to the inmate at the institution.

The number of respondents who reported being informed of their loss over the phone was consistently high in all categories of decedents (21% for grandmothers to
82% for aunts and uncles. Although the corrections policy in the prison system under
study permits prison officials to notify an inmate of an immediate family member's loss,
it is likely that the decedent's deteriorating condition was often known to the inmate
before the death occurred, and learning of the death over the phone while calling for
the person's condition is probably responsible for the consistency of phone notification
even for immediate family deaths.

In addition to these statistics, seventy percent of grief respondents characterized
their relationship with the decedent as having been "closer than most" to "closer than
any other relationship they had." Twenty-three percent reported their relationship with
the decedent as "about as close as most of my relationships with others". The
remaining 7% characterized the relationship as "not as close as most" to "not very
close at all."
Chapter 4

Findings

Disenfranchised Grief Among Prison Inmates

A primary objective of the study was to examine the extent to which mourning inmates exhibited evidence of disenfranchised grief. The descriptive findings in this chapter will begin by examining its overall prevalence and intensity as measured by the Total Disenfranchised Grief Index (DG-TOT). Next, findings of the four dimensional indexes of disenfranchised grief used to calculate the DG-TOT index will be explored in order to further explicate those areas of disenfranchisement having the greatest impact upon the population under study.

Total Disenfranchised Grief

Distributive findings for the Total Disenfranchised Grief Index are presented in Table 4.1. This index was designed to provide a composite intensity measure of each grief respondent's overall social-ritual, social-supportive, and intrapsychic disenfranchisement related to his grief experience. Although providing a potential score between 0 and 100, actual scores ranged between 18 and 77. The index distribution was collapsed in order to more clearly identify the percentage of griever exhibiting high levels of total disenfranchised grief.

As Table 4.1 shows, 60% of all grief respondents exhibited a high to very high level of total disenfranchised grief. While the percentage distribution for white subjects achieving high to very high scores was larger than found for black subjects (62.9% versus 55.2%), t-test analysis between race and total disenfranchised grief did not yield
Table 4.1
PERCENT DISTRIBUTION OF SCORES ON THE TOTAL DISENFRANCHISED GRIEF INDEX (in quartiles from lowest to highest recorded score) FOR ALL GRIEF GROUP SUBJECTS AND t-TEST ANALYSIS BETWEEN INDEX SCORES AND RACE.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Index Scores</th>
<th>All Grief Subjects</th>
<th>Subset By Race</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>Blacks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Scores (18-32.7)</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate Scores (32.8-47.4)</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>29.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Scores (47.5-62.2)</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>44.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very High Scores (62.3-77.0)</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total %</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Score</td>
<td>49.93</td>
<td>47.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Score</td>
<td>50.42</td>
<td>49.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>12.08</td>
<td>11.51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(mean index scores by race)

\[
t-value = 1.588
\]
\[
DF = 128
\]
\[
p = 0.115
\]

a statistically significant finding.

While the finding that a majority of respondents exhibited significant overall disenfranchisement provides a general assessment of its intensity and prevalence, an examination of the specific dimensions of disenfranchised grief (as measured by the DG-SR, DG-ES, DG-IS, and DG-IP indexes) offers a more precise and detailed picture of this phenomenon in the population under study.

Social-Ritual Disenfranchised Grief

Social-ritual disenfranchised grief occurs when one is disenfranchised from ritualized or commonly utilized practices related to anticipatory grieving, or planning
and participation in funeral and religious services. The Social-Ritual Disenfranchised Grief Index distribution is presented in Table 4.2. While the index was designed to provide a score between 0 and 100, actual scores ranged between 14 and 100. The actual distribution was collapsed in order to more clearly identify the percentage of griever exhibiting levels of social-ritual disenfranchisement.

Table 4.2

PERCENT DISTRIBUTION OF SCORES ON THE SOCIAL-RITUAL DISENFRANCHISED GRIEF INDEX (in quartiles from lowest to highest recorded score) FOR ALL GRIEF GROUP SUBJECTS AND t-TEST ANALYSIS BETWEEN INDEX SCORES AND RACE.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Index Scores</th>
<th>All Grief Subjects</th>
<th>Subset By Race</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean Score</td>
<td>Median Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Scores (14.0 - 35.4)</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>26.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate Scores (35.5 - 56.9)</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Scores (57.0 - 78.4)</td>
<td>38.4</td>
<td>38.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very High Scores (78.5 - 100)</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total %</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Table 4.2, 61% of all grief subjects exhibited a high to very high level of social-ritual disenfranchised grief. While the percentage distribution for white subjects achieving high scores was larger than for black subjects (65.3% versus 57.1%), a t-test analysis did not yield a statistically significant finding ($t = 1.333; DF = 138; p = 0.185$).
Table 4.3 lists the items included in the Social-Ritual Disenfranchised Grief Index along with the percentage of grief respondents giving a disenfranchised grief response for each item.

Table 4.3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Index Items</th>
<th>Percent Giving Disenfranchised Grief Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) High religiosity, but didn't use prayer to cope with loss</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Didn't use Chapel/Religious services to cope with loss</td>
<td>78.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Didn't receive sympathy items (cards, letters of condolence, etc)</td>
<td>54.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Amount of sympathy items received were less than expected or none</td>
<td>62.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Didn't receive keepsakes/momentos of decedent after death</td>
<td>44.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Lack of involvement with the care of the decedent before death</td>
<td>81.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>made grief harder once death occurred</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) Didn't attend a death-bed or funeral home visit</td>
<td>69.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* (see Appendix B for item coding and index scoring criteria)

Anticipatory Grief Disenfranchisement.

The literature pertaining to anticipatory grief disenfranchisement suggests that there are various pre-death rituals and practices centered on the process of social disengagement between a dying individual and his/her loved-ones, and that unrecognized or underrecognized griever are often excluded from these important interactions.

This study measured two such items, although one was excluded from the DG-SR index because of a heavily skewed distribution. As shown in Table 4.3 (item 6), when grief subjects were asked whether their lack of involvement with the care of the
decedent before death made their grief harder, 75.8% mostly or fully agreed that it did. Additionally, 88% mostly or completely agreed with the statement "there were things I wish I could have said to this person before they died," while only 57% mostly or completely disagreed with this statement. A related finding was that nearly 50% of our grief sample who reported that the decedent was ill for a period prior to their death also reported that they received little or no information about this person's condition prior to their death. All of these items suggest the occurrence of anticipatory grief disenfranchisement is high in prisoners.

Death-Bed/Funeral Disenfranchisement*

As noted in Table 4.3 (item 7), 70% of the total grief group did not attend either a death-bed or funeral home visitation. Table 4.4 lists the reasons and percent distributions for funeral home or sick-bed visitation denial, refusal, or ineligibility. The 28% of the grief respondents who reported their loss as being a non-immediate family member or friend were prohibited from participating in or even requesting a funeral visit under current Corrections policy. Of those eligible for such visitations (72% of the total grief sample), 63% did not attend either a death bed or funeral visitation for a variety of reasons as listed in Table 4.4. One of the most striking findings was that 15.8% of immediate family losses known to grief respondents were never shared with prison or Chaplain officials, which of course excluded them from any possibility of attending a funeral home visitation.

* Readers are encouraged to refer to the description of Kentucky's Corrections Policy and Procedures on death notification, funeral and death-bed visitations, and security measures used for such visits (Appendix A) prior to reviewing the below analysis.
Table 4.4
REASONS AND PERCENT DISTRIBUTIONS FOR FUNERAL HOME OR SICK-BED VISITATION DENIAL, REFUSAL, OR RESPONDENT INELIGIBILITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Percent of Grief Subjects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Funeral visit was denied due to security reasons*</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funeral visit denied due to funeral out of state *</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent notified too late to attend funeral visit *</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turned-down death-bed or funeral home visit when offered *</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prison/Chaplain staff unaware of loss of immediate family member*</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funeral Trip unavailable since decedent was not immed. family**</td>
<td>28.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Percentage derived from Grief Group Subjects who lost an immediate family member, (n = 105) since funeral and death bed visitations are only permitted for immediate family members.

** Percentage derived from entire Grief Group sample (n = 146)

Distributive findings of funeral visitation and notification variables, when stratified by race, pointed to two specific differences between black and white respondents. While 62% of black subjects who suffered the loss of an immediate family member reported participation in a funeral visitation, only 29% of white respondents reported the same. This finding may be related to whether the subject was notified too late to attend the funeral, since only 2 (6.1%) of otherwise eligible African American grief subjects reported being notified too late compared to 13 (22.8%) of Caucasian respondents. It is also interesting to note that when Chaplains were the primary facilitators during the notification process, nearly half of those respondents attended a funeral visitation, while only 37.5% of those notified by a prison or jail staff member participated.
Religious Service Disenfranchisement

Corrections policy prohibits inmates from participating in religious funeral services outside the prison, leaving institutionally-based religious services the only option for those inmates desiring to participate in what is a commonly practiced grief ritual in general society.

Only 21% of all grief respondents reported visiting the Chapel as a way of mourning their loss. As with funeral attendance, there was a significant association between attending chapel for grief adjustment and respondent race. Thirty-three percent of black grief subjects reported chapel attendance for their grief, while only 15.3% of whites indicated the same ($X^2 = 5.818$, DF = 1, p = .016).

This finding is interesting when compared to the overall distribution of general (non-grief related) chapel attendance for all grief and non-grief respondents, where 51.4% reported attending Chapel at least several times a year, with 28% indicating they go between once a month to several times a week. Regular chapel attendance patterns were closely related to whether a grief respondent chose to attend chapel services as a way of grieving for his loss. Of those grief group respondents who reported visiting the chapel specifically to grieve their loss, 80.6% also reported regular (non-grief related) chapel attendance. Only 6.9% of grief respondents who visited the chapel for grief related reasons rarely or never attended Chapel services during the rest of the year ($X^2 = 29.53$, DF = 2, p = .001). This leads to two conclusions: (1) Unless there was an established pattern of social supportiveness and fellowship associated with chapel attendance, the inmate was unlikely to attend for grief adjustment purposes, and (2) even grief respondents who regularly attended chapel often reported not doing so for reasons specifically related to coping with their loss.
Other Social-Ritual Disenfranchisement

The use of sympathy cards, letters of condolence, and condolence prayer cards are commonly utilized methods of recognizing and responding to another's grief, particularly when the sender and receiver are not able to easily interact. Keepsake items like death notices, pictures of the decedent, and personal remembrances often provide mourning individuals with items to covet, and eventually to emotionally let go of within the course of normal bereavement. Since prisoners often depend on mail to maintain, receive, and reciprocate social support between themselves and their external social network, one would expect that the mailing of sympathy and keepsake items would be a major facilitative component used by external social agents to recognize the grief and loss of a suffering inmate. As shown in Table 4.3 (item 3), 55% of grief respondents reported not receiving any sympathy items. In addition, 44% of grief subjects did not receive any keepsake items (item 5).

External Social-Supportive Disenfranchised Grief

Previous research has suggested that when grief is unrecognized or underrecognized, the process of adjustment for the bereaved becomes complicated (Doka, 1987). Jacobs (1993) noted that successful grief adjustment depends, in part, on the social resources available to the bereaved, and that nonsupportiveness has been linked to poor bereavement outcome. In this section, we will examine whether grief subjects in our study exhibited evidence of social-supportive disenfranchised grief by external (outside the prison) sources of support like family members and friends.

The External Social-Supportive Disenfranchised Grief Index distribution is presented in Table 4.5. While the index was designed to provide a score between 0 and
100, actual scores ranged between 0 and 94. The index distribution was collapsed in order to more clearly identify the percentage of grievera exhibiting high levels of external social-supportive disenfranchisement. The actual scores were divided into quartiles, with scores in the two higher quartiles viewed as being representative of high external social-supportive disenfranchisement.

As Table 4.5 shows, 44% of all grief subjects exhibited a high to very high level of external support disenfranchisement. The median scores between black and white respondents were nearly identical.
Table 4.6 lists the items included in the External Supportive Disenfranchised Grief index along with the percentage of respondents giving a disenfranchised grief response for each item.

Table 4.6 (item 1) indicates that nearly 50% of respondents characterize the grief recognition they received by external social contacts as low to very low. The perceived amount of helpfulness provided by these same contacts with regard to the subject's grief adjustment (item 2) was even lower, with 71% of all grief subjects indicating low to very low external supportive helpfulness.

Also shown in Table 4.6 (items 3 and 4), 28% of grief subjects either didn't participate in writing letters or found the activity unhelpful with regard to their grief. Similar results were obtained with regard to phone conversations, as 22% either didn't place calls to outside family and friends at all, or didn't find such phone conversations helpful in coping with their loss.

The distributions shown on items (5) through (9) in Table 4.6 suggest that many inmates view their incarceration along with their distant proximity to their families as having isolated them from their external support network. In addition, significant percentages of inmate grievers believed their grief and pain over the loss was underrecognized or not recognized at all, and many attributed at least some importance to the statement "they've pretty much forgotten me." Finally, 33% of grief respondents felt that the nature of their crime had at least some impact upon the amount of attention they had with their external social network, with 18% believing the nature of their crime had a very significant influence on the amount of post-death contact they received.
Table 4.6
PERCENT DISTRIBUTIONS FOR INDEX ITEM SCORES IN THE EXTERNAL SOCIAL-SUPPORTIVE DISENFRANCHISED GRIEF INDEX*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDEX ITEMS</th>
<th>Moderate Disenfranchised</th>
<th>High Disenfranchised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Perceived Recognition of Respondent's Grief by External Supportive Contacts (parents, siblings, spouses, children, other relatives, externally situated friends)</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Perceived Amount of Helpfulness by External Supportive Contacts in Adjusting to Loss.</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>36.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Perceived Amount of Helpfulness in Writing letters to External Supportive Contacts</td>
<td>40.7</td>
<td>28.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Perceived Amount of Helpfulness in Calling External Supportive Contacts on Phone</td>
<td>48.3</td>
<td>22.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) The nature of his crime **</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>18.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Being locked-up **</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>43.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) They didn't realize his pain **</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>37.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) They've pretty much forgotten him **</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>23.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9) Being so far away from him **</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>50.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(n = 145)

* see Appendix C for item coding and index scoring criteria
** Respondent's perception of how much item affected the amount of attention he received from external family and friends after loved-one's death.
**Internal Social-Supportive Disenfranchised Grief**

While previous research has linked underrecognition of grief and deficient social support with poor bereavement outcome, inmate griefers face potential social-supportive disenfranchisement from both external and internal social contacts. For this reason, it was necessary to explore the prison grief environment in addition to the external dimension of support examined in the previous section.

The Internal Social-Supportive Disenfranchised Grief Index distribution is presented in Table 4.7. While the index was designed to provide a score between 0 and 100, actual scores ranged between 2 and 88. The actual distribution was collapsed in order to more clearly identify the percentage of griefers exhibiting high levels of internal social-supportive disenfranchisement. Actual scores were divided into quartiles, with scores in the two higher quartiles being representative of high internal social-supportive disenfranchisement.

As Table 4.7 shows, 72% of all grief subjects exhibited a high to very high level of internal social-supportive disenfranchised grief. In addition, there was a significant association between average DG-IS levels and race. In a t-test analysis between race and internal social-supportive disenfranchised grief, white respondents were found to have higher mean levels of disenfranchisement than black subjects (56.75 versus 48.53; p = 0.004).

Table 4.8 lists the items included in the Internal Social-Supportive Disenfranchised Grief index along with the percentage of respondents giving a disenfranchised grief response for each item. As shown in items (1) through (6) of this table, the perceived grief recognition attributed to internal social agents was very low for all agent categories, while perceived helpfulness was even lower. As readers will recall, a similar
relationship between perceived levels of grief recognition and accompanying levels of helpfulness were seen in the analysis pertaining to external supportive contacts.

Table 4.7
PERCENT DISTRIBUTION OF SCORES ON THE INTERNAL SOCIAL-SUPPORTIVE DISENFRANCHISED GRIEF INDEX (in quartiles from lowest to highest recorded score) FOR ALL GRIEF SUBJECTS AND t-TEST ANALYSIS BETWEEN INDEX SCORES AND RACE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Index Scores</th>
<th>All Grief Respondents</th>
<th>Subset by Race</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Blacks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Score (2.0 - 23.4)</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate Score (23.5 - 44.9)</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Score (45.0 - 66.4)</td>
<td>46.8</td>
<td>47.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very High Score (66.5 - 88.0)</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total % n</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Score</td>
<td>54.07</td>
<td>48.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Score</td>
<td>52.36</td>
<td>49.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>16.25</td>
<td>16.23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(mean index scores by race) t-value = 2.957
DF = 148
p = 0.004

Several items in Table 4.8 suggest that norms of emotional expression—both within the formal prison institutional organization and between inmates—may exert significant control over a grieving inmate's ability or inclination to publicly mourn his loss. For example, 75% of all grief subjects mostly or completely agreed with the statement "In prison, you're expected to do everything just like nothings happened." In addition, 71% of grief respondents mostly or completely agreed with the statement: "As a
Table 4.8
PERCENT DISTRIBUTIONS FOR INDEX ITEM SCORES IN THE INTERNAL SOCIAL-SUPPORTIVE
DISENFRANCHISED GRIEF SCALE*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale Items</th>
<th>Moderate Disenfranchisement</th>
<th>High Disenfranchisement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level of Perceived Grief Recognition Respondent Attributed to:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Other Prisoners</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>53.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Prison Staff</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>74.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Prison Chaplain Staff</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>72.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Perceived Helpfulness Toward Respondent's Grief Adjustment by:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Other Prisoners</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>62.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Prison Staff</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>66.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Chaplain Staff</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>78.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) I would probably avoid asking another inmate who's lost a loved one how he's doing because you never know if it might upset him</td>
<td>33.9</td>
<td>22.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) As a prisoner, you are rarely given ways to express your emotions with other inmates</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9) I wouldn't know what to say to my roommate if he had just been told a family member had died</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>18.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10) There were times when I wanted to bring-up my feelings about this person's death with another inmate, but didn't because I thought it might make him uncomfortable</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11) It made my grief harder that most inmates didn't understand how I was feeling</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>18.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12) It's best not to show sadness or act emotional around other inmates if you want to keep their respect</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>19.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13) The best thing another inmate can do is to give a grieving inmate time alone to sort things out</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>57.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14) Other inmates who've lost a loved one probably try not to let their grief show around other inmates</td>
<td>48.7</td>
<td>41.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15) In prison, you're expected to do everything just like nothing's happened</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>44.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16) I [do not] find it easy to share or express my emotions with other inmates when I'm sad or depressed about something **</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>42.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17) How often, if ever, did other inmates bring-up the topic of this person's death before you did in a conversation?</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>51.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* See Appendix D for item coding and index scoring criteria.
** Actual questionnaire item worded without contents in brackets, and presented in table as a reverse-scored item.
(n = 156)
prisoner, you're rarely given ways to express your emotions with other inmates," while an even higher percentage (89%) agreed that "other inmates who've lost a loved-one probably try not to let their grief show around other inmates."

Percentage distributions for item (13) in Table 4.8 suggest that grieving inmates viewed grief and mourning as mostly a solitary experience. Perhaps just as interesting, non-grieving subjects, when asked to respond to the same statement, overwhelmingly felt the same way. While 88% of grief subjects mostly or completely agreed with the statement "The best thing another inmate can do is to give a grieving inmate time alone to sort things out," 85% of non-grief subjects responded similarly. This suggests that within the normative prison environment, socially conditioned grief reactions and expressions of mourning may center on activities that protect both griever and non-griever from facing the potentially disruptive power of emotions that conflict with the norms and values of the prison subculture, like toughness and manliness.

It is also interesting that results on some items included in the index (items 7, 9, 11, and 12 in particular) suggest that at least some interaction between grieving inmates and their non-grieving inmate contacts occurs with regard to topics related to the grieving inmate's mourning. However, when this evidence is considered along with the previously discussed finding that inmate grief subjects perceived the level of grief recognition and social support afforded to them by their fellow inmates as very low, a more complex picture of internal social-supportiveness is suggested. It may be that, while limited interaction with regard to the grieving inmate's loss most certainly occurs, such interaction is largely perceived as uncomfortable and not particularly helpful by both grieving and non-grieving inmates.
Intrapsychic Disenfranchised Grief

In this section, we will examine whether grief subjects in our study exhibited evidence of intrapsychic disenfranchised grief. As noted in the literature review, intrapsychic disenfranchised grief arises from within the grieving person, and is commonly associated with feelings of guilt and shame over the loss, and self-perceptions of unworthiness in relation to the acceptance of social recognition of their grief by others.

The Intrapsychic Disenfranchised Grief Index distribution is presented in Table 4.9. While the index was designed to provide a score between 0 and 100, actual scores ranged between 0 and 95. The actual distribution is collapsed in order to more clearly identify the percentage of grievers exhibiting high levels of intrapsychic disenfranchised grief. Actual scores were divided into quartiles, with scores in the two high quartiles viewed as being representative of high intrapsychic disenfranchisement.

As Table 4.9 shows, 44% of all grief subjects exhibited a high to very high level of intrapsychic disenfranchised grief. Although black respondents had a lower percentage of high to very high intrapsychic disenfranchisement than their white cohorts (35.4% versus 48.0), the distribution of scores, when controlled by race, did not exhibit any statistically significant difference.

Table 4.10 lists the items included in the Intrapsychic Disenfranchised Grief index along with the percentage of respondents giving a disenfranchised grief response for each item. Items (1) in Table 4.9 indicates that some grieving inmates felt guilt over, or responsibility for, the decedent's deteriorating condition or illness prior to their death. Thirty-three percent mostly or completely agreed with the statement: "I couldn't help thinking that my situation probably affected this person's health before he/she died."
When the response distribution for this item was controlled for immediate family members only, the percentage of respondents mostly or completely agreeing with this item increased to 39%.

When asked to respond to the statement "I was ashamed at myself for being unable to be there for this person," 82% mostly or completely agreed with it. Additionally, 72% mostly or completely agreed with the statement "I let my family down by not being there for them." Taken together, items (1) through (3) suggest a strong connection between imprisonment and self-perceptions of guilt and shame during grief and bereavement.
Table 4.10
PERCENT DISTRIBUTIONS FOR INDEX ITEM SCORES IN THE INTRAPSYCHIC DISENFRANCHISED GRIEF INDEX*

INDEX ITEMS:

1) I couldn't help thinking that my situation probably affected this person's health before he or she died 33.5%
2) I was ashamed at myself for being unable to be there for this person 82.6%
3) I let my family down by not being there for them 72.3%
4) I could probably show my emotions sometimes, but the other guys might not be comfortable with it 63.9%
5) Feeling that people are unfriendly or dislike you 26.4%
6) Feeling inferior to others 14.9%
7) Feelings of worthlessness 36.8%
8) Feelings of guilt 45.1%

* See Appendix E for item coding and scoring criteria

Items (5) through (8) in Table 4.10 were extracted from the Brief Symptom Inventory, and used in the DG-IP index to measure self-perceived feelings of inferiority, worthlessness, guilt, and perceptions of unfriendliness by others. These items were included because the presence of such self-reported symptoms could negatively influence a respondent's ability or inclination to solicit or accept the grief recognition of others. It was reasoned that if a respondent were psychologically predisposed to avoiding grief-related interaction, he would be at heightened risk for intrapsychic disenfranchisement. Furthermore, it was viewed as essentially unimportant
whether the occurrence of such feelings or personality traits pre-dated the grief experience or if they were manifestations of the grief itself, since their effect would likely be similar in either case.

Twenty-six percent of grief respondents reported feeling that people were unfriendly or disliked them during the past seven days, 14% indicated moderate to extreme feelings of inferiority, 37% were distressed by feelings of worthlessness, and 45% were bothered by feelings of guilt. When compared to the distributions of non-grief subjects on these same items, no differences were statistically significant, suggesting that these items measured pre-grief psychological characteristics that were not likely caused, but perhaps exacerbated to some degree, by the grief experience itself.

Complicated Grief and Bereavement in Prisoners

The concept of complicated grief was operationalized in this study in order to provide a convergent validity measure for the disenfranchised grief findings. The Complicated Grief Index for Prisoners was designed to provide a quantitative assessment of complicated grief severity. While the index could provide a score between 8 and 100, actual scores ranged between 9 and 94. The actual distribution is collapsed in Table 4.11 to more clearly identify the percentage of grievers who exhibited high levels of complicated grief. Index scores were divided into quartiles, with scores in the two highest quartiles viewed as being representative of complicated grief.

As shown in Table 4.11, 35% of all grief subjects exhibited a high to very high level of complicated grief. In addition, a t-test analysis between race and complicated grief found that white subjects had higher mean levels of complicated grief than black subjects (48.51 versus 40.00; p = 0.009).
Table 4.11
PERCENT DISTRIBUTION OF SCORES ON THE COMPLICATED GRIEF INDEX FOR PRISONERS (in quartiles from lowest recorded score to highest) FOR ALL GRIEF SUBJECTS AND t-TEST ANALYSIS BETWEEN INDEX SCORES AND RACE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Index Scores</th>
<th>All Grief Respondents</th>
<th>Subset by Race</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Blacks</td>
<td>Whites</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Score (9.0 - 30.4)</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate Score (30.5 - 51.9)</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>62.2</td>
<td>37.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Score (52.0 - 73.4)</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very High Score (73.5 - 94.0)</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total %</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>101</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Score</td>
<td>46.13</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>48.51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Score</td>
<td>44.00</td>
<td>36.25</td>
<td>47.40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>18.43</td>
<td>15.45</td>
<td>19.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(mean index scores by race)

\[
t-value = 2.641 \\
DF = 144 \\
p = 0.009
\]

Appendix F lists the items and scoring procedures for the Complicated Grief Index for Prisoners which is an 18 item measure, with higher item scores indicating the presence of maladjustment or difficulties within the grief respondents' mourning experience.

Several items were included to assess the intensity of various grief reactions empirically and clinically associated with difficult grief adjustment early in the mourning phase, but which may continue to persist when grief issues remain unresolved. While any of these items can individually represent a common manifestation of grief, when viewed together, we believe they offer a cumulative
picture of how well a given respondent adjusted to his loss early in the grief experience.

Other items measured whether inmate grief respondents often had a difficult time in reinvesting in, or adapting to, life without the decedent. Fifty-nine percent mostly or completely agreed they had difficulty maintaining a normal level of functioning after their loss, while 46% reported a significant loss of interest in many of their activities following the death. Only a small percentage (11%) mostly or completely agreed they lost interest in their remaining family while mourning.

Additional items measured current feelings associated with chronic, delayed, and inhibited grief, and indicated that high percentages of grief respondents reported being bothered by symptoms associated with complicated grief, including experiencing a shattered world view (e.g., lost sense of security, trust, control), excessive irritability, detachment from others, depression, and persistently painful memories of the decedent.

**The Relationship Between Disenfranchised Grief and Complicated Grief**

Having established that varying degrees of complicated grief are present in the grief sample, we now will test the first hypothesis which states that "disenfranchised grief is positively associated with complicated grief." Pearson's product-moment correlations between the CGIP index and the disenfranchised grief indexes were performed on the total grief sample. As shown in Table 4.12, a strong relationship between total disenfranchised grief and complicated grief was found. In addition, both internal social-supportive and intrapsychic disenfranchised grief strongly correlated with complicated grief in the total grief sample, while external-social supportive
disenfranchisement moderately associated with CGIP. No relationship was found between social-ritual disenfranchised grief scores and complicated grief scores.

Table 4.12
PEARSON'S PRODUCT MOMENT CORRELATIONS BETWEEN DISENFRANCHISED GRIEF INDEXES AND THE COMPLICATED GRIEF INDEX FOR PRISONERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disenfranchised Grief Indexes</th>
<th>Complicated Grief Index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Disnf. Grief</td>
<td>.485**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social-Ritual Disnf.</td>
<td>.027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Sup. Disnf.</td>
<td>.210**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Sup. Disnf.</td>
<td>.325**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrapsychic Disnf.</td>
<td>.673**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05  
** p < .01  
n's between 132-157

Disenfranchised Grief and Psychological Distress

In this section, the second hypothesis that disenfranchised grief is positively associated with psychological distress was tested using correlational analysis. Using Pearson's product-moment correlations, associations between the BSI subscales and the Total Disenfranchised Grief Index were assessed. As shown in Table 4.13, total disenfranchised grief moderately to strongly correlated with every BSI subscale, including the BSI's composite intensity measure of psychological distress, the GSI. Since the DG-TOT index included a composite score of the combined disenfranchised grief dimension scores, this finding clearly established a strong association between higher disenfranchised grief and higher psychological distress.
Table 4.13
PEARSON'S PRODUCT MOMENT CORRELATIONS BETWEEN PSYCHOLOGICAL DISTRESS AS MEASURED BY THE BSI AND TOTAL DISENFRANCHISED GRIEF.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BSI Subscales and GSI</th>
<th>Total Disenfranchised Grief Index (DG-TOT)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Global Severity Index ¹</td>
<td>0.481**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somatization</td>
<td>0.382**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obsessive-Compulsiveness</td>
<td>0.324**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depression</td>
<td>0.463**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety</td>
<td>0.400**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hostility</td>
<td>0.265**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phobic Anxiety</td>
<td>0.431**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paranoid Ideation</td>
<td>0.394**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychoticism</td>
<td>0.449**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ due to shared items between the DG-TOT index and the Interpersonal Sensitivity subscale of the BSI, the I-S subscale was not used for these calculations, and the GSI (which totals the value for each inventory item and divides this total by the number of items answered) was modified to reflect this exclusion in its calculation.

In order to further describe how disenfranchised grief is associated with psychological distress, Pearson's product-moment correlations were performed between each disenfranchised grief dimension index and the subscales of the Brief Symptom Inventory.

It is clear from the data presented in Table 4.14 that higher social-supportive and intrapsychic disenfranchised grief levels are significantly associated with higher levels of psychological distress on virtually all Brief Symptom Inventory subscales.
Table 4.14
PEARSON'S PRODUCT MOMENT CORRELATIONS BETWEEN BRIEF SYMPTOM INVENTORY SUBSCALES AND DISENFRANCHISED GRIEF DIMENSION INDEXES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BSI SUBSCALES</th>
<th>DG-SR</th>
<th>DG-ES</th>
<th>DG-IS</th>
<th>DG-IP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Global Severity Index 1</td>
<td>0.022</td>
<td>0.178*</td>
<td>0.336*</td>
<td>0.661*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somatization</td>
<td>0.055</td>
<td>0.117</td>
<td>0.290*</td>
<td>0.460*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obsessive-Comp.</td>
<td>-0.095</td>
<td>0.151*</td>
<td>0.266*</td>
<td>0.522*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depression</td>
<td>0.096</td>
<td>0.095</td>
<td>0.287*</td>
<td>0.648*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety</td>
<td>0.050</td>
<td>0.134</td>
<td>0.253*</td>
<td>0.561*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hostility</td>
<td>-0.056</td>
<td>0.201**</td>
<td>0.183**</td>
<td>0.403**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phobic Anxiety</td>
<td>0.088</td>
<td>0.112</td>
<td>0.321**</td>
<td>0.519**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paranoid Ideation</td>
<td>-0.036</td>
<td>0.142*</td>
<td>0.330**</td>
<td>0.533**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychoticism</td>
<td>0.035</td>
<td>0.178*</td>
<td>0.264**</td>
<td>0.583**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05  
** p < .01

1 - due to shared items between the DG-IP index and the Interpersonal Sensitivity subscale of the BSI, the I-S subscale was not used for these calculations, and the GSI (which totals the value for each inventory item and divides this total by the number of items answered) was modified to reflect this exclusion in its calculation.

Interestingly, no relationship was found to exist between higher levels of social-ritual disenfranchised grief and psychological distress, which was similar to the finding between social-ritual disenfranchisement and Complicated Grief in the previous section.

In testing the third hypothesis, between-group t-tests were used to determine whether grief group subjects exhibited higher psychological distress than non-grieving inmates. As shown in Table 4.15, statistically significant associations between grief status and psychological distress were noted on the Somatization and Anxiety subscales, with grievers having higher mean scores. All other grief group means were consistently higher than those of the non-grief subjects, albeit without being statistically significant.
### Table 4.15
MEAN SCORES ON THE BRIEF SYMPTOM INVENTORY AND t-TEST ANALYSES BETWEEN GRIEF AND NON-GRIEF SAMPLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BSI SUBSCALES</th>
<th>Non-Grief Group Means (n = 106)</th>
<th>Grief Group Means (n = 157)</th>
<th>Difference Between Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Global Severity Index</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somatization</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>.24*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obsessive-Compulsive</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depression</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>.29**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hostility</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phobic Anxiety</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paranoid Ideation</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychoticism</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05  
** p < .01

In order to further explicate the relationship between grief status and psychological distress, additional analysis was undertaken to include non-grievers as a "null" category when comparing levels of psychological distress with levels of disenfranchised grief for the grief sample. For this analysis, raw scores for each BSI subscale were used as the dependent variables. Using the Total Disenfranchised Grief Index, a recoded variable was created with a value of (1) assigned to all non-grievers, while a value of (2) was given to those grievers who scored in the high to very high range for overall disenfranchised grief.
Table 4.16
**T-TEST ANALYSIS BETWEEN BSI SUBSCALE SCORES OF NON-GRIEVING INMATES AND GRIEVING INMATES HAVING HIGH TO VERY HIGH SCORES ON THE TOTAL DISENFRANCHISED GRIEF INDEX**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BSI SUBSCALES</th>
<th>Non-Grief Subjects With High Disenfranchisement (Means)</th>
<th>Grief Group (Means)</th>
<th>Difference Between Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Global Severity Index</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>.38**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somatization</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>.49**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obsessive-Compulsive</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depression</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>.50**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>.50**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hostility</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phobic Anxiety</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>.40**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paranoid Ideation</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychoticism</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>.33**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05
**p < .01

1Due to shared items between the DG-TOT index and the Interpersonal Sensitivity subscale of the BSI, the I-S subscale was not used for these calculations, and the GSI (which totals the value for each inventory item and divides this total by the number of items answered) was modified to reflect this exclusion in its calculation.

As the results in Table 4.16 indicate, bereaved inmates with high levels of total disenfranchised grief exhibited statistically significant higher levels of psychological distress than non-grievers in all symptom dimensions except for obsessive-compulsiveness, hostility, and paranoid ideation.

When viewed collectively, the findings presented in Tables 4.13 through 4.16 indicate that, while both grieving and non-grieving inmates in the study exhibited high levels of psychological distress overall, findings of high disenfranchised grief within the grief sample were clearly linked to higher levels of emotional and psychological symptomology than seen in the non-grief sample.
In addition to these subscale comparisons, we discovered a high incidence of suicidal ideation within our total sample of inmates. On the BSI item "Thoughts of ending your life," 23.9% of all white respondents and 10.7% of all black respondents indicated that they had been bothered or distressed by such thoughts in the 7 days prior to and including the day they completed their survey. When compared to the BSI's provided normative sample data on non-patient adults in which only 3% indicated a symptomatic response to this item, this finding was significant. White grief-group respondents were somewhat more likely to report suicidal ideation than white non-grievers (mean scores of 0.37 versus 0.57; p = 0.202), but this relationship was not evident between black grievers and non-grievers (mean scores of 0.23 versus 0.18; p = n.s.).
Chapter 5

Discussion of Findings

Disenfranchised Grief Among Prison Inmates

This discussion will follow a similar organizational scheme as the presentation of results in chapter four. The first section will cover the descriptive findings of total, social-ritual, social-supportive, and intrapsychic disenfranchised grief. The second will interpret the analytical findings of association between disenfranchised grief and complicated grief and psychological distress.

Total Disenfranchised Grief

The findings of this study provide compelling evidence of the intensity and prevalence of disenfranchised grief among prisoners in this sample. Sixty percent of inmate grief subjects exhibited high levels of total disenfranchised grief, suggesting its wide range of influence within the inmate mourning and bereavement experience. However, while this overall intensity measure is indicative of significant disenfranchisement in the grief sample, the individual dimensions of disenfranchised grief will now be discussed in order to provide a more detailed analysis of their role in the grief experience.

Social-Ritual Disenfranchised Grief Among Prison Inmates

Through the use of multiple indexes conceptually designed around the previously identified constructs of disenfranchised grief, this research has explicated a number of sources of disenfranchisement associated with the inmate grief experience. With regard
to social-ritual disenfranchisement, 62% of inmate grievers in the study exhibited high to very high levels of social-ritual disenfranchised grief.

Respondents in the grief sample overwhelmingly reported feeling excluded from many of the anticipatory grief rituals and practices viewed by previous researchers as necessary during the social disengagement process between the dying individual and their loved ones. In addition, institutional and procedural constraints pertaining to who is entitled to attend a funeral or sick-bed visitation, combined with a variety of factors including delayed notification of the death to prison officials or to the prisoners themselves resulted in low funeral attendance. Interestingly, black respondents were more likely to have received notification of their loss in time to attend a funeral visitation, and consequently, they were over twice as likely as white grief subjects to have attended a funeral trip to view the decedent and to meet with immediate family.

Due to the limitations of the data collected, the origins of notification delays were unable to be determined. In other words, it is unclear if family members--who understandably would be preoccupied with funeral arrangements and their own emotional upheaval--are more often delayed in relaying the information to prison officials, or if the prison-based notification system itself is a factor. In any case however, notification delays prevented at least 9.3% of otherwise eligible grief respondents from attending a funeral home visitation.

In the literature on disenfranchised grief, Doka (1987) and Murphy (1988) noted that disenfranchised grievers often feel excluded from religious services for the decedent. Present findings indicate that a similar phenomena exists for inmate mourners. Even though a considerable percentage of both non-grief and grief respondents reported regular chapel attendance, less than a quarter of the grief subjects indicated that they visited the prison chapel as a way of grieving for their loss.
As with funeral visitation, black respondents were twice as likely to have visited the chapel as a grief adjustment strategy compared to white subjects. It appears that even when an established pattern of social-supportiveness and fellowship associated with chapel attendance is present under pre-loss circumstances, the grieving inmate is often unlikely to seek such support and comfort for reasons specifically tied to their loss. It may be that the nature of the services currently offered by a variety of volunteer chaplains and spiritual providers are not structured to include or address specific losses.

The receipt of keepsake items, momentos, and sympathy items like letters of condolence and prayer cards is considered by most as being an important facilitative component available to outside family and friends in recognizing the loss and pain of a grieving inmate. Indeed, this common practice in the wider culture would seem to be even more appropriate with regard to prison inmates, since a major portion of their communication and interaction with the outside world depends on the mail. The findings indicate that many grief respondents did not receive such items, and as such, did not experience this particular form of grief recognition and enfranchisement. The finding also underscores the difficulty that both inmates and their families have in maintaining mutually supportive interaction during the mourning period. As Doka (1987) noted, families tend to "circle the wagons" during times of crisis, and may inadvertently exclude an inmate relative from the family's mutual mourning and grieving experience.

Inmate Grief and External Social Support

Previous research has noted that successful grief adjustment depends, in part, on the social resources available, and that nonsupportiveness has been linked to poor
bereavement outcome. This research conceptualized the inmate social-supportive environment as being composed of two distinct dimensions: The "external" which encompassed family and friends on the outside, and the "internal," which included other inmates, prison staff, and chaplain staff. Since each dimension existed apart from the other, it was necessary to analyze them individually, and as such, will discuss them individually here.

With regard to both grieving and non-grieving inmates, the results indicate that their perceptions of external social support with regard to general prison adjustment were consistently low for most external social agent categories. For grieving prisoners in our study, perceptions regarding the recognition of their grief by family members and externally situated friends, while low to begin with, was nonetheless higher than the perceived helpfulness of these same individuals in helping them deal with their loss. Said another way, external supportive contacts were consistently perceived as not being able to offer a level of helpfulness commensurate to the level of grief recognition perceived. For many inmates, writing letters to family members or calling them on the phone were either not helpful avenues of grief adjustment, or were not utilized at all, suggesting that grief-related social supportiveness is not easily facilitated through such methods for a high percentage of prisoners in the study.

Overall, over 44% of the grief sample exhibited high to very high levels of external social-supportive disenfranchised grief as measured by the DG-ES index. Many findings pointed to common perceptions of isolation from those on the outside; and that such isolation was multidimensional in origin. For example, many grieving inmates indicated that their incarcerated status as well as their rural location and distance from their families had negatively influenced the amount of support they had received from family after the loss. In addition, many believed their grief and pain over the loss was
underrecognized or not recognized at all by those on the outside, and one-third of the
grief sample felt that the nature of their crime or crimes had a deleterious impact on
the level of grief recognition and subsequent support they received from external
family and friends.

These findings, when viewed collectively, suggest that intervening factors such as
the inmate's distant location from external contacts, communication difficulties, and
potential emotive elements related to the inmate's criminal behavior and incarcerated
status reduce or even prohibit the kinds of interactions and interactional settings
necessary for social-supportive mourning. For these reasons, inmate grievers often
suffer a considerable level of external social supportive disenfranchisement during their
grief adjustment.

Inmate Grief and Internal Social Support

The analysis of the internal social-supportive grief environment provided compelling
evidence of disenfranchised grief. Grieving inmates in the study were found to have
faced their loss within a particularly indifferent and emotionally restrictive
environment. In general, respondent perceptions of internal social support were even
lower than those found for external social-supportive contacts, and nearly 72% of
mourning subjects exhibited high levels of internal social-supportive disenfranchised
grief.

Limited evidence was found to support Hochschild (1983) and Goffman's (1961)
contentions that the formal prison organization controls both the nature of emotional
expression as well as the setting in which it occurs. Respondent perceptions of staff
indifference during periods of emotional upset were reported by 3 out of 4 grievers
and non-grievers alike. In addition, the findings on other questionnaire items indicated that the highly structured and rigidly scheduled prison operation precluded inmates in both groups from changing their routine in order to address uncomfortable emotional states. While further study is needed in order to support specific conclusions about how the formal prison organization impacts the emotional transformations of grief and bereavement; these findings, when viewed collectively, suggest that the mourning prisoners in the present study were not afforded a recognizable transitional bereavement role in which to express their grief.

Moreover, it is suspected that perceived indifference is largely the result of established normative patterns of interaction between staff and inmates. Goffman (1961) noted that the routinized functioning and security of the prison depends in part upon stringent emotional and interpersonal restrictions between prisoners and staff. The finding that inmate grievers, on average, perceived very little recognition of their grief by prison staff suggest that such emotional and interpersonal restrictions may have resulted in an organizational structure that limited the transfer of information about a grieving inmate's loss among staff, so that few if any of the staff who regularly have contact with the inmate were aware he was mourning.

In addition to institutional-based disenfranchisement, the inmate normative subculture was found to exert enormous influence upon the prison grief experience. Findings indicate that inmates commonly employ mutual avoidance strategies when confronted with grief and mourning. Furthermore, the results supported Hochschild's (1983) contention that "feeling rules" give social pattern to acts of emotional management, since both grieving and non-grieving inmates in the study were socially conditioned to avoid potentially uncomfortable emotionally expressive interaction that might disrupt mutual expectations and self-perceptions of toughness and manliness.
Findings suggest that for inmate grievers, mutual avoidance strategies make their grief and mourning a largely solitary experience. While the findings indicated that at least some grief-related interaction occurred between grief subjects and their non-grieving cohorts, the structure and organizational patterns of such interactions were not examined closely in this study. Nonetheless, the evidence suggests that whatever grief-related interaction does occur was largely perceived as uncomfortable and not particularly helpful by both grieving and non-grieving inmates in the sample.

Finally, it was not clear whether Moss, Rubenstein and Moss's (1997) finding that males exhibit gender-specific patterns of addressing grief could be associated with the overall findings of mutual avoidance and solitary grief and bereavement in the male normative prison environment. While it is suspected that gender-specific socialization in the wider culture has indeed helped to shape the prison mourning experience, the present study was limited to only male inmates, and as such, gender-specific influences upon prison grief could not be isolated.

Intrapsychic Disenfranchised Grief

Inmate grievers in the study were often susceptible to intrapsychic shame and guilt, consistent with the literature on this type of disenfranchised grief. There appears to be a strong connection between being imprisoned and grief-related guilt and shame over an inability to assist and support both the dying loved-one and his family. Additionally, significant percentages of the grief sample reported feeling guilt over, or responsibility for, the decedent's illness or deteriorating condition prior to their death, particularly regarding immediate family members.

High levels of self-reported feelings of inferiority, worthlessness, and unfriendliness by others were commonly reported, and were viewed by researchers as
possible factors in whether a respondent might be psychologically predisposed to
avoiding available grief-related conversation or interaction. Interestingly, comparative
analysis between grief and non-grief subjects yielded no statistically significant
differences on these particular variables, suggesting that such feelings or personality
traits were likely to have pre-dated the grief experience. Nevertheless, and as
mentioned in the findings section, the issue of whether these symptoms or feelings pre­
dated or followed the grieving inmate's loss was viewed as having little consequence,
since their effect upon a respondent's intrapsychic ability or inclination to solicit or
accept the grief recognition and social support of others would be similar in either
case.

This is also suspicion that a substantial overlap is occurring between the findings
related to socially conditioned grief within the normative inmate subculture and
intrapsychically manifested outward behaviors that model emotional self-restraint and
control. Indeed, it appears logical to assume that social constructions of grief are
interrelated with a variety of intrapsychic self-assessments that either encourage or
discourage social mourning in inmate interactional settings.

Disenfranchised Grief, Complicated Grief, and Psychological Distress

While findings have shown that many prison inmate grievers exhibited high levels
of disenfranchised grief, the study also considered whether such disenfranchisement
was associated with established notions of complicated grief and psychological
distress.

This analysis found that the majority of grief subjects exhibited at least moderate
levels of complicated grief, and that 15% of black grief respondents and 43% of white
subjects displayed high to very high levels. Why this racial disparity exists was not
determined, although a similar pattern emerged with regard to findings on the Brief Symptom Inventory scales, albeit to a lesser extent.

Correlational analysis between respondent scores on the disenfranchised grief indexes and the Complicated Grief Index for Prisoners confirmed that total, social-supportive, and intrapsychic disenfranchised grief levels were strongly associated with higher complicated grief levels. Interestingly, no such relationship was found between social-ritual disenfranchised grief and complicated grief. Interpretation of this particular finding was confounding and inconclusive. One explanation may be that high social-ritual disenfranchisement in inmate grievers has a latent function in that it limits the number of grief and bereavement rituals and activities one must confront emotionally. For example, having a funeral visitation denied, while clearly a disenfranchising act for most grievers in most situations, would functionally eliminate the intrapsychic and emotional distress associated with being transported in shackles and leg irons, interacting with immediate family while trying to remain composed, and viewing the body of the decedent.

Findings related to psychological distress centered on whether levels of psychological distress could be linked to corresponding levels of disenfranchised grief and on comparative between-group analysis of the Brief Symptom Inventory's global Severity Index and symptom subscales.

The analysis found strong correlations between total disenfranchised grief and all symptom subscales of the BSI. In addition, internal social-supportive and intrapsychic disenfranchised grief scores were strongly associated with most every BSI subscale as well. Moderate correlations between external social-supportive disenfranchised grief and many of the BSI symptom measures were found, but scores on the social-ritual
disenfranchised grief index were not associated with either higher or lower levels of psychological distress.

These findings suggest that the strong association between intrapsychic disenfranchised grief and psychological distress may, at least in part, reflect respondent pre-loss psychological or personality characteristics which, in turn, have influenced their grief-related perceptions and behaviors. But even if this hypothesis could be supported empirically, it would be of little consequence in terms of how we understand the relationship between intrapsychic disenfranchised grief and psychological distress, since the actual origin(s) of such characteristics have little to do with the importance of the relationship's effect upon grief adjustment and resolution.

When the BSI findings for non-grievers were used as a "null" category for comparing levels of psychological distress on the BSI subscales with psychological distress findings of grievers who displayed high levels of disenfranchised grief, these mourning inmates had significantly higher mean levels of psychological distress than non-grievers on many symptom dimensions including somatization, depression, anxiety, and phobic anxiety as well as on the Global Severity Index of the BSI.

The correlations observed between disenfranchised grief psychological distress as well as the analysis of variance between the mean levels of psychological distress between grievers and non-grievers offer some convergent validity to our findings of disenfranchised and complicated grief in prisoners who have lost a loved-one through death.

It is also interesting to note a secondary finding related to psychological distress in the population under study. A high incidence of self-reported suicidal ideation within the total sample was found, and is indicative of the importance of further
understanding and addressing mental health issues in this particular prison population, and in prison populations across the country.

Finally, this discussion would not be complete without addressing the racial differences noted in some areas of analysis. While not a specific interest during the study's design and implementation, descriptive analysis pertaining to internal social-supportive disenfranchised grief and complicated grief showed that white subjects, on average, exhibited significantly higher levels of both as compared to black respondents.

While these findings are insufficient with regard to drawing any specific conclusion about such racial disparities in the data, socio-demographic factors are suspected as having a role. Informal observation and understanding of prison populations in Kentucky suggest that black prisoners are more likely to have socially interacted with each other prior to incarceration than their white cohorts so that, in effect, a portion of their prior external social supportive network is more likely to be assimilated into their internal social-supportive system. This, in turn, may be explained by the concentration of minorities in relatively small areas of large urban centers in Kentucky, whereas white respondents are more likely to have come from a variety of urban, suburban, and rural settings. Furthermore, the finding that blacks, on average, have a lower level of internal social-supportive disenfranchisement may be viewed as a possible intervening factor as to why they also exhibit less evidence of complicated grief, since correlational analysis pointed to a strong relationship between high internal social-supportive disenfranchisement and high levels of complicated grief.

While further study is indicated in order to draw any specific conclusions, what is clear is that inmates of different racial backgrounds exhibit different patterns of grief.
and bereavement, although it is unclear if such differences are primarily cultural, demographic, or both.

Summary

It is believed that the majority of the prevailing theoretical components of the disenfranchised grief perspective have been successfully generalized to the grieving members of the prison population under study. Grief subjects were shown to exhibit significant levels of social-ritual, social supportive, and intrapsychic disenfranchisement within their grief environment as well as by their external social contacts. Additionally, and with the exception of findings pertaining to social-ritual disenfranchisement, high levels of disenfranchised grief were associated with high levels of complicated grief. A similar finding was seen with regard to social-supportive, intrapsychic, and total disenfranchised grief and psychological distress. As such, the study's findings are meaningful as a preliminary foray into the prison grief experience.

It is hoped that the evidence of disenfranchised grief found in this inmate population will have positive implications for the future support of inmates faced with a loved-one's death, but it is not suggested that these findings can immediately be generalized to other levels of confinement, or to other prison systems without further study.

Limitations of the Current Study

There were certain design limitations that bear mention here. First, the non-random sampling method used depended upon subject self-selection, and may have introduced sampling bias. For example, grieving inmates with severe grief-related or non-grief
related depression or other emotional states, or those who may not have wanted to face reminders of their grief experience by answering the survey, may have chosen not to participate. Second, the survey design method as well as the subject recruitment method used (a volunteer request letter) may have prevented many illiterate or minimally literate inmates from taking part in the study. Due to staff and time limitations, researchers were unable to identify this segment of the population, or offer an oral presentation of the questionnaires to those who couldn't read or write.

Another important limitation of this study concerned its focus on male prisoners only. Additionally, the research was conducted in a single institutional setting. A broader study encompassing both genders and multiple prison settings may have resulted in a more comprehensive understanding of prison-based grief, while allowing for greater generalizability of the findings.

An additional concern was that the cross-sectional design of the current study may not have measured the subjective grief experiences of those inmates whose loss occurred more than a year before the study as accurately as those of inmates with more recent losses. Data were unable to confirm or refute the significance of this concern, and so it remains.

There were also two limitations pertaining to measurement. First, nearly all findings regarding funeral visitation, refusals, or security denials were drawn from inmate self-report measures, since confirmatory records were not available to researchers. As such, some response bias may have occurred, although we did not find any evidence of such. Second, in order to limit the length of the grief group questionnaire, some items used to construct the DG-IP and CGIP indexes were borrowed from the Brief Symptom Inventory measure also contained in each survey. This, in turn, prevented correlational analysis between indexes with shared items. In retrospect, and even
though this was not a significant problem, the addition of a few more questionnaire items would have been a more practical approach to index design.

**Directions For Future Research**

As alluded to in the limitations section, further study of grief and bereavement in prison inmates should include female inmates, inmates of both genders who are unable to read and complete questionnaires, and prisoners in a variety of custody level settings. A related suggestion would be to employ more qualitative approaches and longitudinal approaches to this area of study that include detailed histories of the grief event, external and internal interactional structure, and commonly employed coping strategies. Additional research involving external social support that includes both inmates and their external social contacts should also be considered.

Further study in this area should also include designs that examine the feelings and perceptions of prison staff who are responsible for performing death notifications and arranging funeral visitations, or who spiritually or psychologically counsel mourning inmates. Their insights and perceptions may enhance the overall understanding of this complex grief environment.

Finally, further research should be undertaken to further explore the general social-psychological environment of prison populations with particular emphasis on identifying and addressing severe mentally disordered states including suicidal ideation.
Conclusion

It is worth considering the large and ever-growing ranks of prisoners in this country when contemplating thanatological research in this social environment. The prison population not only continues to grow, but to age as well, making the study of grief and bereavement of those behind bars a timely and important area of study, with potential organizational and policy implications for the corrections industry, prison support staff, and prison chaplain staff. But it is also worth considering what is often overlooked by a society bent on punishment and longer incarceration for criminal offenders. The intense human experience of grief and bereavement escapes no one, and prisoners are certainly worthy of being included among the ranks of disenfranchised grievers.
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Appendix A.

Kentucky Department of Corrections Rules and Procedures Pertaining to Inmate Notification of a Family Member Death, and Funeral And Death-Bed Visitations

1) Prison Chaplains are generally responsible for initiating the notification process when they are informed that an inmate has lost an immediate family member, but if a Chaplain is not available, appropriate staff members may assume this role.

2) When a family member calls the prison to notify the inmate of the death, they are asked a series of questions designed to determine if:
   a: the decedent was an immediate family member
   b: The address and phone number of the funeral home handling the funeral arrangements
   c: Whether the family desires to have the inmate attend a visitation with immediate family present.

The decedent must be an immediate family member to the inmate for the process to continue further. If not, the family contacting the prison is advised to write or visit the inmate to inform him of the loss. They will not notify an inmate of a non-immediate family member’s loss.

Before the inmate is contacted for notification, the prison will verify the death of the decedent, as well as the funeral arrangements. If these cannot be verified, the inmate will not be informed their family has contacted the prison, mainly because family members, in the past, have commonly used a notification request when no death has occurred as a method of getting the inmate to call them for some other reason.

Generally, the Chaplain or Staff member will initiate a security assessment pertaining to the details of any potential funeral home visitation. There are specific regulations concerning the availability of such a visitation for a grieving inmate:

a: Any funeral home visitation must not take place when the actual funeral is in progress. Arrangements are generally made with the funeral director for a private viewing, with only immediate family allowed to be in attendance.

b: Inmates are not permitted to attend Religious Funeral Services, nor are they allowed to visit a cemetery. Both are considered security risks.

c: A death-bed visitation may be arranged if the dying individual is
hospitalized. Verification that the ill person is in a terminal and near death condition is made before such a trip is arranged. If a trip is arranged, the visit must occur when normal visiting hours are not in effect, and only immediate family members will be permitted to visit with the inmate and the dying individual.

3) All medium or maximum security level inmates are to be transported in handcuffs and security box, and leg irons. At E.K.C.C and at some other medium security prisons, inmates are dressed in bright orange jumpsuits before being transported to the funeral or hospital location. During the visit, the inmate must remain fully shackled at all times. In addition, the two Correctional Officers accompanying the inmate are to remain with the inmate at all times.

Once the death of an immediate family member has been verified, the inmate will be notified of the loss—usually by a Chaplain. The person in charge of the notification and verification procedures will generally ask the family if they are able to pay for the costs of the trip, which includes the hourly wages of two correctional officers who accompany any inmate going on a funeral or sick-bed visit, and transportation costs. An inmate with sufficient funds on his account can also pay for his own visitation. Alternatively, for indigent inmates and/or when the family is unable to pay for the trip, regulations are in place to allow their funeral trips to be paid out of the inmate canteen fund.
APPENDIX B: ITEMS INCLUDED IN THE Dg-SR INDEX:

Item (1) is a recoded variable combining respondent self-reported religiosity and whether prayer was used as a method of coping with the loss. If a subject's response on item 1A was between "several times a year" and several times a week" and his response on 1B was "some or "a lot", an item score of "0" was coded. If the subject's response on item 1A was the same as above, but his response on item 1B was "none", a score of "1" was coded. All other response combinations were coded as "0". Items (2), (3), and (5) coded a subject's response of "no" with a positive item score of "1", while a response of "yes" was given a score of "0". Item (4) is a recoded variable, where if the subject's response on item (3) was "yes" and his response on item (4) was "less than expected", a score of "1" was given. If subject's response on item (3) was "yes" and his response on item (4) was "more than expected" or "about the same", an item score of "0" was coded. For subjects who recorded a response of "no" on item (3), a score of "1" was given for item (4). For item (6), a subject response of "made it harder" was given a score of "1", while responses of either "made no difference" or "made it easier" were coded as "0". For item (7), a score of "1" was given for a response of "yes" on category 3 through 9, A response of "yes" on category one or two (or both) were coded as "0".

1) [COMBINED ITEMS IN RECODE]

A. How often do you attend Chapel Services?
   0. Never 3. About once a month
   1. Less than once a year 4. About weekly
   2. Several times a year 5. Several times a week

B. How much, if at all, did praying or visiting the Chapel help you adjust to life without this person after their death?
   0. none 1. some 2. a lot

2) Did you attend Chapel services as a way of grieving for your loss?
   1. yes 2. no

3) Did you receive any notes, letters, sympathy cards or prayer cards from relatives or family after this person's death?
   1. yes 2. no

4) [If yes to question 3] Were they more or less or about the same as you expected them to send?
   1. More than expected 2. About the same 3. Less than expected

5) Did you receive any keepsakes or momento's, like pictures of the decedent?
   1. yes 2. no

6) Since being in prison prevented you from helping with this person's care before their death, did this lack of involvement affect your grief in any way?
   1. made it harder 2. made it easier 3. made no difference
7) For the following questions, please read each one, and choose "yes" or "no" depending on whether it did or didn't apply to your grief experience:

1. Went on a Sick Bed Visit
2. Went on a Funeral Home Visitation
3. I was offered a sick bed or funeral home visit but turned it down
4. I went on a sick-bed or funeral visit
5. My sick-bed or funeral home visit was denied for security reasons
6. My visit was denied because it would have been out of state
7. I was notified of this person's death too late to attend the funeral
8. Prison and/or Chaplain officials were not aware I had suffered this loss
9. Decedent was a non-immediate family member
Items (1) and (2) are recoded variables representing an averaged score based on a respondent's perceptions of how much his grief was recognized and helped by external social contacts using a one-to-ten scale (with 1 being the least and 10 being the most). Scores for each external social category were added together, and divided by the number of social agent categories applicable to a given respondent's external social contact structure to yield an averaged score for each of the first two index items ranging from 0 to 10. Respondents with averaged sub-scores of 3.1 to 6.0 were assigned an score of 1 indicating low perceived external social grief recognition or helpfulness, while an averaged sub-score of 3.0 or less resulted in a score of 2 indicating very low recognition or helpfulness. Subjects with an averaged sub-score of 6.1 or greater were viewed as indicating overall substantial or high recognition or helpfulness, and were given an score of zero. Grief respondents were also asked to indicate whether writing letters to family or calling family members helped them cope with and adjust to their loss, and were offered three response categories: none, some, and a lot. For items (3) and (4), responses of "some" were given a score of one, while responses of "none" were given a score of 2. Items (5) through (9) measured inmate perceptions about whether certain aspects of their criminal conviction(s), their incarcerated status, or a perceived isolation from those on the outside affected the amount of attention they received from external contacts after the death of their loved one using a one-to-ten scale (with 1 indicating no perceived importance, and 10 indicating extreme importance) Subjects recording an importance level between 4 and 6 were given a positive score of 1, while those recording an importance level of 7 or greater were given a score of 2. A total index score was calculated by adding together all item scores, dividing this sum by the highest possible score, and multiplying the resulting value by 100 to yield a total score between 0 and 100.

1-5) [Recoded variable totaling the scores on all items and dividing by the number the respondent has indicated is presently alive] On a scale of 1 to 10 (one being "not at all" and ten being "very much") Please say to what extent you feel your grief over this person's death was KNOWN OR RECOGNIZED by the following people:

1. Parent(s) 2. Wife and/or children (if any) 3. Brothers or sisters (if any) 4. Other relatives 5. Your friends on the outside

6-10) [Recoded variable totaling the scores on all items and dividing by the number the respondent has indicated is presently alive] On a scale of 1 to 10 (one being "not at all" and ten being very much") Please say to what extent you feel your grief over this person's death was HELPED OR MADE EASIER by the following people:

1. Parent(s) 2. Wife and/or children (if any) 3. Brothers or sisters (if any) 4. Other relatives 5. Your friends on the outside

11) How much, if at all, did writing letters to family and friends help you adjust to life without this person after their death

1. none 2. some 3. a lot
12) How much, if at all, did talking to people on the phone help you adjust to life without this person after their death?

1. none 2. some 3. a lot

13 through 17) On a scale of 1 to 10, indicate the importance of each item below upon the AMOUNT OF ATTENTION you received from your family after this person's death:

A. The nature of my crime  
B. Being locked-up  
C. They didn't realize my pain  
D. They've pretty much forgotten me  
E. Being so far away from them
APPENDIX D: ITEMS INCLUDED IN THE DG-IS INDEX:

Items (1) through (6) are recoded variables representing respondent perceptions of how much their grief was recognized and helped by internal social contacts using a one-to-ten scale (with 1 being the least and 10 being the most). Subjects recording a recognition or helpfulness level between 4 and 6 were given a score of 1, while those recording a level of 3 or less were given a score of 2. Items (7) through (16) asked the respondent to indicate his agreement or disagreement with statements pertaining to emotional expression between inmates or within the institutional prison environment (using a 4-point Likert-type scale). Answers indicating some agreement were given a score of 1, while complete agreement was scored as 2. Item (17) asked the respondent to indicate how often, if ever, other inmates initiated conversation about the respondent's loss. Responses included "never," "rarely," "sometimes," and "a lot," with "never" yielding a score of 2, and "rarely" a score of 1. All index items were added together, divided by the highest possible score, and multiplied by 100 for an final index score between 0 and 100.

1-3) [Recoded variable totaling the scores on all items and dividing by the number the respondent has indicated is presently alive] On a scale of 1 to 10 (one being "not at all" and ten being "very much") Please say to what extent you feel your grief over this person's death was KNOWN OR RECOGNIZED by the following people:

1. Other prisoners  
2. Prison Staff  
3. Chaplain Staff

APPENDIX D, cont.

4-6) [Recoded variable totaling the scores on all items and dividing by the number the respondent has indicated is presently alive] On a scale of 1 to 10 (one being "not at all" and ten being "very much") Please say to what extent you feel your grief over this person's death was HELPED OR MADE EASIER by the following people:

1. Other prisoners  
2. Prison Staff  
3. Chaplain Staff

7-16) [ALL OF THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS HAD THE FOLLOWING FOUR POSSIBLE RESPONSES AFTER EACH:

1. Completely False  
2. Mostly False  
3. Mostly True  
4. Completely True

A. I would probably avoid asking another inmate who's lost a loved one how he's doing because you never know if it might upset him.

B. As a prisoner, you are rarely given ways to express your emotions with other inmates.

C. I wouldn't know what to say to my roommate if you had just been told a family member had died.

D. There were times when I wanted to bring-up my feelings about this person's death with another inmate, but didn't because I thought it might make him uncomfortable.

E. It made my grief harder that most inmates didn't understand how I was feeling.
F. It's best not to show sadness or act emotional around other inmates if you want to keep their respect.

G. The best thing another inmate can do is to give a grieving inmate time alone to sort things out.

H. Other inmates who've lost a loved one probably try not to let their grief show around other inmates.

I. In prison, you're expected to do everything just like nothing's happened.

J. I find it easy to share or express my emotions with other inmates when I'm sad or depressed about something.

17) How often, if ever, did other inmates bring-up the topic of this person's death before you did in a conversation?
APPENDIX E: ITEMS INCLUDED IN THE DG-IP INDEX

Items (1) through (4) are based upon 4-point Likert-type agree/disagree measures recoded to yield an index item score between 0 and 3. Responses of "mostly disagree" or "completely disagree" received a score of 0, while responses indicating agreement with the item received a score of 3.

Items (5) through (8) are based on 4 questions taken from the Brief Symptom Inventory. Possible response choices included "not at all," "a little bit," "moderately," "quite a bit," and "extremely" based on how much the item had distressed the respondent in the past 7 days. Each of these items were recoded to yield an index item score between 0 and 3, with responses of "not at all" or "a little bit" receiving a score of 0, "moderately" a score of 1, "quite a bit" a score of 2, and "extremely" a score of 3. All item scores were added together, divided by the highest possible score, and multiplied by 100 to yield an index score between 0 and 100.

1-5) [ALL OF THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS HAD THE FOLLOWING FOUR POSSIBLE RESPONSES AFTER EACH:


A. I couldn't help thinking that my situation probably affected this person's health before he/she died.

B. I was ashamed at myself for being unable to be there for this person.

C. I let my family down by not being there for them.

D. I could probably show my emotions sometimes, but the other guys might not be comfortable with it.

5-8) [THE FOLLOWING WERE ITEMS INCLUDED IN THE BRIEF SYMPTOM INVENTORY, WHICH ASKED THE RESPONDENT TO REPORT WHETHER EACH ITEM HAD DISTRESSED OR BOTHERED HIM IN THE LAST SEVEN DAYS USING THE FOLLOWING SCALE]:


A. Feeling that people are unfriendly or dislike you

B. Feeling inferior to others

C. Feelings of worthlessness

D. Feelings of guilt
APPENDIX F: ITEMS INCLUDED IN THE CGIP INDEX

Items (1) through (7) each yielded a sub-score of 1 to 4 using a four point Likert-type true/false construction, while items (8) through (18) generated sub-scores between 0 and 4. The index was scored by adding individual item scores together, dividing by the highest possible score, with the resulting value multiplied by 100 to yield an index score between 7 and 100 (seven items had a minimum value of 1).

1-7) [ALL OF THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS HAD THE FOLLOWING FOUR POSSIBLE RESPONSES AFTER EACH:


A. After this person died, I found it hard to get along with certain members of my family.
B. After this person died, I found it hard to get along with other inmates and staff.
C. I couldn't keep-up with my normal activities for awhile after this person died.
D. After this person died, I lost interest in my remaining family.
E. Sometimes I felt like I was the only one who cared that this person had died.
F. After this person died, I lost interest in many of my activities.
G. Even now, it's painful to recall memories of the person who died.

8-18) [THE FOLLOWING WERE ITEMS INCLUDED IN THE BRIEF SYMPTOM INVENTORY, WHICH ASKED THE RESPONDENT TO REPORT WHETHER EACH ITEM HAD DISTRESSED OR BOthered HIM IN THE LAST SEVEN DAYS USING THE FOLLOWING SCALE]:


A. Feeling easily annoyed or irritated.
B. Feeling that people cannot be trusted.
C. Temper outbursts that you couldn't control.
D. Feeling blocked in getting things done.
E. Feeling blue.
F. Feeling no interest in things.
G. Feeling hopeless about the future.
H. Having urges to beat, injure, or harm someone.
I. Having urges to break or smash things.
J. Never feeling close to another person.
K. Feeling people will take advantage of you if you let them.

...