

CHAPTER I

Introduction

Some women can't hack the game. Their sex lives go down the drain. They can't take the pressures, the loneliness, the feeling of isolation, and trying to communicate with their men through letters. And the prison sets up these rules for visiting. It's wrong to kiss your man. They tell you when you have the legal and moral right to be intimate with your man. And then your old man is continually saying that he doesn't want you to do this or that. You're continually pulled a thousand ways.

—A Prisoner's Wife

When prison doors shut behind married men, their wives, although on the outside, also find themselves "doing time." Feelings of powerlessness, helplessness, and frustration are part of the everyday world of prisoners' wives as they share with their men the critical events of arrest, arraignment, trial, imprisonment, and release. This book is based on interviews with ordinary Vermont women who have endured these traumatic events. Their responses reveal their hardships, their struggles, their losses, but also their resourcefulness in coping with their husbands' criminality, their family and friends, and the prison system.

THE WOMEN SPEAK FOR THEMSELVES

These womens' accounts provide an introduction to the crucial but unexamined issues faced by prisoners' wives. Resistant to extricating themselves from marriages to men who participate in criminal activities, get arrested, and subsequently imprisoned, these women seek ways to explain and cope with their husbands' criminal actions and their consequences. The following discussion took place among four prisoners' wives at a support group meeting. Three of the women were neophytes. Vicki's husband,

Charles, was arrested and convicted for attempted rape; Susan's husband, Tim, was arrested and convicted for armed robbery; Nancy's husband, Kevin, was convicted for rape. The old timer, Tammy, was pregnant when her husband, Mark, was arrested and convicted for possession of stolen property.

VICKI. I did learn that criminals are really people who have problems. I didn't think that way before. I don't think any more, "That bastard's not any good." I don't condone what he did but I do make jokes. Like now, I say, "I'm married to rapist jokes."

People keep asking me how I can stand by Charles. I knew Charles as a person and not as an attempted rapist. He didn't violate me.

NANCY. I felt raped. I felt violated when I learned about it. I kept asking myself, "Why did he hurt me like that?"

SUSAN. I felt a little like that too. I felt that he had done a very selfish thing. He didn't let me in on his feelings. He didn't let me know that he went out and did something criminal. I felt angry that he didn't trust me with his feelings. I felt that if he had trusted me, he wouldn't have done it. He forced me into a position to be hurt. I felt inadequate. I said that I didn't pick up the signs that he was going to get into trouble and that's why he's in jail. It was my fault for not seeing the signs.

VICKI. I didn't have this to contend with. I knew that Charles has this sexual problem. I knew that there was nothing I could do to help him and it was out of my hands. I was glad that he was arrested. I prayed to the Lord that something would happen so that he would try to get some help and when this happened I was glad. I knew he had a problem. He was masturbating and at one point he didn't even care that I knew that he was masturbating.

SUSAN. It's hard for me to get angry about anything. My first reaction to Tim's arrest was the feeling that everything we had together had been destroyed. I felt really bad because I saw everything go down the drain. Then later I got angry at society and the causes that brought Tim to do these things. But I didn't get angry at Tim.

TAMMY. I felt sorry about the way Mark was brought up. He was brought up by his father who was an alcoholic and beat him continually. At eleven Mark was completely on his own. He got in with a bunch of criminals and he doesn't know anything different. I see that his problem is his hanging around this bunch of criminals.

I thought about leaving Mark. I thought about it a lot. But to

me he's really a good guy. He's very intelligent and sensitive. And he now recognizes that he has to get his life in order. He has begun to recognize that he had to carry out his responsibilities and not try to escape them. He knows that he has to do it this time. I won't stand for him going back with those criminals.

SUSAN. I felt that Tim came from an economically depressed situation and he did not know how to solve his problems any other way but to get arrested. He needed to be punished and go to jail. And then he managed to come out the better for it. Tim and I are glad now that it has happened because we are coming out the better for it. He felt that I would have been pulled down by his problems if this hadn't happened.

VICKI. It's hard for the men to believe that we can wait for them. I've never resented waiting for Charles. I've never even considered going out with other men. When he was sentenced and learned that he got 4–10 years, and he hadn't even raped the women, he was terribly upset. He had to go into another room, and I went with him, so that he could change from his own clothes to the allocated clothes. He cried and cried. I've never seen Charles cry. And I was standing there crying also. I knew that he wanted to be punished. He asked to be punished. He wanted help with his problems and that was his way of crying out for "help." I told him that I would wait for him. He said, "You can't wait that long." Then he went on to say that he had always been in a prison all his life. His prison was his mind. Then he said, "When I walk out of here, I'll walk out of here a better man. I'll leave that prison forever." I knew right then and there that I'd wait for Charles and that it would be worth the wait.

Involuntary separation entails many hardships resulting from what some wives consider their worst "punishment"—being separated from their husbands. Ethel gave birth to her sixth child when her husband, Matt, was incarcerated, having been convicted of theft.

All I know is that he's been involved in possession of stolen property and attempted escape. When he was in jail before, it was for possession of stolen property. He said that he's been in and out for the past six years. But I really don't know how many times he's been in.

When he went in this time, he wasn't working. He was getting General Assistance. Now I get more. It bothers him that he's not

able to support us. And that the state is doing his job. It makes him feel more like a man when he can support us. I don't like the idea of being on the State. I don't like the way they treat me. People look down on you because you're on the State. I know that I'm as good as they are. I tried to get a deep freezer on credit. The shopkeeper was all ready to give me the credit and then he asked me how I was going to finance it. When he learned that I was on welfare, the man said that he couldn't help me.

I then received an eviction notice and I had to look for a house. Here I was in Lynchburg, living in the middle of nowhere. I didn't have a car or a phone and I was pregnant and had three little kids. There was no way that I could walk to St. Albert. I got hold of some people in the CEO office and told them my plight. They started to help me. I found this place and finally had some money.

Then it took me a couple of weeks to move in. I had no one to help me. My uncle helped me to move. During the move, we had a major snow storm. All the roads were impassable and so I couldn't get the rest of my stuff from the house into St. Albert for another week. The kids and I had to sleep on the floors without beds or bedding for that week.

I was depressed, upset, and hurt. I didn't know who to turn to. My friends were never around to help me. They were always too busy. There was nothing that Matt could do. I felt all alone. My mother lives in Florida and my sister died and my brother lives in Connecticut. I was more or less alone. I was more depressed than ever. I took it out on the kids. I would argue a lot with them. I was very hard on them. I was punishing them for no reason. I didn't want them around me and to be clinging to me all the time. And they continually clung to me. I guess I ignored them a lot.

I was pretty scared. I felt fearful about being alone. We hadn't even been married a year. Our first anniversary is next month. It's just so hard. This is going to be our first baby. All the other children I had with my first husband.

All I do is go pay bills, go to the doctors and go grocery shopping and once in a while I get to go to Burlington. The rest of the time I spend in this house. I wouldn't mind all this if I had someone to talk to. It's pretty boring not to have anyone to talk to. During the day my friends work and they are pretty busy. I feel closed in.

My temper has gotten shorter with the kids. I snap at them quicker. It seems to be getting harder and harder to handle them.

Maybe it's my imagination but they seem to be different since Matt has gone. They have changed. They seem to challenge me. They keep trying to see how much they can get away with. They seem meaner now and they don't seem to be minding since he's been gone. That might be their way of letting out their anger. Now they are constantly at each other's throats. They aren't minding me as good and they are fighting over nothing.

(At this point in the account, Matt has been transferred to Londonderry which is located within a few miles of Ethel's home.)

But the phone calls help now that he has transferred to Londonderry. He can now talk to them on the phone. He disciplines them over the phone. He talks to me to see what the problem is then he punishes them by not letting them watch TV or go out to play. They're straightening out. It helps because they know that Daddy is close by. When they really haven't been good, I can take them to talk with him now. They are not anxious to have that kind of talk.

I'm not as depressed as I was when he was at Newport. No ways near as much now. I have cut down on writing letters to him. I get to see him now.

When he was at Newport, we could only talk for ten minutes at a time. Now I don't have to worry about the phone bills. The kids get to see him and are happier. He's close by and I can get to him.

Now he calls me up at 6 AM in the morning and that's a nice way to start the day with his voice. Then we talk off and on during the day and he calls me at night before he goes to bed.

We both call. He calls me every morning. He gets me up. When I feel lonely, I call him. Lately, he's been doing most of the calling.

I just want to hear his voice. We have only been married a year and I feel it's our honeymoon. It's bringing us closer. We celebrated our first anniversary and we have the baby now. But this is no way to start a marriage. I know that absence makes the heart grow fonder but I do wish he were home. He has a year to go. He's been in 8 1/2 months now and it's been a killer.

CRISIS AND COPING

Each stage in the criminal justice system is crisis-provoking for prisoners' families. Wives often undergo identity crises. Families

almost always experience abrupt shocks. To some extent, events such as arrest, conviction, imprisonment, and parole are *inherently* crisis-inducing because of their larger connotations. But, in another sense, the crises generated by stages in the criminal justice process are similar to those experienced by families in other cases of enforced separation.

Enforced separation itself generates a series of "crisis points" due to changes in the status and location of family members. At each point, family members must accommodate or adjust to altered circumstances by re-organizing their lives. Their ability to do this successfully depends on both external conditions and the internal resources of their family units.

The events that generate these crisis points are, of course, different for prisoners' families. Stigmatization, the conditions placed on prison visitation, the special difficulties involved in preserving marital commitments, and a variety of other circumstances make prisoners' families' crises quite different from those which impinge on other separated families. But broad similarities remain at the level of the social processes which both types of families undergo and it is important to note where and why these occur.

Almost no work has explicitly dealt with the moral careers of persons formally outside the bounds of institutions but whose lives are strongly affected by them.¹ The moral careers of prisoners' wives are largely defined by the criminalization process² their husbands are undergoing. To the extent that prisoners' wives are emotionally and materially dependent on their husbands, then they too become caught up in the criminal justice system. Thus they share with their husbands the implications that each stage in the criminalization process holds for the self-conceptions of those being processed by it. The moral careers of prisoners' wives parallel the changes taking place in their husbands' identities.

Several researchers have investigated the conditions under which the accused, in the course of being labelled as "criminal," become *stigmatized* and, therefore, treated as "different." According to Goffman (1963), arrest, conviction and incarceration carry so powerful a stigma that it is often difficult for families to avoid it. Thus, when one family member has been stigmatized,

others may face a loss of community respect and increased social hostility as well. Goffman (1963:30) has called this "courtesy stigma" and maintains that it is attached to "... those regarded by others as having a spoiled identity because they share a web of affiliation with the stigmatized." The stories told by prisoners' wives show plainly that "courtesy stigma"—the pall of blame that remains behind after the period of their husbands' arrest, conviction, and initial incarceration—is often one of the heaviest burdens these women must bear. The concept of "criminalization" includes "secondary" effects, in this case, the transfer of stigma to persons not *officially* designated as part of the process.

Male prisoners' stigma extends to their wives who are vulnerable to feelings of shame and who both anticipate and encounter stigmatization within their own communities and within the prison system. In particular, prisoners' wives often perceive themselves as suffering for the "sins" of their husbands.

As prisoners' wives pass through each of the crisis points generated by the criminalization process, they are forced to assess and reassess their husbands' criminal behavior and to employ accommodative techniques to assist in preserving their marriages and making their lives more bearable. Two important strategies involve manipulating definitions of their husbands' behavior and their own relationships to it, and developing lifestyles that allow them to "normalize" their lives. Both strategies are formed in the context of continuous interaction with their husbands and with social control agencies. As such, these forms of accommodation are contingent, in certain critical respects, upon the subcultures out of which prisoners' wives are drawn, on the ways in which police and courts stage and carry out the earliest phases in the criminalization process, on the forms of interaction allowed between inmates and their wives, and on the definitions and strategies employed by social control agencies, generally, in maintaining the system.

Very little is known about the ways in which prisoners' wives' accounts vary in response to external events in their lives.³ The present findings make it clear that wives' accounts relate to the general kinds of coping strategies they use in coming to grips with their husbands' careers. These strategies are

used by the wives in their attempts to preserve their marriages, deter male criminality, and support their husbands. Some wives also devise a range of strategies to maintain the outward appearance of smooth relationships with their husbands as well as with friends and families. Few of these patterns of accommodation are, however, permanent; they are usually modified in the course of wives' ongoing interactions with their husbands. Therefore, over the course of a wife's career there are distinct patterns in the accommodative strategies employed at different stages in the criminalization process.

These wives' accounts reveal that accommodations are made within the context of their particular social milieux. Prisoners' wives respond not only to social control agents, but also to stresses and strains that stem from their socio-cultural backgrounds. Hence, they are likely to draw upon culturally specific notions in determining what they consider to be the most effective accommodations. The majority of prisoners' wives are from the working class. The kinds of accommodations they make to intermittent poverty as well as male criminality are those suggested by working class environments.

The working-class wives' accounts reveal two forms of working-class lifestyles to which they are oriented⁴—"fast-living" and conventional patterns. According to their own accounts, wives perceive "fast living" to include: (1) alcohol and drug abuse; (2) violence, especially wife beating; (3) seeking adventure in criminal and quasi-criminal activities; (4) marital instability, as evidenced by male infidelity and/or separation from their wives; and (5) frequent absences from home with peers, hanging out in local bars, etc. Wives also perceive their husbands' fast-living activities as precursors to criminal activity and subsequent arrest. These women view a conventional lifestyle as characterized by: (1) stable marriages; (2) generally steady employment among men, domestic orientation among women; (3) moderate drinking and drug use; (4) absence of domestic violence; and (5) a feeling of being "respectable" members of their communities.

These typologies provide a useful starting point for discussions of the over-all styles of accommodation prisoners' wives adopt toward the criminal justice system. Howell's (1972) obser-

vations of working class lifestyles is particularly relevant here. He observes, for instance, that these lifestyles represent ends of a continuum and, as such, are highly unstable, easily upset by external events, etc. Prisoners' wives frequently shift their lifestyle orientations towards one or another of these patterns in response to changes in their social situations which are occasioned by changes in their husbands' statuses.

CONTACTS AND COMMITMENT

The traditional conception of prison is that of a "closed system" or "total institution."⁵ "Closed" prison systems are those with policies and practices that, in effect, sever most ties between prisoners and their families, friends, and communities. The thick walls which surround such prisons are thought not only to keep prisoners in, but to keep the rest of the world out. In recent years, however, prisons have begun to allow, and often to encourage, contacts with the outside world. This trend has arisen, in part, from the finding that prisoners with strong family or community ties are less likely to return to prison⁶ and from the observation that inmates with family ties are more tractable. Thus, many prisons have introduced family programs which allow prisoners greater communication with their families and friends through visitation, letters, telephone, and home visits.⁷ Accordingly, such reports have begun to break down the monolithic image of prisons as "total" institutions and to document the effects of such contacts on prisoners' adjustment to prison and parole.

Given this, it is important in describing the everyday worlds of prisoners' wives to examine closely the mechanisms wives and their incarcerated husbands use to maintain their relationships and how these may be reinforced by various types of prison systems. The kinds of contacts between husbands and wives during confinement and parole, and how wives handle these contacts, can influence their husbands' prison experience. Further, the conduct of married prisoners can exert ongoing influences on their spouses' lives on the outside.

Most of the current literature seems predicated on the assumption that contacts between prisoners and their families—

except for occasional visits—are minimal and that ties between inmates and the outside world are almost completely severed. However, these wives' accounts suggest that it is the continuing nature of such contacts that best explains the adjustments prisoners and their wives make to one another and to the situation in which they find themselves. Through their letters, phone calls and, in particular, prison visiting, these couples preserve their commitments to one another and maintain a thread of continuity through this most traumatic and disruptive episode in their lives.

POVERTY AND IMPRISONMENT

Grounded in the multi-dimensional worlds of prisoners' wives, this book raises important issues about women in regard to poverty, social class, and gender. Most recently there has emerged a literature that addresses the increasing poverty of women, especially for women and children who are in transition due to male desertion, divorce, death, etc. These studies are mainly quantitative studies on the "feminization of poverty" and tend to focus on structural trends in our society.⁸ Only a few of these studies,⁹ however, have focused on the economic consequences of divorce on the everyday lives of women and their children. The work presented here fills another important gap in this literature insofar as it contends that a segment of the population of women experiencing poverty are women and children whose status changes abruptly as a consequence of the male's arrest and imprisonment. Imprisonment itself is a socially structured experience which can have some similar economic consequences on the lives of women as well as some consequences which are unique to involuntary separation.

The findings here suggest that imprisonment, as do divorce and family life, reflects the gender-based organization of our society. Wives' accounts reveal that imprisonment exaggerates gender inequities and that imprisonment (as does divorce) necessarily comprises two parallel sets of experiences: those of the prisoners *and* those of their wives. Prisoners' wives' reactions to imprisonment reveal their secondary status in a gender stratified society; their social, legal, and economic status shapes every aspect of their lives. As a consequence, the conclusions drawn by

the women raise questions about the extent to which women have been “liberated” in our society. Most prisoners’ wives concur that in order to achieve conventional and manageable lifestyles, for themselves and their children, they must be married.

METHOD

This report represents a retrospective reconstruction of wives’ accommodations to male criminality, imprisonment, and re-entry. It is based on material gathered from thirty Vermont women: (1) who had lived in common-law or as legally married to their men for at least six months prior to the men’s arrest; and (2) whose husbands served at least six months in prison and had been incarcerated in either of two Vermont correctional facilities (hereafter referred to as Londonderry Correctional Facility, a traditional medium security prison, and as Newport Community Correctional Center, a community-based prison).

Contrary to what one might expect, wives of prisoners are not an easily identified population. Both the sources and the consequences of the stigmatization they experience are hidden; nothing, at first glance, marks them off from the great mass of those in a social welfare agency, a local bar, or a middle class neighborhood. Thus, in order to make contact with them, it is necessary to begin with their husbands.

In the present case, I decided that the most expedient method was to first define the population of “married”¹⁰ men who were incarcerated in the Vermont prison system. From this population I selected men who had not been estranged from their wives at the time of their arrest—since I wanted to study on-going relationships—and who had been in prison for a sufficiently long period of time to become adjusted to the situation.

In order to facilitate contacts with the wives of these men, I decided to focus on a study population within a two-hour drive of Burlington, Vermont, my research base. Two facilities—the Londonderry Correctional Facility and the Newport Community Correctional Center—were most likely to hold married men whose wives would live within the specified area. My sub-group of married prisoners, consequently, was restricted to men drawn from these two facilities.

In theoretical terms, the selection of these two centers was fortuitous. Londonderry Correctional Facility is a traditional medium security prison designed to hold about eighty offenders drawn from throughout the state. It maintains three kinds of programs: diagnostic work for the courts and the Vermont Department of Corrections; medium security incentive-based programs for sentenced offenders; and short-term high security detention. Londonderry was considered the most "closed" prison in Vermont at the time the study was conducted. When prisoners in incentive-based programs have fulfilled their requirements, they are transferred to the community-based center nearest their home. Aside from visiting, emergency telephone use, and correspondence, Londonderry allows prisoners and their wives to make or receive unlimited telephone calls at specified times of the day, and, occasionally, to visit with one another off the prison grounds through the mechanism of supervised day passes. Thus, while relatively more "closed" than other Vermont institutions, Londonderry is by no means a "total institution" in the conventional mold.

As one of four community-based correctional facilities in Vermont,¹¹ Newport Community Correctional Center is structured somewhat differently. It holds, at any one time, approximately 132 men and women. Vermont's community correctional facilities are intended to "provide a bridge" for prisoners back into the free community. Newport is, therefore, charged not only with putting prisoners in touch with the educational, mental health, and employment resources of their communities, but with including prisoners' families in the reintegration process. In order to achieve this second goal, prisoners are granted liberal visiting privileges, unlimited correspondence, and free access to the telephone. In order to encourage prisoners to resume their relationships with their wives and families—as well as roles in the larger community—programs have been designed which include supervised day passes, unsupervised day passes, unsupervised weekend passes, work release, extended furlough and parole. As a community-based program, Newport services offenders who reside within Chittenden County so that they can be in a good position to maintain personal and work-related ties.

These two centers—the Londonderry Correctional Facility and the Newport Community Correctional Center—thus represent the range of variation in “openness” among Vermont prisons. At present, this range is obviously more restricted than in other states. In the last several years, the Vermont prison system as a whole has been informed by a “philosophy of corrections” that emphasizes the preservation of prisoners’ family and social ties as a means of rehabilitating inmates and reintegrating them into their communities after release. Vermont’s only nominally “maximum security” facility (Newfane prison) was closed in 1975.¹² It was a classic “closed” prison in which the routine and monotony of a prisoner’s existence was heightened by strict surveillance of both correspondence and visitation. All other forms of contact with the outside were prohibited. With the implementation of the “new” philosophy, it was no longer needed.¹³

By using married prisoners drawn from these two facilities as the basis for the construction of the study sample, I was able effectively to represent the experiences of the wives of the vast majority of Vermont married prisoners at the time. Therefore, all prison records of both facilities were reviewed.

In order to define a population of currently incarcerated “married men,” interviews were held with all sixty-nine prisoners so identified; sixty-five of them both signed an agreement to participate in this study and provided their wives’ names and addresses. Thirty wives agreed to be interviewed.¹⁴ They are ordinary women who come from all walks of life and represent a cross-section of prisoners’ wives in America today. Twenty-six resided in urban or suburban areas while four lived in the more rural areas. The majority appeared working class and lower class in socio-economic status. Five were classified as middle class since they had at least some college education and/or held white collar jobs, and pursued a middle class round of activities. The wives’ spouses were generally serving short sentences, on average, between six months and two years,¹⁵ primarily for alcohol-related, property crimes. Few men had been convicted of crimes of violence, possession of heroin, or other more serious offenses.

Since this study concerns women’s subjective perceptions and assessments of their experiences with their husbands’ criminal

activities, in-depth interviews were considered the single most important data source. Interviews were conducted with these women a minimum of two times over a twenty-four month period. The interviews ranged in length from three to ten hours, and were designed to elicit wives' perceptions and assessments of their experiences with male criminality, and with the crisis of enforced separation. Since the interviews conducted with the wives followed no rigid or fixed sequence, an interview guide was used to ensure that, while sequence might vary, the same basic topics were raised with each woman—for example, family life prior to arrest, husbands' and wives' history of illegal activities, wives' reactions to male criminality, arrest, and imprisonment, and reunion.

Most interviews were conducted in wives' homes. Only a few were held in my office. During each interview, I was able to take notes without apparently disturbing the wives.¹⁶ There can be some methodological problems with collecting data on a deviant population. Due to the risk of exposure, it might seem that wives married to men who are officially labelled criminals would be less than candid with a researcher. However, my general impression is that, throughout these in-depth interviews, rapport between myself and prisoners' wives was quite good. The majority welcomed me with warmth, curiosity, and enthusiasm. In turn, I felt comfortable working with them. There were several factors, alone or in combination, that seemed to explain their openness. First, in many cases, husbands had told their wives to expect that I would get in touch with them. Hence, possible confusions about my intentions, etc., were minimized from the outset. Second, I had been married to a man who had been incarcerated in various Federal penitentiaries. I shared many experiences, feelings, and reactions with them. Wives repeatedly told me how rare it was that they could relate their reactions to someone who could appreciate the "uniqueness" of their experiences. Finally, since I was a university teacher, many felt that I would be in a good position to interpret these experiences to the conventional world and, perhaps, help others in a similar position. Many participants greeted me by saying, in effect, "Thank God somebody has discovered us! Everybody pays attention to the men. I feel that no one knows we're here and suffering too!"

Endless cups of coffee, whole packs of cigarettes, lot of talking, laughing, weeping, and sharing what was on women's minds—this captures the texture of the interviews. Talking for many hours with women makes the kind of rapport possible that allowed me to delve into places generally hidden from public view. Most wives felt that they had shared a deep part of their lives, their anguish, pain, joys, and boredom with me. I came to like these women and they knew it. And I think they came to regard me, first, as the wife of a prisoner who wanted to know more about the experiences of other prisoners' wives, and only secondly as a woman writing about these experiences.

Two other sources of data should be noted. First, a total of ten group meetings involving prisoners' wives were organized and observed. The primary topics discussed included married life prior to imprisonment, reactions to male criminality and enforced separation, and the prison system. Second, twelve wives contacted me by telephone at least every two weeks. Careful notes were kept on these telephone conversations, which typically lasted from fifteen minutes to an hour. Sometimes wives simply treated these calls as an opportunity to "sound off" to a sympathetic listener; at other times they were seeking help in solving particular problems or trying to mobilize resources.

This combination of research methods has yielded a rich source of data with which to capture the fullness of the lives of these women. Their life stories add to our understanding, not only of the crucial but often unexamined issues in the individual lives of such women, but also of criminals and the criminal justice system. The voices of these women reflect a diversity of experiences and emotional responses, and they speak for all women married to men who are less than they expected.