3-1-1980

A Study of Correctional Officers and Inmates Perception Relevant to Institutional Custody and Treatment

Ronald G. Limbeck
University of Nebraska at Omaha

A STUDY OF CORRECTIONAL OFFICERS' AND INMATES' PERCEPTION RELEVANT TO INSTITUTIONAL CUSTODY AND TREATMENT

A Thesis

Presented to the

Department of Criminal Justice

and the

Faculty of the Graduate College

University of Nebraska

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Arts

University of Nebraska at Omaha

by

Ronald G. Limbeck

March, 1980

ProQuest LLC.
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106 - 1346

THESIS ACCEPTANCE

Accepted for the faculty of the Graduate College, University of Nebraska, in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree Master of Arts, University of Nebraska at Omaha.

Thesis Committee

Name	Department
[illegible]	Criminal Justice
Bill Schofield	Criminal Justice
Mary Jane Evans	Adult Education

Chairman

Date 4/17/80

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to acknowledge my appreciation to the members of my committee. I am especially grateful to Dr. Laurence French, not only for the invaluable technical assistance he provided, but for the knowledge, skill and experience he cared enough to share. I am also indebted to Dr. Mary Jane Even and Dr. William Wakefield for the time and assistance they have offered in directing me toward completion of this project.

For their understanding and their approval for conducting the field research, I am thankful to Mr. Jerry Bolin, Director of the Nebraska Department of Correctional Services, Mr. John Dahm, Assistant Director of Adult Services and Mr. Robert Parratt, Warden of the Nebraska State Penitentiary. In addition, I am particularly grateful to those correctional officers and inmates of the Nebraska State Penitentiary who willingly consented to participate in the survey.

Most importantly, I wish to express my sincerest appreciation to my wife, Sue, for the support, encouragement, and generous supply of patience she has provided. It is to this lovely lady, and to my children Kim and Danny, that I dedicate the effort which I have put into the following pages.

R.G.L.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER I: STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Introduction

This paper presents an exploratory study of institutional corrections policy in general and the nature of such within one state system in particular. Traditionally, correctional institutions have evolved along two lines of thought - custody and treatment. However, the role of the correctional officer has formulated along only one line of thought - custody. Due to the all encompassing nature of the correctional officer position, this imbalance prevents, and may even hamper, treatment potential within the institution.

The purpose of this study is to collect information from correctional officers and inmates within one state correctional facility to see how they perceive:

1. The role of the correctional institution in terms of custody and treatment;
2. The role of the correctional officer in terms of custody and treatment.

While this author is reluctant to posit definite hypotheses concerning these perceptions, certain working propositions are employed.

Proposition I: If the correctional officers and/or inmates perceive the role of the correctional institution as primarily custodial in nature, then those same correctional officers and/or inmates perceive the role of the correctional officer as primarily custodial in nature.

Proposition II: If the correctional officers and/or inmates perceive the role of the correctional institution as primarily treatment in nature, then those same correctional officers and/or inmates will perceive the role of the correctional officer as primarily treatment in nature.

Supplementary Propositions

1. The greater the variance between the correctional officers' and the inmates' perceptions of the role of the correctional officer, the greater will be the social distance between these two groups.

2. The greater the similarities between the correctional officers' and the inmates' perceptions of the role of the correctional officer, the lesser will be the social distance between these two groups.

3. The more the correctional officers and the inmates perceive the role of the correctional officer as custodial in nature, the greater will be the social distance between the two groups.

4. The more the correctional officers and the inmates perceive the role of the correctional officer as treatment in nature, the lesser will be the social distance between the two groups.

5. The more correctional officers and inmates perceive the role of the correctional officer as custodial in nature, the less these two groups will perceive that role as a

rewarding one.

6. The more correctional officers and inmates perceive the role of the correctional officer as treatment in nature, the more these two groups will perceive that role as a rewarding one.

Thesis Methodology

These propositions focus on the two basic correctional components of institutional policy and the role of the correctional officer. These two components are discussed within the Hegalian dialetic methodology, whereby the institutional policy component is labeled the "institutional thesis," while the role of the correctional officer component is called the "correctional officer antithesis." The movement to integrate these two components into a viable correctional policy is termed the "correctional synthesis."

The institutional thesis and the correctional officer antithesis are discussed in Chapters II and III respectively, while the correctional synthesis comprises Chapter IV. Chapter V is a description of the research design followed by the findings in Chapter VI. Chapter VII summarizes the "conclusions" drawn from the study.

The field research is guided by both an "independent" and a "dependent" variable. The former is "correctional institutionalization," the policies and practices associated with the process of maintaining a correctional institution. The dependent variable relates to the role of the correctional officer in these facilities. Both variables are concerned

with two types of modalities - custodial and treatment.

The following are dominant concepts as used throughout the study, and are briefly defined according to general social science standards. Other concepts are defined as needed.

Thesis Concepts

Correctional institution - A "total environmental" facility for incarcerating convicted, adult male felons.

Inmate - A resident of a correctional institution.

Correctional officer - A line staff employee of a correctional institution working directly with inmates performing among other things, the traditional tasks of a prison guard.

Custodial policy (custody) - Prevention of escape and maintenance of internal order in a correctional institution.

Treatment policy (treatment) - Taking active steps to change the behavior of an inmate, such that upon release from the correctional institution, he discontinues performing illegal activities.

CHAPTER II: THE INSTITUTIONAL THESIS

Historical Overview

In the very early years of incarcerating law violators concern focused on the formation of structures and the establishment of programming centered around physical discipline and work.[1] The first such facility is attributed to Bridewell Palace in London, England, a house donated by King Edward II. Initiated in 1555 without any formal set of rules or regulations, it maintained a single purpose of housing "vagrants and lazy harlots."

In 1596, a rectangular building with a large open yard surrounded by cells for inmates was opened for men in Amsterdam called Rasphius. Although strict discipline was enforced by the use of flogging and solitary confinement, it was kept clean, a physician was available to attend to the needs of the sick, and educational and religious instruction was provided.[2]

An octogonal institution was opened in Ghent, Belgium, in 1775. The idea of a well-born Flemmish politician, Jean Jacques Phillippe Vilain XIIII, this structure was built like a wagon wheel fortress. The perimeter was built in the shape of an octagon connected to five spokes protruding from the center. These spokes were divided into housing areas for the administration, serious male criminals, petty offenders, female offenders, and volunteers-pensioners and others needing low-rent living quarters. Inmates were employed and received wages which they kept and were allowed to spend.

The first English cell-prison was built in 1779 in Horsham, Essex, the same year the English Penitentiary Act was passed. This act, espousing prisoner isolation from one another, as well as, hard and servile work, was implemented by the construction of two facilities, one for men, and one for women. As Eriksson states:

> It was intended that the new institutions would be the means "not only of deterring others from the commission of the like crimes, but also of reforming of the individual and insuring them to habits of industry."[3]

In the United States, the history of incarcerating law violators can be divided into six periods:[4]

1. 1790 to 1830, the Early American Prison;
2. 1830 to 1870, the Pennsylvania and Auburn Systems;
3. 1870 to 1900, The Reformatory System;
4. 1900 to 1945, the Industrial System;
5. 1945 to 1965, Post World War II Reconstruction;
6. 1965 to the present, a period of rigorous reappraisal and searching for alternatives.

The first attempts at institutionalization, beginning with the Walnut Street Jail, adopted the early European concepts. Influenced by the Quakers who wished to place "emphasis on penitence and solitary confinement,"[5] the Walnut Street Jail was built in 1773 to house Revolutionary War prisoners for both sides, depending who had it under control. However, as Eriksson states, after the war:

> ...it was turned into a common prison in which not even the sexes were segregated and in which the keeper ran a taproom, as was customary in those days. Terror reigned among the prisoners.[6]

Then, in 1792, a small block of 16 solitary cells was con-

structed in the yard of the jail, allowing it to lay claim as America's first penitentiary.

Prior to this time, in 1787, Dr. Benjamin Rush, one of the signers of the Declaration of Independence had presented a paper to a group of citizens at the home of Benjamin Franklin in which he proposed programming for a new prison. According to him such an institution should have:

> a.) classification of prisoners for housing;
> b.) a rational system of prison labor to make the prison self-supporting, including gardens to provide food and outdoor exercises for the prisoners;
> c.) individualized treatment for convicts according to whether the crimes arose from passion, habit, or temptation, and;
> d.) indeterminate periods of punishment.[7]

Rush's paper set the ground work for what was to follow as America's prisons developed along two basic formats: the Auburn system in New York, begun around 1819, and the Pennsylvania system, begun around 1829.[8]

The Auburn system emphasized single cells with congregate work and meals, and strict silence throughout.[9] The Pennsylvania system on the other hand placed heavier emphasis upon solitary confinement with no congregating of prisoners whether during work, meals, or exercising. Under this system it was felt:

> ...the appropriate way to deal with (criminality) was to remove the culprit from society, and place him in an austere and disciplined environment within which to meditate his way to an upright life.[10]

This type of treatment was later reiterated by the Philadelphia Society for Alleviating the Miseries of Public Prisons. Founded in 1776 by a Quaker, Richard Wiston, to aid Philadelphia prisoners, it disbanded a year later, but was reformed in 1887 with the membership unanimously stating:

> ...solitary confinement to hard labor and total abstinence from alcoholic beverages would prove to be the most effective means of reforming convicts.[11]

In 1876 Zebulon Reed Brockway, the individual given credit for initiating the reformatory idea, became the first warden at the first reformatory, Elmira. Brockway felt a reformatory should: house only first offenders; utilize single cells; have an appropriate dining hall, school, and library; and provide productive, industrial work.[12]

Two major innovations stemming from the Elmira Reformatory include the belief that work should be productive, not just punitive or for the good of the government, and the introduction of an inmate wage system. A man could work at a trade (there were 34 major trades in the institution at one time) and use his earnings to support himself. Except for the first meal and the first issue of clothing, all items had to be purchased. With all the work going on inside the institution, however, the public started to complain due to lack of employment on the outside.[13]

In the early 1900's, large industrial prisons developed in areas of high population, while small, less secure forestry and road camps sprang up in sparsely populated areas. The emphasis during this period was hard labor in industrial and

agricultural production to reduce rising prison costs due to overpopulation and aging facilities. However, this era died away by 1940, primarily as a result of the numerous state and federal laws restricting or limiting sale of prison made goods as unfair competition on the labor market.[14]

After World War II it became apparent prisons were experiencing some severe problems. They were becoming large and overcrowded with low budgets, idle inmates, deteriorating facilities, philosophical conflicts, and lack of rehabilitative programs. These problems compounded until several riots and disturbances shook the system from 1952 to 1955.[15]

Examples of prison unrest since that time can be listed in succession: $2 million in damages to the Oregon State Penitentiary on March 9, 1968; 24 inmates wounded in a sit down strike in the Arkansas State Penitentiary in October, 1968; $140,000 in damages to the Kansas State Penitentiary in June, 1969; one inmate death and 46 wounded inmates resulting from a confrontation at the Indiana Reformatory at Pendleton on September 26, 1969; 100 inmates beaten or shot in February, 1971, in a work stoppage-riot in the Florida Prison; and ultimately the Attica atrocity in September, 1971, resulting in one guard and 42 inmates being killed.[16] The reason for the inmates participation in such activities is summed up by Murton:

> Current prison disorders indicate that the inmates are usually petitioning for humane treatment, better food, adequate medical services, and-incredibly-for "prison reform."[17]

Inmate Life

Inmate life in a correctional institution is a dichotomy between custody and treatment. In order to fully explain this dichotomy, this author, based upon the literature presented and his knowledge of the state system of corrections in Nebraska, will take the liberty of using the Nebraska system as representative of correctional institutions as a whole. This is not to say, of course, that all such systems are the same. However, many of the standard practices occurring in adult institutional corrections today, along with some progressive movements in architecture and programming, can be found in the Nebraska system thus making it a viable example.

An inmate enters the Nebraska system through the Diagnostic and Evaluation Center (D&E), a separate facility housing new committments for approximately a four week period of orientation, testing, counseling, and ultimately, classification. Here, inmates are housed in single rooms, separated according to first or multiple offender status, and denied outside contacts.

A social background is conducted on the man including research into the man's family, education, work history, and criminal record. This information is gathered from other agencies and institutions, correspondence with family and/or acquaintances, and through interviews with the man himself.

Psychological and intelligence testing is designed to develop personality makeup, determine intelligence level, educational functioning and deficiencies. Medical and dental

exams are provided. In addition, representatives from all departments are scheduled to lecture to the men on the various programs available at the institution.

During the inmate's stay in the D & E his behavior is monitored for possible adjustment problems in his permanent living location. This information plus all that gathered is placed with recommendations in the man's record jacket and sent to the Classification Committee. The basic purpose of the D & E is to provide information for classification of the inmate. As a treatment method classification developed strongly shortly after W.W. I becoming a fundamental part of the New Jersey correctional system. Its purpose then, as now, was to provide a study of each individual through detailed educational, medical, psychiatric, psychological, and sociological examinations.[18] Loveland defined it:

> Classification is a method by which the diagnosis, treatment, planning, and the execution of the treatment program are coordinated in the individual case. It is also a method by which the treatment program is kept current with the inmates changing needs.[19]

Jarvis speaks of classification in terms of both security and diagnosis.[20] First, inmates are classified according to maximum, medium or minimum security. Maximum security is imposed on inmates who have been convicted of violent crimes, have long sentences, and are an escape risk, while medium security is designated for those inmates who are seen as having more immediate potential for being placed in trusting situations and eventual minimum security. Mini-

mum security on the other hand, is given to those inmates who the administration thinks will benefit from programs in open facilities such as work release. Secondly, inmates are diagnosed in an attempt to assess the needs of the offender. Through diagnosis, the new inmate is evaluated, a treatment program is developed specifically for him, and he is assigned to a facility where he can best benefit.[21]

Perhaps, two of the most influential innovations in treating the long term incarcerated legal offender, have been the development of: (1) a classification system; and (2) the indeterminate sentence. Many, if not most, of the legal offenders entering correctional institutions (including those in Nebraska) do so with an indeterminate sentence. That is, the judge sets a minimum and a maximum time to be served. At the completion of the minimum time the inmate can be released upon certain stipulations set down by a parole board. These stipulations must be met until the full sentence is served. Violation of any stipulation can mean being placed back in the institution.

The indeterminate sentence perspective is credited to Alexander Maconochie who implemented it for the British at Norfolk prison in the 1840's.[22] In the United States, Michigan passed the first indeterminate sentence law in 1869, and by 1963, thirty-five states, the federal government, and the District of Columbia had indeterminate sentence laws for at least some adult offenders.[23]

Advocates of the indeterminate sentence argue that the trial judge is not in a position to determine how long an

individual should be incarcerated, but those who work with the individual know when best to release him. Those opposed to the indeterminate sentence point out it circumvents the retribution and deterrence factors; disagree that anyone can determine when an inmate is ready for release; thinks it leads to making inmates servile and dependent; argues that it makes inmates suspicious, distrustful, uncertain, and insecure; and even feel that it may have constitutional objections.[24]

After the advent of classification and the indeterminate sentence came numerous attempts at "curing" the inmate through various treatment methodologies. Jarvis lists numerous models in his book Institutional Treatment of the Offender stating:

> The key to treatment is concern for the resocialization of each prisoner. Techniques must be designed to help offenders help themselves.[25]

Fogel, whose Justice Model will be discussed later, feels the same way. He states:

> The state cannot with any degree of confidence hire one person to rehabilitate another unless the latter senses an inadequacy in himself that he wishes to modify through services he himself seeks.[26]

However, this has not always been the case in the past. Mitford offers a valuable critique of the treatment process citing use of force, coercion and lies in an attempt to diagnose a "cure."[27]

The basic premise in the Nebraska system is to provide

the inmate with the necessary provisions to help bring about change within himself. These include counseling, religious activities, education, vocational training, recreation, self-betterment clubs, and the use of volunteers from the community.

Education plays an important role in the Nebraska Department of Corrections because of its lacking in the lives of the inmates.

> Despite their deficiencies in education, the intelligence of men in prison is not markedly different from that of men out of prison.[28]

Both academic and vocational education is provided through a contract with Southeast Community Colleges. Full and part-time academic instruction is offered in preparation for completing the requirements for a General Education Diploma (G.E.D.). In addition, it is also possible to take college courses leading to an Associate Degree in General Studies. Full and part-time vocational courses are available such as auto mechanics, auto body repair, welding, graphic arts, building trades, and refrigeration and air conditioning geared toward job placement upon release.

Presently, counseling at the Nebraska State Penitentiary is by caseload with each institutional counselor having approximately 70 to 80 clients. The counselor's time is spent as a resource person, helping the offender do his time to his best advantage. They assist the man through the proper procedures of getting furloughs, gaining parole, and other aspects of institutional life. In addition, they monitor the

inmate's progress and encourage him to participate in various activities, or refer him to other professionals: doctors, psychiatrists, the chaplain, the legal advisor and the like.

It is difficult to judge the effectiveness of such a counseling program; however, Glaser states of the counseling program in California:

> There seems to be no doubt that the opportunity to "ventilate" feelings in these programs has, on the whole, improved relationships between staff and inmates, as well as helped inmates to get along with each other in the institution.[29]

Leisure time activities, also an important part of an overall program, include physical recreation, hobbies and crafts, television and movies, games, and reading.

> All such activity enriches the prisoners enjoyment of life, enhances his conception of his own worth, and makes his institutional stay more bearable.[30]

Organized intramural sports and contests include softball, basketball, football, weightlifting, boxing, miniature golf, handball and others. Games and hobbies include horseshoes, chess, cards, and dominoes.

Various clubs are available for self awareness and betterment purposes. They are organized and run by the offenders through a staff sponsor, and are self supporting. They include Alcoholics Anonymous, an Art Club, Jaycees, Checks Anonymous, Gavel Club, the Mexican Awareness through Association group, Native American Spiritual and Cultural Awareness group, the Stamp Club, and Harumbee, an Afro-American organization.

And, one of the most important programs in the Nebraska institutions is the Chemical Dependency Program. A voluntary program open to inmates, it provides counseling with the primary purpose:

> ...to aid the individual to become aware of his inner self and his behavior, to begin to think and plan constructively and purposefully and to learn to act in a responsible manner.[31]

Although individuals can be counseled individually, the major process is group therapy. Through interactions with other members, it is believed, growth takes place, leading to the taking of responsibility to one's self. There is no completion of the program while in the institution as maintenance is felt necessary, and upon release a man is referred to a community agency.

When a man enters any correctional institution he assumes the role of an inmate. Clemmer termed this role assumption as prisonization "to indicate the taking on in greater or less degree of the folkways, mores, customs, and general culture of the penitentiary."[32] Through anonymity, subordination, and fear he looks for an easy job, learns the gambling and sex traits of prisoner life, and rationalizes that the little he does receive is owed to him. Unfortunately, such universal characteristics "so disrupt his personality that a happy adjustment in any community becomes next to impossible."[33]

Power is often the "dominating value of the inmate social system."[34] The more power an inmate can acquire of

staff and other inmates, the better living conditions he can expect. Power can best be achieved through money, buying whoever or whatever is necessary, but it can also be acquired through gifts, favors, threats, and violence.

It is this authors contention that a strict custodial policy permeates these conditions through punishment of the inmate by deprivation. Sykes lists some examples of these deprivations as losses of liberty, goods and services, heterosexual relationships, autonomy, and security.[35]

The first and most natural deprivation, his loss of liberty, is actually a double loss, "first by confinement to the institution and second by confinement within the institution."[36] Confinement to the institution physically disables the inmate, denying him the freedom to go where he wants, when he wants. Confinement within the institution places him in a maze of locked doors, barred windows, electronic surveillance equipment, towers and fences. Such confinement can produce loneliness, boredom, and loss of individuality.

The inmate's lack of possessions is his second deprivation. He eats the food given to him, except that which he buys from the canteen or pilfers from the institution or others, wears government issue clothing, and sleeps on a bunk in a cell provided for him. In a world placing great emphasis on material possessions, Sykes points out the offender's:

> ...standard of living can be hopelessly inadequate, from the individual's viewpoint, because it bores him to death or

> fails to provide those subtle symbolic overtones which we invest in the world of possessions.[37]

Third, a man's sex drive does not diminish simply because he is sentenced to prison, yet heterosexual relationships, a third deprivation, is non-existant. Heightened through the mass media, pornography, and their own imaginations, lack of heterosexual contact generates in the offender anxieties about his masculinity, and guilt feelings about his self-image. Participation in homosexual activity, whether voluntary or involuntary, reduces this self-image even more, heading to depression and violence.[38]

Fourth, the legal offender loses autonomy. Deprived of the freedom of self determination, he is regimented into a system of rules and regulations, often not making any sense to him, yet never taking part in their formulation, or even having them explained to him:

> ...the frustration of the prisoner's ability to make choices and the frequent refusals to provide an explanation for the regulations and commands descending from the bureaucratic staff involve a profound threat to the prisoner's self-image because they reduce the prisoner to the weak, helpless dependent status of childhood.[39]

Summary

Throughout history punishment and hard work have dominated the institutional correction of the legal offender in an attempt to deter his behavior. More recently, treatment methods and programs have been implemented to diagnose and help the inmate change his inadequacies. However, the

custodial policies of the institutions have not adequately been incorporated into those of treatment hence resulting in a stalemate in which the inmate is torn between the often contravening philosophies and practices of treatment and custodial policies.

FOOTNOTES

[1]Torsten Eriksson, The Reformers: An Historical Survey of Pioneer Experiments in the Treatment of Criminals. Trans. Catherine Djurklov (New York: Elsevies Scientific Publishing Co., Inc., 1976), pp. 8-9.

[2]Ibid., pp. 13-15.

[3]Ibid., p. 43.

[4]Robert M. Carter, Richard A. McGee, and E. Kim Nelson, Corrections in America (Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Co., 1975), p. 98.

[5]Thomas O. Murton, The Delemma of Prison Reform (New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1976), p. 8.

[6]Eriksson, p. 44.

[7]Carter, McGee, and Nelson, pp. 97-98.

[8]Louis P. Carney, Corrections and the Community (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1977), p. 31.

[9]Murton, p. 8.

[10]Carter, McGee, and Nelson, p. 9.

[11]Eriksson, p. 45.

[12]Ibid., pp. 98-99.

[13]Ibid., p. 102.

[14]Carter, McGee, and Nelson, pp. 101-102.

[15]Ibid., p. 103.

[16]Murton, pp. 29-51.

[17]Ibid., p. 30.

[18]Robert G. Caldwell, Criminology, 2nd ed. (New York: The Ronald Press Co., 1965), p. 522.

[19]Frank Loveland, "Classification in the Prison System," The Sociology of Punishment and Correction, ed. Norman Johnston, Leonard Savitz and Marvin E. Wolfgang (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1962), p. 188.

[20]Dwight C. Jarvis, Institutional Treatment of the Offender (Gregg Division McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1978), pp. 134-147.

[21]Ibid., p. 141.

[22]Ibid., p. 30.

[23]Caldwell, p. 657.

[24]Ibid., pp. 660-661.

[25]Jarvis, p. 167.

[26]David Fogel, "...We Are the Living Proof..." (Cincinnati: The W. H. Anderson Co., 1975), p. 202.

[27]Jessica Mitford, Kind and Usual Punishment: the Prison Business (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1973), pp. 95-117.

[28]Daniel Glaser, The Effectiveness of a Prison and Parole System (Indianapolis: The Bobbs-Merrill Co., Inc., 1964), p. 261.

[29]Ibid., p. 188.

[30]Ibid., p. 283.

[31]Taken from an unpublished report on The Nebraska Penal and Correctional Complex-Chemical Dependency Program, 1976.

[32]Donald Clemmar, "Prisonization," The Sociology of Punishment and Correction, 2nd ed., ed. Norman Johnston, Leonard Savitz and Marvin E. Wolfgang (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1970), p. 148.

[33]Ibid., p. 194.

[34]Lloyd W. McCorkle and Richard Korn, "Resocialization Within Walls," The Sociology of Punishment and Correction, 2nd ed., ed. Norman Johnston, Leonard Savitz and Marvin E. Wolfgang (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1970), p. 411.

[35]Gresham M. Sykes, "The Pains of Imprisonment," The Sociology of Punishment and Correction, 2nd ed., ed. Normal Johnston, Leonard Savitz and Marvin E. Wolfgang (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1970), pp. 447-454.

[36]Ibid., p. 447.

[37]Ibid., p. 449.

[38]Ibid., pp. 450-451.

[39]Ibid., p. 453.

CHAPTER III: THE CORRECTIONAL OFFICER ANTI-THESIS

Historical Overview

Little has been written on the historical role of the correctional officer. One of the earliest examples in the United States, however, is presented by Lewis who describes what an ex-inmate wrote about Newgate prison in New York in 1823:

> ...some keepers set a good example for the inmates, but alleged that many of them were small-minded, intoxicated with their power, vulgar, and occasionally cruel. On the other hand, he argued, it was hard to expect a capable man to lead the life of a turnkey for $500 per year, especially when he had to stay inside the stockade almost constantly and was permitted to visit his family and friends only once every two weeks.[1]

Low salaries also made it difficult to hire a proper staff in Auburn around 1825. The prison had to accept men who lost their jobs elsewhere, or remained only temporarily until they could find better jobs.[2]

Fear of corporal punishment, particularly through the use of flogging, was strongly advocated in the early 1800's to maintain control and discipline within prisons. It was the duty of the line staff "keeper" to administer such punishment, although not all approved of it.[3] And another early duty described by Fogel was the control of contraband.

> Constant frisks and searches had to be undertaken to reduce the number of homemade weapons available to convicts. Other forms of contraband also found their way into the prison and had to be watched for: beer, liquor, newspapers, letters, fresh fruit, etc. Guards were now

> given the impossible task of keeping the prison hermetically sealed.[4]

And Fogel sums up the role of the early correctional officer thusly:

> The guard had a clearer task in the early days. All he needed was a whip or a steel-tipped cane (later a rifle) to administer a lock-step, silent system of prison behavior management. His mission was unambigous: "no escapes, order and silence."[5]

The Correctional Officer Today

In 1976 there were 42,324 correctional officers[6] in charge of 249,408 inmates[7] in state correctional institutions. And with the exception of maintaining silence, this role has changed little. Jacobs and Retsky describe the purpose of today's correctional officer.

> Prevention of escape and riot is the primary task around which the role of the guard is organized. Closely related is maintenance of a modicum of internal order and security.[8]

For the most part, then, correctional institutions are staffed according to the number and location of predesigned security "posts" or positions experience has shown to be necessary to maintain a smooth running operation. Security duties include, among other things, tower duty, escorting dangerous inmates, "shaking down" inmates and living locations for contraband, and counting inmates. In addition, however, an officer can be assigned to run the kitchen or the laundry, supervise a work crew, process in new inmates, or manage a living unit.

Very few people initially anticipate persuing a career

as a correctional officer. Indeed, most correctional officers apply because they are either "in between" jobs, or are in need of a second job. In their study in Illinois, Jacobs and Retsky found that people investigated employment as a correctional officer only after a period of unemployment, a layoff from another job, or a physical accident had eliminated an individual's previous employment.[9]

Like many professions, being a correctional officer has many drawbacks, one of which is the pay. While some officers earn $30,000 per year, with overtime pay, some rural area officers, with no overtime opportunities, take home a mere $100 per week. In 1976, only nine states had starting salaries of $10,000 or more.[10] There can be few career advancement possibilities for those who do become correctional officers. In its paramilitary style, the officer force has a limited number of higher ranks in which to move. The professional positions are closed to them by virtue of their lack of education, as are the administrative positions in many instances. In addition, the job itself continually confronts the officer with crisis situations resulting from the inmates' confinement, family problems, homosexuality, and violence.

Correctional Officer-Inmate Relations

The correctional officer is involved with every aspect of the institution, and thus, every aspect of the inmate's life. As line staff assigned to all phases of institutional activity, it is the correctional officer among all staff, who

most intimately, and routinely, associate with the inmates housed there.

As depicted in Chapter II, institutional life presents special problems for the inmate. Being the most obvious contact inmates have with the institutional staff specifically, and non-inmate personnel in general, the correctional officer can have a strong effect on inmate attitudes.[11] Yet, due to the tradition of authoritarianism in correctional institutions, little positive interaction formally takes place between inmate and officer.[12] Goffman explains this problem:

> When persons are moved in blocks, they can be supervised by personnel whose chief activity is not guidance or periodic inspection...but rather surveillance - a seeing to it that everyone does what he has been clearly told is required of him, under conditions where one persons infraction is likely to stand out in relief against the visible, constantly examined compliance of the others.[13]

Rather than a helping situation, a split arises as the handful of officers try to manage the mass of inmates.

Sometimes the lack of interaction is mandated through official rules and regulations. For example, until recently prison guards at Statesville Prison:

> ...were not allowed either to offer or accept a light from an inmate on the rationale that any non-essential contact, no matter how superficial, ultimately would be corrupting (to the officer).[14]

And California's Departmental rule 3400 states:

> Familiarity. Employees must not engage in undue familiarity with inmates...Whenever

> there is reason for an employee to have personal contact or discussion with an inmate... the employee must maintain a helpful but professional attitude and demeanor.[15]

The purpose of these rules, of course, is to prevent inmate-officer relationships that could threaten the security of the institution under the premise: the less informal contact, the less problems.

Concerning officer-inmate relations, this author has observed that it is certainly easy for a correctional officer to remain aloof and uninvolved with the thoughts, feelings, and activities of individual inmates. It can be reasoned that to do so allows him to react to situations fairly and impartially. It is more difficult for him to be "conned" into performing special favors for inmates which may be against the rules, thus jeopardizing not only his safety, but his employment as well. Non-involvement also leads to an ignorance of the unpleasant activities that are constantly happening around him, allowing him to remain in the job. And finally, if the inmates are not thought of as individuals, then the necessity of working with them; and the responsibility of aiding them in changing their behavior, is non-existent.

The Correctional Officer and Treatment

Correctional officers face a lack of clarity in prison rules and regulations, and contradictory claims about the mission of corrections. As McCorkle states:

> Custody is frequently dismissed as a rather sordid and punitive operation, consisting chiefly of keeping inmates perpetually locked

> counted and controlled. Almost as if in opposition to this, treatment and welfare are described as attempts to introduce freedom and dignity into custody's restrictive, punitive context by the provisions of recreation, education and counseling.[16]

The emergence of treatment as an important aspect of institutional life has questioned and challenged the traditional custodial purpose of correctional institutions. Like the inmates, correctional officers become bewildered at the dichotomy between custody and treatment. They withdraw into their security duties, developing a gap between themselves and treatment personnel.[17] Treatment staff can be partly to blame. Johnson found in a study conducted in two New York prisons that treatment staff there, rarely requested treatment information or assistance from correctional officers.[18]

The correctional officer, not fully accepting treatment methods as being necessary, can become envious of the treatment staff's good relationship with inmates. He resents any insinuation that he is hindering the treatment process by being too strict on the treatment staff's "clients."

> Professionals from the domains of social service and psychology often hold to a view of inmates as individuals with deficiencies that need to be erased so that successful readjustment to the society will be possible. In effect, the success of their career depends on their ability to get along with and to "convert" inmates. Relationships with guards are in no way essential to the careers of treatment personnel. On the contrary, the guards serve as a convenient scapegoat for the lack of success that has attended most efforts at rehabilitation.[19]

In addition, the conflict between custodial personnel and treat-

ment personnel can be utilized by the inmate who sides with treatment in many instances (which is generally safe and to his advantage) and also blames the officer for his not being rehabilitated.

Summary

It is clear that the role of the correctional officer has not drastically changed throughout the years. Indeed, their primary purposes still involves the maintenance of internal order and the prevention of escape. Moreover, their duties continue to involve them in practically every function of the institution, forcing them into close contact with the inmates. Yet, in spite of this involvement, a split remains between correctional officers and inmates, just as it does between correctional officer and treatment personnel.

FOOTNOTES

[1]Walter Lewis, From Newgate to Dannemora; the Rise of the Penitentiary in New York, 1796-1848 (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1965), p. 38.

[2]Ibid., pp. 59-60.

[3]Ibid., p. 60.

[4]David Fogel, "...We Are the Living Proof..." (Cincinnati: The W.H. Anderson Co., 1975), p. 74.

[5]Ibid., pp. 72-73.

[6]Edgar May, "Prison Guards in America," Corrections Magazine, 2 (1976), 4.

[7]Prisoners in State and Federal Institutions on December 31, 1976. National Prisoner Statistics Bulletin SD-NPS-PSF-4. U.S. Department of Justice (Washington D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1978), p. 32.

[8]James B. Jacobs and Harold G. Retsky, "Prison Guard," Urban Life, 4 (1975), p. 7.

[9]Ibid., p. 9.

[10]National Survey of State Correctional Officers taken by Corrections Magazine, 2 (1976), p. 35.

[11]Lloyd W. McCorkle and Richard Korn, "Resocialization Within Walls," The Sociology of Punishment and Correction, 2nd ed., ed. Norman Johnston, Leonard Savitz, and Marvin E. Wolfgang (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1970), pp. 413-414.

[12]Daniel Glaser, The Effectiveness of a Prison and Parole System (Indianapolis: The Bobbs-Merrill Co., Inc., 1964), p. 122.

[13]Erving Goffman, Asylums (Chicago: Aldine Publishing Co., 1961), p. 7.

[14]Jacobs and Retsky, p. 17. Parenthesis are the authors.

[15]May, p. 36.

[16]Lloyd W. McCorkle, "Guard-Inmate Relationships," The Sociology of Punishment and Correction, 2nd ed., ed. Normal Johnston, Leonard Savitz, and Marvin E. Wolfgang (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1970), p. 419.

[17]David Fogel, "...We Are the Living Proof..." (Cincinnati: The W.H. Anderson Co., 1975), pp. 74-75.

[18]Robert Johnson, "Informal Helping Networks in Prison: The Shape of Grass-Roots Correctional Intervention," Journal of Criminal Justice, 7 (1979), p. 56.

[19]Jacobs and Retsky, p. 13.

CHAPTER IV: THE CORRECTIONAL SYNTHESIS

The Totality of Institutional Treatment

Most would agree that the treatment of inmates in correctional institutions should involve a concerted effort by all concerned: administrators, treatment staff, line staff, auxiliary staff, and inmates. Quinny states:

> Any efforts at treating the offender within the prison are affected by its social organization, especially by the relationships of staff members to one another, the relationships of inmates, and the interaction of staff members and inmates.[1]

Generally, inmates need assistance in not only changing their behavior for release, but also in coping with the restricted environment of the correctional institution. It becomes more a matter of the quality of the inmate's institutional life, coupled with his ability to relate to the other inmates, than the number of hours of recreation, education, psychotherapy, and other treatment methods that he is exposed to. McCorkle agrees with Quinny by stating it is the total makeup of the social world that is important in determining whether an inmate will be released back into society "with an intact or shattered integrity."[2]

As noted in Chapter III, the custodial force and the treatment staff often conflict, seeing each other as working in opposite directions, and developing no workable relationships. This can also be true between correctional officers and inmates as the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice found:

> The task of preparing the inmate for re-integration into the community becomes lost in elaborate forms of competition, in covert and corrupting reciprocities between guards and inmates, and in forced maintenance of passivity on the part of inmates. This encourages anger toward-and yet complete dependence on-institutional authority.[3]

Rather than helping the inmates, or working with them to resolve their problems, officers and inmates maintain their traditional roles of the keepers and the kept with no positive results. The President's Commission thus recommended:

> All institutions should be run to the greatest possible extent with rehabilitation a joint responsibility of staff and inmates. Training of correctional managers and staff should reflect this mode of operation.[4]

Fogel in presenting his Justice Model for correctional institutions also:

> ...seeks to engage both the keeper and the kept in a joint venture which insists that the agencies of justice shall operate in a lawful and just manner.[5]

Among other proposals, Fogel suggests the entire institutional organization can be utilized to influence inmates in leading law-abiding lives by treating them in a lawful manner.[6] In simple terms, the institution must teach by example. In addition, and somewhat more radical, inmate and correctional officers must be given a say as to how the institution is to function "with the purpose of improving the quality of life and work in prison."[7] This can be done, Fogel says, through

various formats, but suggests a correctional officer-inmate advisory council of some type.

The Correctional Officer in the Helping Role

Rogers defines the helping relationship as:

> ...a relationship in which at least one of the parties has the intent of promoting the growth, development, maturity, improved functioning, improved coping with the life of the other...one in which one of the participants intends that there should come about in one or both parties, more appreciation of, more expression of, more functional use of latent inner resources of the individual.[8]

And Combs, Avila, and Purkey, stating the goal of the helping professional as "self-actualization," espouse its universality:

> ...This goal is the same for every form of the helping professions whether it be counseling, social work, pastoral care, nursing, teaching, or any of the dozens of other specialties currently recognized in the field.[9]

A good helper has certain qualities he carries into the relationship. One such quality is empathy in which the helper attempts to enter into the world of the client and sense his private personal meanings.[10] The helper must grow to understand the client, then use this understanding as a basis to help the client in his own self-exploration.[11]

Another quality, simply called sincerety by Tyler,[12] is called congruence by Rogers, who through his own clinical research, has found that a helper must be trustworthy and genuine to his client.[13] The helper must always remain him-

self, yet respect the client, allowing him the freedom to develop and mature. Furthermore, this genuineness must be accomplished sensitively and without threat to the client.

The helper must also have respect for his client.[14] He must accept the client for what he is as a person, an individual with potential value, showing genuine interest in him. The helper must be careful not to be judgmental or evaluative.[15] He accepts the entire personality not just parts of it; realizing there is some bad as well as the good. This allows the client to understand that the true source of evaluation, and eventual change, is himself.

In addition to the above qualities, an important skill possessed by an effective helper is the ability to convey the attitudes previously described to the client.[16] It is not enough, of course, for the helper to have the appropriate helping attitudes if the client does not perceive them. Also, not only must the helper be certain he is getting his ideas and thoughts across to the client, but he must be sure he is accepting accurate information from the client by constantly encouraging the eliciting feedback.[17]

As stated earlier, one of the goals of today's correctional institutions is to assist the inmate in changing his behavior to that of a law-abiding individual prior to release. Treatment personnel are clearly helpers in that process while the literature indicates correctional officers are not, but do possess such potential.

One of the fears of custodial personnel is that security

will be lost if correctional officers assume a more permissive treatment status. However, Glaser has found:

> There is ample evidence that control can be achieved by staff without a hostile or superior attitude, and that positive leadership and influence is difficult to achieve without at least a minimum of friendliness and respect.[18]

Summary

In other words, security will not be hampered if correctional officers loosen up in an attempt to aid and/or assimilate the treatment staff. Additionally, it may prove to be more beneficial than strict custodial measures in maintaining order within the institution by reducing tension and stress. Glaser further found that if the correctional officer is to have any influence on the behavior of the inmate, he can do so more through a treatment philosophy than that of strict discipline or punishment.[19]

Johnson found that the correctional officer can be a source of information for the treatment staff.

> The guards job brings him in close proximity to the inmate. His observations and interactions with susceptible men may therefore significantly influence the delivery and impact of ameliorative services.[20]

In his day to day activities, then, the officer can note changes in the mood and routine of the offender which may be of crucial importance to the counselor, psychologist, or other treatment staff member. Cressey agrees that the officer is an excellent observer and referral agent, but suggests going one step further. He states:

> ...under professional direction, they should deal with inmates' minor emotional problems, advise and encourage them to "talk out" their difficulties with the law and with institutionalization, and inspire them by personal example to lead law-abiding lives.[21]

The President's Commission also recognized the helping potential functions of the correctional officer, having potential in formal and informal counseling functions.[22] Implications from the literature point to the correctional officer as doing more than "guarding" if treatment is to take place in correctional institutions.

Many correctional officers themselves feel they are an unused source of treatment, resenting the gap they see between themselves and the treatment staff.[23] Some officers admittedly receive most of their job satisfaction from assisting inmates through the institutional bureaucracy. They straighten an organizational mix-up, direct an offender to the proper services, or perhaps use some influence to get a job for a man in which he can learn something useful.

An example of using correctional officers in the treatment role can be seen in the Vienna Correctional Center in Illinois. There officers share responsibilities with the treatment staff in an attempt to fuse the roles of treatment and custody. Warden Vernon G. Housewright states:

> The staff...must take up the slack for no fenses, no guard towers and no walls. That slack is getting to know the residents, to short circuit their problems before they get out of hand, to understand them, and their problems as human beings.[24]

In addition, an inmate's progress is monitored on the

team concept. This procedure allows every member of the staff, important to the inmate's plan, including the inmate, to have input into the decisions affecting him. The correctional officer, also a member of the team, can share the observations he has acquired from, and the contacts he has made with, the inmate with other team members.

Another approach to using correctional officers in a treatment mode began in Maryland in March of 1974.[25] There, correctional officers are assigned to counseling and case-work management. Officers work in teams of eight with each being assigned seven to ten offenders. Although referrals to the professional treatment staff are allowed, they have been few. Officers are specially trained to deal with offenders' problems being responsible for counseling, program planning, as well as custody.

Summary

For treatment to be effective within correctional institutions a total effort is required by a unified staff. Presently, however, a gap exists between custodial and treatment personnel repressing treatment potential. To close the gap various "helping" qualities must be incorporated into the role of the correctional officer. In addition, various functions must be added to his duties to enhance his relationship not only with the treatment staff, but with the inmates as well. In essence, the correctional officer is his own link between treatment and custody.

FOOTNOTES

[1]Richard Quinny, Criminology: Analysis and Critique of Crime in America (Boston/Toronto: Little, Brown and Company, 1975), p. 242.

[2]Lloyd W. McCorkle, "Guard-Inmate Relationships," The Sociology of Punishment and Correction, 2nd. ed., ed. Norman Johnston, Leonard Savitz, and Marvin E. Wolfgang (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1970), p. 419.

[3]The Challenge of Crime in a Free Society: A Report by the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice. Avon Books (New York: The Hearst Corporation, 1968), p. 415.

[4]Ibid., p. 416.

[5]David Fogel, "...We Are the Living Proof..." (Cincinnati: The W.H. Anderson Co., 1975), p. 207.

[6]Ibid., p. 204.

[7]Ibid., p. 214.

[8]Carl R. Rogers, "The Characteristics of a Helping Relationship," The Helping Relationship Sourcebook, 2nd ed., ed. Donald Avila, Arthur W. Combs, and William W. Purkey (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1977), p. 3.

[9]Donald Avila, Arthur W. Combs, and William W. Purkey, Helping Relationships: Basic Concepts for the Helping Professions (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1971), p. 175.

[10]Carl R. Rogers, "The Interpersonal Relationships: The Core of Guidance," Harvard Educational Review, 32 (4) (1962), p. 419.

[11]Robert R. Carkhuff and Bernard G. Berenson, Beyond Counseling and Therapy (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1967), p. 26.

[12]Leona E. Tyler, The Work of the Counselor, 3rd ed. (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts; Educational Division, Meredith Corp., 1969), p. 37.

[13]Rogers, "Characteristics."

[14]Carkhuff and Berenson.

[15]Rogers, "Characteristics," p. 15, and Tyler, p. 34.

[16]Carkhuff and Berenson, p. 29.

[17]Tyler, p. 38.

[18]Daniel Glaser, The Effectiveness of a Prison and Parole System (Indiannapolis: The Bobbs-Merrill Co., Inc., 1964), p. 132.

[19]Ibid., 146.

[20]Robert Johnson, "Ameliorating Prison Stress: Some Helping Roles for Custodial Personnel," International Journal of Criminology and Penology, (1977), p. 264.

[21]Donald Cressey, "Limitations of Treatment," The Sociology of Punishment and Correction, 2nd ed., ed. Norman Johnston, Leonard Savitz, and Marvin E. Wolfgang (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1970), p. 501.

[22]Challenge, p. 415.

[23]Edgar May, "Prison Guards in America," Corrections Magazine, 2 (1976), p. 47.

[24]Edgar May, "In Illinois Guards Have a Wider Role." Corrections Magazine, 2 (1976), p. 41.

[25]Richard J. Ward and David Vandergott, "Correctional Officers with Caseloads," Offender Rehabilitation, 2 (1) (1977), pp. 31-38.

CHAPTER V: THE SURVEY PROCEDURE

In order to conduct the field research approval was both requested and granted from the Director of the Nebraska Department of Correctional Services through the Assistant Director for Adult Services. The department currently has two adult male institutions, both located in Lincoln. For this study only one, the Nebraska State Penitentiary, was selected because of its traditional use of correctional officers and general style of operation as depicted in the preceding chapters.

Built in the late 1800's this facility houses approximately 560 inmates. Housing for the maximum and medium security inmates is provided in two multi-tiered cellblocks "behind the walls," and for the minimum security inmates in the Trustee Dormitory located outside the walls but within a security fence. The inmates themselves are generally the older, and/or multiple offenders, or first offenders with long sentences and/or violent backgrounds. Racially they breakdown: 53% White, 35% Black, 4% Hispanic, 4% Unavailable.

Approximately 200 correctional officers comprise the custodial staff. Racially they breakdown: 94% White, 3% Black, 1% Native American, 1% Hispanic, and 1% other. Basic qualifications for a correctional officer position is 18 years of age and a high school or General Education Diploma (G.E.D.). Starting salary is $789 per month.

Research Design

The data gathering instrument (see Appendix) was designed after the literature search produced no instrument acceptable for the present survey. A preliminary interview schedule was developed adhering strictly to characteristics found in helping relationships. This interview schedule was administered to a college class of criminal justice students; discussed with an inmate knowledgeable about the institution; and submitted to a psychologist and an associate psychologist working in corrections, as well as two university professors of criminal justice and one university professor of adult educational psychology. It was then decided, and further supported by the literature, that if sufficient understanding of the groups' perceptions were to be acquired, additional information needed to be gathered. The final revised instrument include six categories: general perceptions of corrections; perceptions of the custodial aspect of institutional corrections; perceptions of the treatment aspect of institutional corrections; perceptions of empathy as a treatment variable in the role of the correctional officer; perceptions of trust as a treatment variable in the role of the correctional officer; and perceptions of communication as a treatment variable in the role of the correctional officer.

Survey Administration

A selected stratified sample of correctional officers was asked to complete the interview schedule during "guard mount,"

an informational meeting of all officers on a shift held just prior to going on duty. The officers were told the survey was an effort by the author to gather data for his thesis, that it had been approved by the Warden but was not mandatory to take, and individual's answers would remain anonymous. Data were collected during one guard mount from each shift.

Of those correctional officers approached, 66 (74%) completed an interview schedule resulting in approximately 33% of the correctional officer force being surveyed. Of those who did not comply, several gave no reason, while many stated they did not have enough time (which was especially true for some who came late). Some did not like the wording of the survey instrument, one said his eyesight was too poor, and another had already participated as a student in the control group.

Concerning the inmates, a random sample of 126 (21%) inmate names was collected from a listing of 608 inmates housed in the Trustee Dormitory and the cellblocks. A letter signed by the Administrative Assistant to the Warden introducing the study to the inmates, and requesting their cooperation, was sent to each inmate in the sample. In all, 91 (72%) inmates from the random sample of 126 completed the questionnaire, resulting in 15% of the total Nebraska State Penitentiary population being surveyed.

Data were collected in two sessions. First, passes were sent to 44 inmates housed in the Trustee Dormitory. Of those, 30 (68%) showed up and completed the interview schedule. Again, the inmates were told the survey was an effort

by the author to gather data for his thesis, that it had been approved by the Warden but was not mandatory to take, and individual's answers would remain anonymous. Of those who did not participate, ten refused the pass because they had other activities they wanted to do, and four were unavailable due to institutional needs.

On a separate night the interview schedule was administered to the inmates "behind the walls" after they had been deadlocked in their cells for the night. Of the 82 inmates in this group, 61 (74%) agreed to participate. Of those not participating, the majority were sleeping, one was in the hospital and some refused without giving a reason.

The control group consisted of 68 undergraduate students in an upper level class on corrections on the University of Nebraska-Lincoln campus. This group was used because it was felt the students comprised a responsible informed public not usually directly associated with the other two samples.

The interview schedule was also mailed to 22 top administrators in the Nebraska Department of Corrections, however, their data is not recorded here. Of this group 18 (82%) responded. This sub-sample was used as an internal control among the institutional staff.

The analysis reflects categories of agreement (agree versus disagree) for : (1) the inmate and correctional staff samples; and (2) the inmate, correctional staff and control samples. The statistical analysis involves a test of differences (chi square) along with a supportive test of correlation (contingency coefficient).

CHAPTER VI: THE SURVEY FINDINGS

The survey results were condensed to an agree/disagree format. They are listed according to the six categories of perceptions surveyed.

TABLE I: GENERAL PERCEPTIONS OF CORRECTIONS

13. The role of correctional personnel is a dangerous one:

	Inmate	C.O.	Inmate	C.O.	Control
Agree:	38(54)	55(39)	38(52)	55(38)	37(40)
Disagree:	51(35)	9(25)	51(37)	9(26)	30(27)
C:	.3984		.3379		
X^2:	28.86		28.35		
P:	.001		.001		

14. The "Social gap" between the correctional officers and inmates is considerable:

	Inmate	C.O.	Inmate	C.O.	Control
Agree:	62(65)	51(48)	62(68)	51(49)	56(52)
Disagree:	27(24)	14(17)	27(21)	14(16)	12(16)
C:	.0890		.1311		
X^2:	1.23		3.88		
P:	no sig.		.20		

15. Capital punishment is an effective deterrent and therefore should be continued:

	Inmate	C.O.	Inmate	C.O.	Control
Agree:	20(41)	51(30)	20(38)	51(27)	22(28)
Disagree:	70(49)	13(34)	70(52)	13(37)	46(40)
C:	.4852		.4418		
X^2:	47.43		53.84		
P:	.001		.001		

16. A correctional career is a rewarding one both in terms of pay and status (social recognition):

	Inmate	C.O.	Inmate	C.O.	Control
Agree:	22(22)	17(17)	22(19)	17(15)	10(15)
Disagree:	66(66)	49(49)	66(69)	49(51)	57(52)
C:	0		.1176		
X^2:	0		3.10		
P:	no sig.		no sig.		

20. Most serious criminals are eventually imprisoned:

	Inmate	C.O.	Inmate	C.O.	Control
Agree:	44(45)	35(34)	44(42)	35(32)	29(34)
Disagree:	42(41)	29(30)	42(44)	29(32)	39(34)
C:	.0271		.1004		
X^2:	0.11		2.22		
P:	no sig.		no sig.		

25. Most inmates seem to suffer from some form of serious psychological problems:

	Inmate	C.O.	Inmate	C.O.	Control
Agree:	41(48)	41(34)	41(43)	41(30)	27(36)
Disagree:	47(40)	22(29)	47(45)	22(33)	47(38)
C:	.1855		.2273		
X^2:	5.38		12.26		
P:	.05		.01		

26. The high ricidivism (prison return) rate supports the fact that inmates are "screwed-up" people:

	Inmate	C.O.	Inmate	C.O.	Control
Agree:	18(31)	34(21)	18(28)	34(19)	16(21)
Disagree:	71(58)	28(41)	71(61)	28(43)	52(47)
C:	.3460		.3143		
X^2:	20.53		24.01		
P:	.001		.001		

27. Corrections is strongly supported by the general public:

	Inmate	C.O.	Inmate	C.O.	Control
Agree:	52(43)	23(32)	52(39)	23(29)	23(30)
Disagree:	36(45)	41(32)	36(49)	41(35)	45(38)
C:	.2333		.2360		
X^2:	8.75		12.98		
P:	.01		.01		

32. Prison riots and protest (like Attica) illustrate the unruly nature of inmates and their threat to both society and to correctional officers:

	Inmate	C.O.	Inmate	C.O.	Control
Agree:	11(29)	40(22)	11(24)	40(18)	10(19)
Disagree:	76(58)	24(42)	76(63)	24(46)	58(49)
C:	.4540		.4416		
X^2:	39.20		53.05		
P:	.001		.001		

It would appear correctional officers disproportionately feel their role is a dangerous one (q. 13) while the inmates, who would be the cause of such danger, and the control group, who may have been taught otherwise, disagree. These feelings are reiterated when the groups are asked about prison riots and protest (like Attica) illustrating the threat inmates pose to society and the correctional officers (q. 32). However, the disagreement by inmates and the control group is even greater, while agreement by officers is less, quite possibly because of the extreme example Attica provides.

All three groups strongly agree there is a considerable social gap between inmates and correctional officers (q. 14) with little proportional difference in the results. They all strongly disagree that a correctional career is a rewarding

one (q. 16). Yet inmates seem to feel corrections is strongly supported by the public (q. 27). However, this question may have been ambigious to the inmates. They may be actually saying the public wants legal offenders locked up, and thus are supportive of corrections. Correctional officers and the control group disagree, however, because they may feel a general apathy by the public toward corrections.

Correctional officers tend to think most inmates suffer from serious psychological problems (q. 25), and that the high recidivism rate supports the fact that inmates are "screwed-up" people (q. 26). A fair amount (47%) of inmates also feel most inmates have some psychological problems, but do not relate it to the recividism rates. One reason for this high percentage may be that inmates are continually classified and diagnosed with someone trying to find the "problem." The control group strongly disagrees with both assumptions.

On the question of capital punishment (q. 15) there is a significant difference in the results. Perhaps out of frustration correctional officers strongly agree capital punishment is an effective deterrent and should be continued. More than one officer, however, told this author that they felt capital punishment was not a deterrent, but should continue as a retribution factor. The inmates and the control group strongly disagree.

TABLE II: PERCEPTIONS OF THE CUSTODIAL ASPECT OF INSTITUTIONAL CORRECTIONS

6. The function of prisons are primarily to punish criminal offenders:

	Inmate	C.O.	Inmate	C.O.	Control
Agree:	44(38)	21(27)	44(37)	21(26)	26(28)
Disagree:	44(50)	42(36)	44(51)	42(37)	42(40)
C:	.1606		.1367		
X^2:	4.00		4.17		
P:	.05		.20		

7. Prison security issues must always take precedence to correctional programs:

	Inmate	C.O.	Inmate	C.O.	Control
Agree:	44(58)	60(46)	44(51)	60(41)	30(42)
Disagree:	37(23)	5(19)	37(30)	5(24)	38(26)
C:	.3918		.3756		
X^2:	26.48		35.41		
P:	.001		.001		

11. All inmates should be treated as if they are potentially dangerous individuals:

	Inmate	C.O.	Inmate	C.O.	Control
Agree:	12(37)	51(26)	12(33)	51(24)	18(24)
Disagree:	79(54)	14(39)	79(58)	14(41)	49(43)
C:	.5525		.4926		
X^2:	68.53		71.46		
P:	.001		.001		

22. An important role of prisons is to "correct" the inmates' antisocial (illegal) behavior and this is done best with punishment:

	Inmate	C.O.	Inmate	C.O.	Control
Agree:	18(23)	21(16)	18(20)	21(15)	12(16)
Disagree:	69(64)	41(46)	69(67)	41(47)	56(52)
C:	.1532		.1461		
X^2:	3.58		4.73		
P:	.10		.10		

23. Viable correctional programs for criminal inmates should eventually reduce the need for institutional security:

	Inmate	C.O.	Inmate	C.O.	Control
Agree:	55(43)	19(31)	55(48)	19(35)	45(36)
Disagree:	33(45)	46(34)	33(40)	46(30)	22(31)
C:	.3027		.3074		
X^2:	15.43		22.96		
P:	.001		.001		

28. Long prison terms (5 years or more) are more effective than short terms:

	Inmate	C.O.	Inmate	C.O.	Control
Agree:	22(33)	35(24)	22(29)	35(21)	15(22)
Disagree:	67(56)	29(40)	67(60)	29(43)	53(46)
C:	.2885		.2860		
X^2:	13.89		19.69		
P:	.001		.001		

Inmates are split equally as to whether or not the functions of prisons is to primarily punish legal offenders (q. 6). Correctional officers tend to disagree with the statement providing a significant difference (.05) when the two groups are considered alone. However, the difference is no longer statistically significant (.20) when the control group, who also generally disagrees, is added. The inmates split may be a result of their confusion as to what prisons are supposed to be, and what they actually are.

When the groups were asked whether or not punishment was the best way to "correct" the inmates' antisocial behavior (q. 22) a large percentage in all groups disagreed. This statement may have been ambigious to some inmates who agreed with punishment being a primary function of prisons. They

may have been disagreeing that an important role of prisons was to "correct."

As if in conflict to their responses on punishment in questions 6 and 22, correctional officers believe long prison terms (greater punishment) is more effective than short terms (q. 28). Perhaps, this is the ideal versus the real. Correctional officers realize punishment is not considered effective, and will answer that way, but do not actually believe it. And perhaps being effective to correctional officers means providing retribution (as in capital punishment) and not deterrence. In this question there is a significant difference (.001) between the correctional officers and the other two groups with the inmates and the control group disagreeing in the same or in greater proportion than before.

When it comes to prison security taking precedence over correctional programs (q. 7) there is a strong significant difference (.001) with the correctional officers strongly agreeing, while the inmates and the control group disagree. Similarly, correctional officers feel all inmates should be treated as if they are potentially dangerous individuals (q. 11) while the control group disagrees and the inmate group strongly disagrees.

A majority of the inmate group and the control group think correctional programs for inmates should eventually reduce the need for institutional security (q. 23) while a large majority of correctional officers disagree. One might interpret such results as wishful thinking on the part of the

inmates, idealism on the part of the control group, and a fear of change on the part of the correctional officers.

TABLE III: PERCEPTIONS OF THE TREATMENT ASPECT OF INSTITUTIONAL CORRECTIONS

8. Experiential group therapy (encounter, growth and/or T-Groups) could provide an ideal vehicle for personal development for inmates:

	Inmate	C.O.	Inmate	C.O.	Control
Agree:	64(64)	50(50)	64(67)	50(52)	61(56)
Disagree:	15(15)	11(11)	15(12)	11(9)	5(10)
C:	0		.1438		
X^2:	0		4.35		
P:	no sig.		.20		

9. Experiential group therapy (encounter, growth and/or T-Groups) could provide an ideal vehicle for personal development for correctional officers:

	Inmate	C.O.	Inmate	C.O.	Control
Agree:	56(57)	48(47)	56(61)	48(51)	61(53)
Disagree:	20(19)	15(16)	20(15)	15(12)	5(13)
C:	.0328		.2065		
X^2:	.15		9.13		
P:	no sig.		.02		

10. Experiential group therapy (encounter, growth and/or T-Groups) could provide an ideal vehicle for personal development for mixed groups of inmates and staff:

	Inmate	C.O.	Inmate	C.O.	Control
Agree:	66(59)	35(42)	66(63)	35(46)	57(49)
Disagree:	18(25)	26(19)	18(21)	26(15)	9(17)
C:	.2077		.2681		
X^2:	6.54		16.34		
P:	.02		.001		

12. Inmate treatment should be highly structured i.e., like AA (Alcoholics Anonymous), TA (Transactional Analysis) and Behavioral Therapies:

	Inmate	C.O.	Inmate	C.O.	Control
Agree:	47(56)	48(39)	47(55)	48(39)	41(42)
Disagree:	43(34)	16(25)	43(35)	16(25)	27(26)
C:	.2368		.1906		
X^2:	9.15		8.37		
P:	.01		.02		

29. Chemotherapy, antibuse, electroshock therapy and other forms of B-Mod (behavior modification) should play a significant role in any inmate treatment program:

	Inmate	C.O.	Inmate	C.O.	Control
Agree:	13(22)	24(15)	13(22)	24(15)	17(17)
Disagree:	76(67)	37(46)	76(67)	37(46)	50(50)
C:	.2727		.2294		
X^2:	12.05		12.05		
P:	.001		.01		

31. Most treatment programs in prison are a waste of the taxpayers money and should be eliminated:

	Inmate	C.O.	Inmate	C.O.	Control
Agree:	33(41)	37(29)	33(37)	37(26)	20(27)
Disagree:	56(48)	27(35)	56(52)	27(38)	46(39)
C:	.2082		.2248		
X^2:	6.93		11.65		
P:	.01		.01		

All three groups closely agree that experiential group therapy in the form of encounter, growth and/or T-Groups could provide personal development for inmates and correctional officers in separate groups (qs. 8,9). The inmates and the control group also strongly favor therapy groups comprised of both correctional officers and inmates. The correctional officers, however, although a majority do agree, have a sig-

nificantly large number who disagree. Apparently, some correctional officers feel that mixed groups are less than ideal. Perhaps it poses a threat to their authoritative standards.

A majority of all groups feel inmate treatment should be highly structured (q. 12). However, there is a significant difference in the results due to a disproportionate number of inmates disagreeing and a disproportionate number of correctional officers agreeing. These results could be possible because correctional officers may relate structure to order which they must maintain. Some inmates on the other hand may see structure as being controlling, dominating and submissive.

Physical forms of Behavior Modification (q. 29) are not popular with any group. However, there is a significant difference in the results because of strong disagreement by the inmates and disproportionate agreement by the correctional officers. Inmates are understandably opposed to behavior modification because, like structure, they may feel it puts them in a submissive, uncontrolable role. Some correctional officers, however, may feel it is necessary to take such strong measures (electroshock) to control and "cure" inmates of their anti-social behavior.

A general question was asked about treatment being a waste of the taxpayers' money (q. 31). A majority of the inmate group and the control group disagree, while a majority of the correctional officers agree that treatment is a waste of the taxpayers' money. One would expect inmates to disagree. Even if they felt treatment was not doing anyone any good, at

least it shows someone has an interest in them. Correctional officers, however, along with not seeing immediate treatment benefits, may be envious of the money going into salaries in the area of treatment, while they feel they remain understaffed and poorly paid.

TABLE IV: PERCEPTIONS OF EMPATHY AS A TREATMENT VARIABLE IN THE ROLE OF THE CORRECTIONAL OFFICER

1. A person must know what it is like to be an inmate before he/she can be an effective correctional officer:

	Inmate	C.O.	Inmate	C.O.	Control
Agree:	71(57)	27(41)	71(59)	27(43)	48(44)
Disagree:	20(34)	38(24)	20(32)	38(22)	20(24)
C:	.3526		.3200		
X^2:	22.15		25.56		
P:	.001		.001		

17. Effective correctional personnel must be able to empathize with the inmates he/she encounters:

	Inmate	C.O.	Inmate	C.O.	Control
Agree:	76(73)	49(52)	76(72)	49(51)	53(55)
Disagree:	12(15)	14(11)	12(16)	14(12)	15(13)
C:	.1058		.0954		
X^2:	1.71		2.01		
P:	.2		no sig.		

Only two questions were asked regarding empathy as a treatment variable in the role of the correctional officer. Asked if correctional personnel must empathize with inmates to be effective (q. 17) all groups agree. However, when the question was reworded to state, "a person must know what it is like to be an inmate before he/she can be an effective correctional officer" (q. 1) there is a significant difference.

Inmates and the control group agree, while a majority of the correctional officers disagree.

These results suggest two things. Perhaps the correctional officers do not understand the term empathy. Or, perhaps some correctional officers may agree with the ideal of empathizing with inmates, but in practice do not put it to use.

TABLE V: PERCEPTIONS OF TRUST AS A TREATMENT VARIABLE IN THE ROLE OF THE CORRECTIONAL OFFICER

2. Openness and trust are crucial aspects of staff/inmate interaction:

	Inmate	C.O.	Inmate	C.O.	Control
Agree:	74(69)	45(50)	74(74)	45(54)	66(57)
Disagree:	15(20)	20(15)	15(15)	20(11)	2(11)
C:	.1550		.2708		
X^2:	3.79		17.65		
P:	.10		.001		

18. Correctional staff are most effective when they play the impersonal, authoritarian role:

	Inmate	C.O.	Inmate	C.O.	Control
Agree:	29(35)	32(26)	29(28)	32(20)	9(22)
Disagree:	59(53)	32(38)	59(60)	32(44)	59(46)
C:	.1609		.3008		
X^2:	4.04		21.88		
P:	.05		.001		

30. Counselors, therapists and other correctional personnel must be constantly alert so as not to be "conned" by the inmates:

	Inmate	C.O.	Inmate	C.O.	Control
Agree:	48(62)	58(44)	48(64)	58(45)	51(48)
Disagree:	41(27)	5(19)	41(25)	5(18)	15(18)
C:	.3770		.3377		
X^2:	25.19		28.09		
P:	.001		.001		

A considerable majority of each group agrees that openness and trust are crucial aspects for the correctional officers interaction with inmates (q. 2). However, there is a significant difference (.001) in the results when the control group is included mainly because a greater percentage of the control group than expected agree, while a greater percentage of the correctional officers than expected disagree.

When asked if the correctional staff should be impersonal and authoritarian (q. 18), seemingly the opposite of open and trusting, the inmate group and the control group strongly disagree. These positions are not difficult to understand since the inmates would bear the brunt of such a role, and the control group may be idealistic in this regard. The correctional officers, however, are split in half with a disproportionately larger than expected number of them agreeing. Surely, since their job descriptions require maintenance of order, it is no surprise they feel it necessary to be authoritative.

All three groups agree in majority that "counselors, therapists and other correctional personnel must be constantly alert so as not to be 'conned' by the inmates" (q. 30). At first such agreement from the majority of inmates and a vast majority of the control group is surprising. However, the well publicized survival tactics in total institutions (particularly in gaining release), coupled with the "sympathetic" label applied to counselors and therapists may account for this. Even with each group agreeing, there is a significant

difference (.001) in the results. A larger than expected number of inmates disagree while a larger than expected number of correctional officers agree.

TABLE VI: PERCEPTIONS OF COMMUNICATION AS A TREATMENT VARIABLE IN THE ROLE OF THE CORRECTIONAL OFFICER

3. It is important that correctional officers relate to inmates on a person basis and not just view them as "cons":

	Inmate	C.O.	Inmate	C.O.	Control
Agree:	84(80)	52(56)	84(82)	52(58)	65(61)
Disagree:	7(11)	12(8)	7(9)	12(6)	3(7)
C:	.1574		.2038		
X^2:	3.94		9.66		
P:	.05		.01		

4. Staff/inmate communication should be initiated from the staff and directed toward inmates only through formal channels:

	Inmate	C.O.	Inmate	C.O.	Control
Agree:	52(44)	23(11)	52(35)	23(26)	13(27)
Disagree:	38(46)	42(34)	38(55)	42(39)	55(41)
C:	.4429		.3239		
X^2:	37.82		26.13		
P:	.001		.001		

5. Staff/inmate communication should be open, honest and involved reciprocal (two-way) disclosure:

	Inmate	C.O.	Inmate	C.O.	Control
Agree:	78(75)	51(54)	78(77)	51(56)	63(59)
Disagree:	12(15)	14(11)	12(13)	14(9)	5(9)
C:	.1042		.1532		
X^2:	1.70		5.36		
P:	.20		.1		

19. Effective correctional officers treat all inmates as "cons" maintaining both professional and personal distance between himself/herself and the inmates:

	Inmate	C.O.	Inmate	C.O.	Control
Agree:	35(40)	34(29)	35(32)	34(23)	10(24)
Disagree:	53(48)	31(36)	53(56)	31(42)	58(44)
C:	.1317		.2959		
X^2:	2.70		21.20		
P:	.20		.001		

21. Correctional officers know what is best for inmates and therefore inmate input into correctional programs would only serve to complicate matters:

	Inmate	C.O.	Inmate	C.O.	Control
Agree:	11(17)	19(13)	11(13)	19(10)	4(11)
Disagree:	75(69)	45(51)	75(73)	45(54)	64(57)
C:	.1978		.2559		
X^2:	6.11		15.28		
P:	.02		.001		

24. Effective correctional officers solicit feedback from inmates in decisions relevant to the inmate's personal development:

	Inmate	C.O.	Inmate	C.O.	Control
Agree:	70(72)	53(51)	70(74)	53(53)	60(56)
Disagree:	19(17)	10(12)	19(15)	10(10)	7(11)
C:	.0677		.1166		
X^2:	0.70		3.02		
P:	no sig.		no sig.		

All three groups agree "it is important that correctional officers relate to inmates on a personal basis and not just view them as 'cons'" (q. 3). However, a slightly greater than expected percentage of inmates and control group agree, while a lesser than expected percentage of correctional officers agree.

When asked about officers maintaining their distance between inmates and themselves (a form of non-verbal communication) for the sake of job professionalism (q. 19) there is no significant difference until the results of the control group are considered. A large number of inmates and the control group disagree while a slight majority of officers agree. It is interesting to note the large number of inmates that do agree, possibly because they feel it is easier to do their time with as little custodial contact as necessary.

There is a significant difference on agreement about following formal channels of communication (q. 4). Surprisingly, inmates agree that formal channels from staff to inmates should be followed while the correctional officers and the control group disagree. Perhaps the inmates feel that is the only way to get factual information and avoid the rumor mill while the correctional officer and control groups feel such formalities sidestep the correctional officer and leave the inmate less informed.

There is great agreement among all three groups that what communication there is should be open, honest and two-way (q. 5). However, the inmates and control group agreed in greater numbers than the correctional officers. All three groups disagree that inmates input into correctional programs would only serve to complicate matters (q. 21). However, again the correctional officers do so to a lesser percentage than the other three groups resulting in a significant difference in responses. However, when asked about soliciting "feedback from inmates in decisions relevant to

the inmate's personal development" (q. 24) there is no significant difference with all three groups agreeing. This suggests some ambivalence by the correctional officers as to what part correctional programs have to play in the inmate's personal development.

Summary

Overall, the results of the survey indicate a considerable difference between the perceptions of correctional officers and the inmates. Correctional officers see themselves in a hazardous, unrewarding occupation working with inmates, many of whom they believe to have psychological problems, who are dangerous to the officers and society.

Correctional officers somewhat agree that group therapy could be beneficial to themsleves, inmates and mixed groups of both. They want structured treatment programs, but do not approve of extreme types of Behavior Modification. Generally, however, they think treatment is a waste of the taxpayers' money, and although they do not think punishment corrects anti-social behavior, they are in favor of longer sentences and security measures over treatment programs.

When considering helping characteristics in relation to their role, the correctional officers are somewhat ambiguous. They espouse empathy in the ideal, but deny a need to "know what it is like to be an inmate" before being an effective correctional officer. They indicate a need to be open and trusting, yet are hesitant to give up being authoritative. They maintain there is a "social gap" between themselves and inmates, and it is best for them to be somewhat impersonal in

contact with inmates, but believe inmates could have a say in their own personal development, as well as, input into correctional programs without creating complications.

The inmates on the other hand do see the correctional officer's job as unrewarding, but do not see themselves as having psychological problems, nor being dangerous to the officers or society. They do not think punishment corrects anti-social behavior, are thus opposed to longer sentences and believe treatment programs could eventually reduce the need for security. They think group therapy could be beneficial to inmates, correctional officers, and mixed groups of both; and are in favor of structured programs, but not in the form of extreme Behavior Modification.

Concerning the role of the correctional officer, inmates generally favor empathy, openness and trust over authoritarianism. They apparently want to communicate to correctional officers their concerns relevant to their self-development as well as correctional programs in general while at the same time fully admitting the necessity for correctional staff to be wary of being "conned."

CHAPTER VII: CONCLUSIONS

The first part of the chapter discusses the survey findings in relation to the propositions offered in Chapter I, while the second part of the chapter links the survey findings with the Correctional Synthesis presented in Chapter IV. Lastly, there is a short section on future prospects for continued research of this nature.

The Propositions Discussed

> Proposition I: If the correctional officer and/or inmates perceive the role of the correctional institution as primarily custodial in nature, then those same correctional officers and/or inmates will perceive the role of the correctional officer as primarily custodial in nature.

> Proposition II: If the correctional officer and/or inmates perceive the role of the correctional institution as primarily treatment in nature, then those same correctional officers and/or inmates will perceive the role of the correctional officer as primarily treatment in nature.

Ostensibly, correctional officers seem to view the role of the correctional institution as being primarily "custodial" in nature. Clearly, these perceptions do not strongly support the contention that correctional officers should act in some helping or counseling capacity. Time and again they selected security over treatment while at the same time giving the impression that these two roles are incompatable. However, the responses concerning the helping qualities of empathy, trust, and communication seem somewhat encouraging. It appears correctional officers do believe these qualities

are important in performing their role effectively, thus somewhat identifying with the treatment modality. In essence, since the correctional officers view the role of the correctional institution as being "custodial" in nature, and since they view these helping qualities as being important to performing their role effectively, this author suggests these treatment qualities at least as being important to the security of the institution.

The inmates on the other hand, see the purpose of the institution as being primarily "treatment" in nature. Moreover, they would like to have a say in their own personal development and correctional programs. Furthermore, they feel programming could eventually reduce the need for institutional security. Inmates also favor correctional officers who are empathetic, trusting, communicative, and receptive of feedback as against those who are impersonal and authoritative. This author interprets this to mean inmates prefer a treatment-oriented institutional philosophy along with treatment-oriented correctional officers.

> Supplementary Proposition 1: The greater the variance between the correctional officers' and the inmates' perceptions of the role of the correctional officer, the greater will be the social distance between these two groups.

> Supplementary Proposition 2: The greater the similarities between the correctional officers' and the inmates' perceptions of the role of the correctional officer, the lesser will be the social distance between these two groups.

Both the inmates and the correctional officers agree that there is a considerable social distance between the two

groups. In addition, the results indicate that of the eleven questions concerned with the role of the correctional officers, eight have a statistically significant difference (.05 or greater when the control is included). Consequently, supplementary proposition 1 is strengthened. Yet the results of the survey did not find similarities in the perceptions concerning the correctional officers role, hence rendering supplementary proposition 2 void.

> Supplementary Proposition 3: The more the correctional officers and the inmates perceive the role of the correctional officer as custodial in nature, the greater will be the social distance between the two groups.

> Supplementary Proposition 4: The more the correctional officers and the inmates perceive the role of the correctional officer as treatment in nature, the lesser will be the social distance between the two groups.

Overall, correctional officers see their role as being custodial in nature, while also perceiving a polar social gap existing between themselves and the inmates. The inmates also feel a considerable social gap between the two groups, but differ from the correctional officer sample by perceiving the correctional officer role as being treatment-oriented. This presents a problem of ambiguity in these propositions due to the question of the ideal correctional officer role versus the actual correctional officer role. Perhaps the inmates presently see a social gap because of the existing qualities of the correctional officers. The unanswered question then arises: Would the inmates still see a social gap between them and the correctional officers if the cor-

rectional officers were actually reacting as treatment personnel?

> Supplementary Proposition 5: The more correctional officers and inmates perceive the role of the correctional officer as custodial in nature, the less these two groups will perceive that role as a rewarding one.

> Supplementary Proposition 6: The more correctional officers and inmates perceive the role of the correctional officer as treatment in nature, the more these two groups will perceive that role as a rewarding one.

The data indicates that, while correctional officers perceive their role as being custodial in nature, many apparently do not see it as a rewarding career. Inmates, while perceiving the correctional officers' role as being treatment-oriented, also do not consider it as a rewarding career. Again, perhaps the inmates view the situation as not being rewarding due to the present qualities associated with correctional officers. It would be interesting to see if the inmates still see this role as being unrewarding if the correctional officers were reacting as treatment personnel. Obviously, this question remains unanswered.

Relating the Survey Findings With the Correctional Synthesis

The survey reiterates what the literature already suggests. The data shows a significant difference in the perceptions of inmates and correctional officers concerning the role of the correctional institution and the role of the correctional officer in terms of custody and treatment. Since treatment needs to be a total effort by all concerned,

such differences within the institution provides a substantial stumbling block in treating the inmate. The following suggestions are offered to minimize these differences.

First, the purpose of the institution must be made absolutely clear to both parties. Presumably this would be done through explicit, written policies, procedures, rules, and regulations made easily available to all inmates and correctional officers. Nothing can disrupt any process from the start more than arguing over what the goals are.

Second, the correctional officers position must be upgraded. Correctional officers see time, effort and money being spent on the inmates while their situation is often ignored. Obviously, this enhances the polar hostilities existing between these two groups. As long as they feel they are in an unrewarding, hazardous, low-status job with little public support, correctional officers will not be able to properly perform their duties.

Third, correctional officers should be involved in the treatment process. They are not blind to its potential, just somewhat confused as to its applicability in a correctional institution. For example, correctional officers can be involved in caseload management, offering suggestions and input concerning client inmates, and assisting in treatment planning. First, however, communication between custodial and treatment staffs must be normalized.

Fourth, inmates must be given a say in their self-development as well as the correctional programming in the institution. According to the survey both inmates and

correctional officers agree that inmates should assume responsibility for their own personal development. This is not possible without also having input with correctional programming as well.

The fifth suggestion affects the previous four. In order to ensure total effort and participation this author suggests the establishment of an advisory board to assist the institutional superintendent. It should be comprised of members from both the ranks of inmates and lower level staff. Lower level staff is suggested because, presumably, higher level staff already have access to the decision-making process. Such an advisory board should be comprised of an equal number elected by their peers and should ensure a two-way source of communication between the top administrators and the inmates and line staff.

Possibilities for Further Research

The present study was an effort to gain general information from correctional officers and inmates on their perceptions of the role of the correctional institution and the role of the correctional officer. Since it is general in nature a suggestion for further research would be to scrutinize each area more rigorously. More specific information is certainly needed. Indeed, future researchers might want to be more specific in their time frame, discriminating between that which is desireable and that which is real.

This survey might also be useful in determining the

perceptions of the treatment staff and their relation to inmates and correctional officers. Of particular interest to this author would be the differences and similarities of perceptions between the treatment staff and correctional officers.

This survey might also be utilized, or modified for utilization, and given periodically to samples of staff and inmates to see what changes in perceptions, if any, have occurred. In a sense it might be used to monitor the distance the groups remain from each other thus inhibiting or encouraging a total treatment effort. This, in turn, could be utilized as an indicator of miscommunication, and perhaps as a device for determining apathy, alienation and/or potential hostilities within the institutional environment.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Avilla, Donald, Arthur W. Combs and William W. Purkey. Helping Relationships: Basic Concepts for the Helping Professions. Boston: Allyn and Bason, Inc.

Caldwell, Robert G. Criminology. 2nd ed. New York: The Ronald Press Co., 1965.

Carkhuff, Robert R. and Bernard G. Berenson. Beyond Counseling and Therapy. New York: Hold, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1967.

Carney, Louis P. Corrections and the Community. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1977.

Clemmar, Donald. "Prisonization." The Sociology of Punishment and Correction. 2nd ed. Ed. Norman Johnston, Leonard Savitz and Marvin E. Wolfgang. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1970, pp. 479-483.

Carter, Robert M., Richard A. McGee, and E. Kim Nelson. Corrections in America. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippencott Co., 1975.

Cressey, Donald. "Limitations of Treatment." The Sociology of Punishment and Correction. 2nd ed. Ed. Norman Johnston, Leonard Savitz and Marvin E. Wolfgang. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1970, pp. 501-508.

Eriksson, Torsten. The Reformers: An Historical Survey of Pioneer Experiments in the Treatment of Criminals. Trans. Catherine Djurklov. New York: Elsevies Scientific Publishing Co., Inc., 1976.

Fogel, David. "...We Are the Living Proof..." Cincinnati: The W. H. Anderson Co., 1975.

Glaser, Daniel. The Effectiveness of a Prison and Parole System. Indiannapolis: The Bobbs-Merrill Co., Inc., 1964.

Goffman, Erving. Asylums. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Co., 1961.

Jacobs, James B., and Harold G. Retsky. "Prison Guard." Urban Life, 4(1975), pp. 5-28.

Jarvis, Dwight C. Institutional Treatment of the Offender. Gregg Division McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1978.

Johnson, Robert. "Ameliorating Prison Stress: Some Helping Roles for Custodial Personnel." International Journal of Criminology and Penology. (1977), pp. 263-273.

Johnson, Robert. "Informal Helping Networks in Prison: The Shape of Grass-Roots Correctional Intervention." Journal of Criminal Justice. 7(1979), pp. 53-70.

Lewis, Walter. From Newgate to Dannemora: the Rise of the Penitentiary in New York, 1796-1848. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1965.

Loveland, Frank. "Classification in the Prison System." The Sociology of Punishment and Correction. Ed. Norman Johnston, Leonard Savitz and Marvin E. Wolfgang. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1962, pp. 188-195.

May, Edgar. "In Illinois Guards Have a Wider Role" Corrections Magazine, 2(1976), pp. 41-43.

May, Edgar. "Prison Guards in America." Corrections Magazine, 2(1976), pp. 3-5, 12, 36-40, 44-48.

McCorkle, Lloyd W. "Guard-Inmate Relationships." The Sociology of Punishment and Corrections. 2nd ed. Ed. Norman Johnston, Leonard Savitz and Marvin E. Wolfgang. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1970, 419-422.

McCorkle, Lloyd W., and Richard Korn. "Resocialization Within Walls." The Sociology of Punishment and Correction. 2nd ed. Ed. Norman Johnston, Leonard Savitz and Marvin E. Wolfgang. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1970, pp. 409-418.

Mitford, Jessica. Kind and Usual Punishment: the Prison Business. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1973.

Murton, Thomas O. The Delemma of Prison Reform. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1976.

"National Survey of State Correctional Officers." Corrections Magazine, 2(1976), p. 35.

Prisoners in State and Federal Institutions on December 31, 1976. National Prisoner Statistics Bulletin SD-NPS-PAF-4. U.S. Department of Justice. Washington D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1978.

Quinney, Richard. Criminology: Analysis and Critique of Crime in America. Boston/Toronto: Little, Brown and Company, 1975.

Rogers, Carl R. "The Characteristics of a Helping Relationship." The Helping Relationship Sourcebook. 2nd ed. Ed. Donald Avila, Arthur W. Combs and William W. Purkey. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1977, pp. 3-17.

Rogers, Carl R. "The Interpersonal Relationship: The Core of Guidance." Harvard Educational Review, 32(4) (1962), pp. 416-428.

Sykes, Gresham M. "The Pains of Imprisonment." The Sociology of Punishment and Correction. 2nd ed. Ed. Norman Johnston, Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1970, pp. 447-454.

The Challenge of Crime in a Free Society: A Report by the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice. Avon Books. New York: The Hearst Corporation, 1968.

The Nebraska Penal and Correctional Complex-Chemical Dependency Program, 1976. Unpublished.

Tyler, Leona E. The Work of the Counselor. 3rd ed. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts; Educational Division, Meredith Corporation, 1969.

Ward, Richard J., and David Vandergoot. "Correctional Officers with Caseloads." Offender Rehabilitation, 2 (1) (1977), pp. 31-38.

APPENDIX

INSTRUCTIONS: READ EACH STATEMENT AND THEN RESPOND ACCORDING TO WHAT YOU BELIEVE TO BE THE MOST APPROPRIATE DEGREE OF "AGREEMENT" OR DISAGREEMENT" USING THE OPTIONS AVAILABLE BELOW.

EACH STATEMENT WILL BE FOLLOWED BY A SCALE WITH SIX CHOICES, USE THE CODE BELOW TO IDENTIFY YOUR RESPONSE:

1 = STRONGLY AGREE

2 = MODERATELY AGREE

3 = SLIGHTLY AGREE

4 = SLIGHTLY DISAGREE

5 = MODERATELY DISAGREE

6 = STRONGLY DISAGREE

THERE ARE NO "RIGHT" OR "WRONG" ANSWERS IN THIS QUESTIONNAIRE. IT'S PRIMARY PURPOSE IS TO DETERMINE HOW DIFFERENT GROUPS PERCEIVE CERTAIN CORRECTIONAL SITUATIONS.

THE NUMBERS MERELY IDENTIFY THE ABOVE RESPONSE AND HAVE NO VALUE IN THEMSELVES.

PLEASE DO NOT SIGN THE QUESTIONNAIRE. WE ARE NOT CONCERNED WITH YOUR IDENTITY.

HOWEVER, IF YOU ARE INTERESTED IN THE FINAL RESULTS - CONTACT RON LIMBECK FOR THESE AFTER THE FIRST OF MARCH, 1980.

PLEASE FILL IN THE FOLLOWING:

AGE:_____

RACE: AMERICAN INDIAN_____

BLACK _____

HISPANIC _____

WHITE _____

OTHER _____

YEARS EXPERIENCE IN CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTIONS_____

THANK YOU FOR YOUR ASSISTANCE.

A person must know what it is like to be an inmate before he/she can be an effective correctional officer: 1___2___3___4___5___6___

Openness and trust are crucial aspects of staff/inmate interaction: 1___2___3___4___5___6___

It is important that correctional officers relate to inmates on a personal basis and not just view them as "cons": 1___2___3___4___5___6___

Staff/inmate communication should be initiated from the staff and directed toward inmates only through formal channels: 1___2___3___4___5___6___

Staff/inmate communication should be open, honest and involve reciprocal (two-way) disclosure: 1___2___3___4___5___6___

The function of prisons are primarily to punish criminal offenders: 1___2___3___4___5___6___

Prison security issues must always take precedence to correctional programs: 1___2___3___4___5___6___

Experiential group therapy (encounter, growth and/or T-Groups) could provide an ideal vehicle for personal development for:

(a) Inmates. . . . . 1___2___3___4___5___6___

(b) Correctional Officers . . . . . 1___2___3___4___5___6___

(c) Mixed groups of inmates and staff. . . . . 1___2___3___4___5___6___

All inmates should be treated as if they are potentially dangerous individuals: 1___2___3___4___5___6___

Inmate treatment should be highly structured i.e., like AA (Alcoholics Anonymous), TA (Transactional Analysis) and Behavioral Therapies: 1___2___3___4___5___6___

The role of correctional personnel is a dangerous one: 1___2___3___4___5___6___

The "Social gap" between the correctional officers and inmates is considerable: 1___2___3___4___5___6___

Capital punishment is an effective deterrent and therefore should be continued: 1___2___3___4___5___6___

A correctional career is a rewarding one both in terms of pay and status (social recognition): 1___2___3___4___5___6___

Effective correctional personnel must be able to empathize with the inmates he/she encounters: 1___2___3___4___5___6___

Correctional staff are most effective when they play the impersonal, authoritarian role: 1___2___3___4___5___6___

Effective correctional officers treat all inmates as "cons," maintaining both professional and personal distance between himself/herself and the inmates: 1___2___3___4___5___6___

Most serious criminals are eventually imprisoned: 1___2___3___4___5___6___

Correctional officers know what is best for inmates and therefore inmate input into correctional programs would only serve to complicate matters: 1___2___3___4___5___6___

An important role of prisons is to "correct" the inmates' antisocial (illegal) behavior and this is done best with punishment: 1___2___3___4___5___6___

Viable correctional programs for criminal inmates should eventually reduce the need for institutional security: 1___2___3___4___5___6___

Effective correctional officers solicit feedback from inmates in decisions relevant to the inmate's personal development: 1___2___3___4___5___6___

Most inmates seem to suffer from some form of serious psychological problems: 1___2___3___4___5___6___

The high recidivism (prison return) rate supports the fact that inmates are "screwed-up" people: 1___2___3___4___5___6___

Corrections is strongly supported by the general public: 1___2___3___4___5___6___

Long prison terms (5 years or more) are more effective than short terms: 1___2___3___4___5___6___

Chemotherapy, antibuse, electroshock therapy and other forms of B-Mod (behavior modification) should play a significant role in any inmate treatment program: 1___2___3___4___5___6___

Counselors, therapists and other correctional personnel must be constantly alert so as not to be "conned" by the inmates: 1___2___3___4___5___6___

Most treatment programs in prison are a waste of the taxpayers money and should be eliminated: 1___2___3___4___5___6___

Prison riots and protest (like Attica) illustrate the unruly nature of inmates and their threat to both society and to correctional officers: 1___2___3___4___5___6___