This is to certify that the

dissertation entitled

CORRECTIONAL OFFICER TYPES:

DIMENSIONS, RELATIONSHIPS, AND SOURCES

presented by

MARY ANN FARKAS

has been accepted towards fulfillment
of the requirements for

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY degree in **SSC INTERDISCIPLINARY DOCTORAL PROGRAM WITH A CONCENTRATION IN CRIMINAL JUSTICE AND CRIMINOLOGY**

Major professor

Date **SEPTEMBER 28, 1995**

PLACE IN RETURN BOX to remove this checkout from your record.
TO AVOID FINES return on or before date due.

DATE DUE	DATE DUE	DATE DUE
MAR 0 9 2001		

MSU Is An Affirmative Action/Equal Opportunity Institution

c:\circ\datedue.pm3-p.1

CORRECTIONAL OFFICER TYPES:
DIMENSIONS, RELATIONSHIPS, AND SOURCES

By

Mary Ann Farkas

A DISSERTATION

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

College of Social Science/Interdisciplinary

1995

ABSTRACT

CORRECTIONAL OFFICER TYPES:
DIMENSIONS, RELATIONSHIPS, AND SOURCES

BY

MARY ANN FARKAS

The main purpose of this research was to identify and describe social types among correctional officers and their underlying dimensions. Variability in prison context and its association with officer types was explored by studying two state prisons. The relationship between individual and work variables was also examined and their influence on types. A typology was constructed by the researcher based on four salient themes: orientation to rule enforcement, orientation to exchange or negotiation, extent of norms of mutual obligations, and interest/preference for expansion of their role to include human service delivery. The types were located within the theoretical framework of an organization by Allaire and Firsirotu (1992), in which an organization is viewed as having three interrelated components: the individual actors, a sociostructural system, and a cultural system.

The research method was qualitative which involved an analysis of documents, records, policies, procedures, training manuals, and other relevant material. Interviews were also conducted with correctional officers. In total, eighty-six interviews were completed; seven of these were follow ups to explore an issue in more depth or clarify a finding.

Mary Ann Farkas

The data indicated that there were distinct and varied types among officers in the occupational culture of correctional work. These types were essentially modes of accommodation. There were officer types, "enforcers," "hard asses", and "social isolates" which reproduced the official goals, values, and modes of conduct. Other types, "people workers" and the "consolidated" types modified the formal definitions and imperatives. Still other types were identified by respondents as rejecting or ignoring the formal goals. The distribution of types and characteristics of types varied by prison revealing the importance of prison context. Individual and work variables further distinguished types. The implications in terms of policy and research are examined.

To my beloved husband Jeff,
for believing in me and sharing in my dreams.
To my dear children and parents,
for their boundless love and support.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

And I would finally like to thank the many correctional officers from both research sites who unselfishly gave of heir "off duty" time to interview with me. Their contribution was their candor and interest in talking about their work. Finally, I would like to thank my children, Erika for her typing skills and Tom for his help creating and editing the tables.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF FIGURES

Chapter I

INTRODUCTION

Although there is some research identifying and describing "social types" among correctional officers (see Klofas & Toch, 1982); there has been few scholarly attempts to systematically examine the various dimensions of the roles and their relationship to the formal and informal organization. A social type may be defined as "an idealized concept of how people are expected to act or be. The type may describe the way people should be, should not be, or simply are predicted to be" (Klapp,1971:11). It is differentiated from a *stereotype* because it is a more accurate conceptualization with a base in reality. Social types contribute a variety of personal and group functions: role definition for the individual officer, the development and affirmation of collective norms and values, and clarification of action. A social type is cognitively valuable because it provides a way of orienting oneself to the norms and values of the official structure and the informal culture of an organization.

This dissertation will develop a classification of correctional officers into social types and explore the underlying dimensions of those roles. It will locate the types within the theoretical framework of an organization by Allaire

and Firsirotu (1992) which allows an exploration of the interrelationship between the individual actors, the sociostructural system, and the cultural system. This study will use a comparative analysis of officer types in two state prisons in order to highlight the distinctions in organizational context and their association with types. This will involve an examination of the particular characteristics of each prison and their influence on officer types. Moreover, personal variables, age, race, gender, and education, and work variables, seniority, shift, work assignment (post), and reason for becoming an officer will be specified in order to examine their influence and to further distinguish between types.

This dissertation has 3 basic propositions:

(1). There are distinct types of correctional officers which are shaped by the interplay between the sociostructural system, the cultural system, and the individual actors themselves.

(2). The types are also influenced by the organizational context of the particular prison. Since each prison has distinctive characteristics; the distribution of types will vary accordingly.

(3). Officer types may be further differentiated by certain individual and work variables. This allows a comparison of differences in types by these characteristics.

Need and Significance of the Study

This typology of correctional officers is important for the following reasons. First "classification is the premier descriptive tool. A good classification allows the researcher to provide an exhaustive and perhaps even definitive array of types or taxa," (Bailey, 1994: 12). Classification allows the researcher to describe the sample according to a number of salient underlying dimensions and provides the researcher with a basis of comparison of the similarities and differences across types (Bailey, 1994). In terms of this dissertation, a theory of officer types will provide a broader knowledge of the array and variability of roles among correctional officers (COs). A typology allows a finer analysis and discrimination of the informal roles of an officer, since any formal structure can only label and recognize a limited number of roles (Klapp, 1972). Second, this typology will furnish an awareness of how the context of the prison affects the development of officer types. A variety of organizational characteristics may influence types, such as style of leadership, age of facility, and types of inmates.

Finally, knowledge of the association between individual and work variables and types of officers may have important policy implications. The identification of predominant social types among officers may reflect a variety of factors, such as the emphasis of a particular goal, leadership style, inmate

management philosophy, etc. Depending upon the prevalent type, officials may need to evaluate their objectives in training and policies to determine whether this approach to the job coincides with their goals and values. Membership in the various types may reveal the influence of certain demographic or work variables. This may have recruitment and training implications.

Chapter II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Social Types

A variety of social types are represented in the literature on corrections officers reflecting the historical and philosophical evolution in corrections. Prior to 1956, the role of guard was clearly defined; maintaining security and internal order (Carroll, 1974). Indeed, the term "guard" suggests a custodial identity and function. The change of the title to "correctional officer" reflects the introduction of the rehabilitative philosophy to the field of corrections. For officers, the renewed emphasis on rehabilitation has led to difficulties and confusion in interaction with treatment personnel and in incorporating treatment into their daily activities (Crouch, 1986). Guards essentially perceived counseling as a job for social service personnel and their job to be unrelated to the rehabilitative process (Webb & Morris, 1978). Irwin (1980) describes how officers resented the deflation of their values of strict rules backed by punitive sanctions in handling inmates and distance in relations with inmates. The treatment staff wanted individualized, discretionary decision making tailored to the individual inmate and close interaction with inmates.

> Today the official title of the custodial staff is "correctional officers," a title that both incorporates and symbolizes the conflicting and ambiguous definitions of their current role. As the term "officer" connotes, the custodians remain organized in a military hierarchy, the function of which is to ensure security and order. But the adjective "correctional" connotes an additional expectation of equal priority. In some way the officers are expected to be agents in a rehabilitative process in addition to maintaining security and order (Bowker, 1974: 52).

Much of the research on corrections officers focuses on this polarity between a custodial identity and function and a rehabilitative or human service identity and function. Types are generally described in terms of these polar opposites. The primary dimensions examined are attitudes toward inmates, colleagues, and career stage of the officer.

In order to classify officers, some researchers have developed tables of correctional types based on attitudes toward inmates and/coworkers. Klofas and Toch (1982) surveyed officers in four maximum security prisons regarding their attitudes toward inmates. Twenty-five survey items were designed to measure an officer's "professional orientation" defined as "interest in work beyond pure custody and preference for moderate social distance from inmates" (Klofas & Toch, 1982: 240). The authors developed a typology (2x2 table) based on the combinations of the officers' responses and their estimates of coworkers' responses on seven items[1].

---

[1] The following are the seven items used in Klofas and Toch's survey: (1) the CO's only concern is with prison security; (2) rehabilitation programs should be left to mental health professionals; (3) it's important for a CO to have compassion; (4) the way to get respect from an inmates is to

"A respondent acquires membership in a type by producing the same combination of responses and estimates on 4 or more of the 7 items" (Klofas & Toch, 1982: 246). The authors identified the following types of officers: "subcultural custodians," "lonely braves," the "supported majority," and "discouraged subculturalists".

	% of Respondents who see other as-	
% of Respondents who see self as:	Professional	Not Professional
Not Professional	Discouraged Subculturalists 0%	Subcultural Custodians 21.8%
Professional	Supported Majority 44.5%	Lonely Braves 33.6%

Figure 1 - KLOFAS & TOCH'S TYPOLOGY

"Subcultural custodians" were in the minority of officers, but believed that they were in the majority. They assumed their "anti-inmate perspective" was consensually shared. "Lonely braves" scored "highly professional", however they felt surrounded by hostile conservatives. The "supported majority" were "professional" officers perceiving a high level of professionalism among fellow officers. They believed that a custodial oriented subculture did not exist among correctional

---

take an interest in them; (5) counseling is a job for counselors, not correctional officers; (6) any infraction of the rules should result in disciplinary action; and (7) if a CO wants to do counseling he should change jobs.

officers. The distribution of types varied by seniority and shift. "Subcultural custodians" were clustered in the lowest seniority category and on the night shift. Newer officers were frequently assigned to the night shift. Officers with more seniority worked the day shift which presumably involved more direct inmate contact. They appeared more interested in expanding their roles to include human service delivery.

Klofas (1984) re-examined the notion of a custodial subculture among correctional officers consisting of officers with a shared anti-inmate, procustodial orientation. He argues against such a subculture because: (1) this concept of subculture neglects or "masks" the variability between officers and other groups in the prison organization, (2) where common beliefs are identified they are often opposite those predicted in the subculture model, (3) officers are neither homogeneous nor different enough from other workers to be viewed as a subculture, and (4) applying the concept of a subculture offers only an uncomplimentary stereotype for analyzing personnel issues.

> "The manager who views officers as an undifferentiated mass whose contribution is limited to security is unlikely to tap an officer's interest in human service roles. Potential contributions in counselling, education, vocational training, and athletics - as well as many other areas - will remain either unsolicited or unrewarded and progressive officers may grow discontented in their limited roles" (Klofas, 1984:172).

Klofas believes that applying the concept of an anti-inmate, procustodial subculture does not recognize the diversity among officers and their potential contributions to

correctional work other than primarily custodial tasks.

Kauffman (1988) also used attitudes toward inmates in her classification; however, she included orientation toward fellow officers and its relationship to social types. Officers were typed according to positive, ambivalent, or negative responses to questions regarding inmates and fellow officers[2]. She constructed a 3 x 3 table of types with attitude toward inmates on the vertical axis and attitude toward officers on the horizontal axis. Five types were identified: "pollyannas", "white hats", "burnouts", "hard asses", and "functionaries."

		Attitude	*toward*	*Coworkers*
		POSITIVE	**AMBIVALENT**	**NEGATIVE**
Attitude	**POSITIVE**	*POLLYANNAS*		*WHITE HATS*
toward	**AMBIVALENT**		*FUNCTIONARIES*	
Inmates	**NEGATIVE**	*HARD ASSES*		*BURNOUTS*

Figure 2- KAUFFMAN'S TYPOLOGY

"Pollyannas" were defined as officers who generally had positive attitudes toward officers and inmates. They liked the officers they work with, although they did not always agree

---

[2] "Pollyannas", "White Hats", and "Hard Asses" were considered the "primary types" since most officers began their careers as these types. "Burnouts" and "Functionaries" were considered "secondary types", since they emerged as "consequences" of prison work.

with their behavior toward inmates. "Pollyannas" derived enormous satisfaction in their work through intrinsic factors, helping inmates with institutional adjustment and providing services. "White hats" or "goody two shoes" were the opposite extreme from "hard asses". They were officers who held positive attitudes toward inmates and derived great satisfaction from helping inmates, however they had negative feelings toward other officers. This negative attitude toward fellow officers appeared to stem from a belief that most officers were dispassionate and indifferent toward inmates. "White hats" held the hope of changing the prison from within through their attitudes and behaviors toward inmates.

"Burnouts" are yet another type identified by Kauffman. These officers held a negative orientation to both inmates and officers. Paranoia characterized relations with inmates, while relations with fellow officers were strained. They were unable to cope with the realities of working in prison. The experience of being a correctional officer dominated their behavior; they tended to behave and experience the same feelings outside the prison. Burnouts essentially remained in the job for its extrinsic rewards.

Finally, "functionaries" were officers ambivalent, at worst indifferent, to inmates and officers. They had no desire to help inmates or serve a useful role in society. They worked as an officer simply because they needed a job. They insulated themselves from the social realty of prison by

simply going through the motions or "functions" of the job and not getting involved. This functionary type has also been referred to as a "ritualist" by Crouch and Marquart (1980).

Research has also examined the career stage of correctional officers and its association with types. Webb & Morris (1978) discuss how new guards held positive attitudes and were initially sympathetic toward inmates. They then became "con-wise" through an initiation of "getting burned" or "being conned" by inmates. Kauffman (1988) indicates that officers transition from one type to another as a reflection of a socialization process and moral transformations of officers. Those with positive attitudes toward inmates tended to be "rookies", this attitude underwent a transformation with time and exposure to inmates. Most rookies were initially sympathetic to inmates and opposed their victimization and conditions of confinement. As officers became socialized into the prison environment, they searched for justifications for their emerging hostility and negativism toward inmates. Some officers, the "functionaries", anesthetized themselves from feeling sympathy or kindness toward inmates. "Hard asses" justified their negative attitudes through depersonalizing inmates as a group which was owed no moral obligation.

In contrast, Klofas and Toch (1982) found that newer COs held a more negative orientation toward inmates, but "mellowed" and developed a human service orientation toward inmates as they became accustomed to working with inmates. Owen (1988)

also looked at types as a process or stage which officers undergo. She differs from previous researchers because she sees variability among types at different career stages. Owen also expands her examination of the officer role to include the dimensions of power relations, approaches to rules, and overall adjustment to the authority inherent in the job. "Each type and strategy of the correctional officer is directly related to the individual's alignment to the power structure and material interests, and abilities to get through the day," (Owen, 1988:97).

The career stages of correctional officers are discussed, as well as the influence of these dimensions on the formation and perpetuation of types. Newer officers emphasized rule enforcement, "going by the book". However as the officer solidified his relationships with the prison order, he developed a workable way of solving problems. In many cases, this attempt involved becoming "badge heavy" or overly concerned with one's authority. Owen characterizes this type as a "John Wayne-Clint Eastwood type". This type is out to gain as much power and status within the power hierarchy as possible......They are seen as both humorous and dangerous by others with the 'common sense' of the seasoned worker" (Owen, 1988: 94). Their rule enforcement strategy is marked by arbitrariness and inconsistency. This type held true for male and female officers. Another type identified among newer officers are the "wishy-washy" officers. These are correctional

officers who fear inmates and haven't developed or devised appropriate strategies for working with them. Their approach to rule enforcement is unpredictable, discretionary, and inconsistent (Owen, 1988). The label of "weak" is affixed until the officer shows some evidence of being able to handle himself within prison walls. Those who do not, are not likely to last very long in positions with prolonged direct inmate contact. They may initiate a transfer or be transferred to another post, since they are a problem for supervisory staff. They cannot maintain order in their unit.

The third career stage or "oldtimer phase" for correctional officers spanned a continuum from "good officer" to "weak officer" to "just doing their eight hours."

> "This approach is characterized by the ability to balance and reconcile the conflicts of the institution and the daily routine. These types of workers have developed the common sense to do the job but also recognize the limits of their authority over the prisoners and other workers" (Owen, 1988:95).

The "good officer" is generally represented by older officers, however there may be a few newer officers in this classification. Older officers are viewed as having settled into a niche of "just doing the job", while newer officer may have developed the common sense or a work strategy in a short time. The "professional correctional officer" has more education than his colleagues and is interested in a career with the Department of Corrections. This type is characterized by consistency and lack of favoritism in rule enforcement. Younger officers generally fit in this category.

The "lazy/laid-back officer" is another type classified by Owen. This type does not pull his/her full weight on the job. They are lax with security procedures and easily manipulated by inmates and hence are a danger to security within the prison. The "dirty cop" is still another classification of correctional officer. This CO is distrusted and avoided by coworkers. "Being dirty takes several forms, the most common are doing illegal 'favors' for prisoners, carrying contraband (packing), and having intimate relationships with inmates" (Owen, 1988:96). This officer is also perceived as a danger or threat to institutional security and order.

One study by Zimmer (1986) focused on gender as a key variable influencing the emergence of roles among correctional officers. With the increasing numbers of women entering correctional work, the author claims that distinct roles have emerged among female prison guards in response to problems basic to the job and to women in a nontraditional, predominantly male job. She interviewed 70 female guards in minimum, medium, and maximum security prisons for men. She describes 3 patterns of adaptation or roles identified by women working in men's prisons: the "institutional", "modified", and "inventive" roles. The "institutional role" is a type which adheres closely to the formal rules established by the administration and stressed during academy training. The women gain and maintain inmate compliance by following the established system of rewards and punishments. They strive to

perform their job on an equal basis with male officers, and hence minimize their female status in interactions with inmates, coworkers, and supervisors. The "institutional type" does not have negative attitudes toward inmates, however they do maintain social distance. Interactions with male officers are also formal and impersonal. The women are essentially loners, and have little contact with other male or female officers.

Female officers in the second type, the "modified role," differ from the former type in their belief that women are incapable of performing the job on an equal basis with men. They feel hostility toward female guards who demand equal treatment. The women prefer to work on posts involving less direct contact with inmates because of a belief in their physical limitations and the impropriety of having female guards see nude male inmates. They rely on the assistance and protection of male officers in performing their duties and in preferred assignments to less threatening posts by supervisors. Since the women are dependant on the support and assistance of male officers, they tolerate gender-related remarks or jokes in their presence.

The "inventive role" is the third type of correctional officer identified by Zimmer. These women prefer less social distance from inmates, and seek opportunities for increased interaction. They have integrated counseling into their job; for some, in order to better perform their control functions,

and for others, to help inmates. The women acknowledge their physical limitations in controlling inmates, however they perceive that interpersonal skills, common sense, and even manipulation are effective in gaining compliance. They rely on male inmates for protection from other inmates, since they do not feel male guards will come to their assistance. Because of their good relationships with inmates and more lenient rule enforcement, women in the inventive role have antagonistic relationships with male coworkers.[3]

After reviewing the types presented in the literature, there are certain prevailing social types which have either been mentioned frequently or described in great detail. One such type is the "custodian/subcultural custodian," (Klofas, 1982), "hard ass" (Kauffman, 1988), or "John Wayne-Clint Eastwood type" (Owen, 1988). This officer type constitutes one polar opposite if one envisions a continuum of officers with a "custodial officer" at one end and a "human service" officer at the other end. The "custodian" perceives the work as primarily custodial and emphasizes the themes of coercive authority, toughness, and social distance. Irwin (1980) asserts that a custodial orientation rests upon 3 premises: (1) the primary purposes of prisons are to punish inmates and protect society; (2) prisoners cannot be trusted; and (3) in order to maintain control over prisoners, strict discipline must be maintained.

---

[3] Black and Hispanic women were the exception; they often developed friendly relations with minority male officers based on their mutual antagonism toward White male officers.

"The 'tenets of subcultural wisdom' include the view that
security and control are paramount, that high levels of
social distance from inmates must be maintained and that
the guard must be 'tough, knowledgeable, and able to
handle inmates" (Klofas, 1984 :170).

Attitudes toward inmates are essentially negative. Proving

their authority is paramount (Owen, 1988). These officers feel

the need to project "personal, physical dominance" in order to

maintain respect and authority (Crouch, 1980). They are "badge

heavy," out to gain as much power and status within the prison

power hierarchy as possible (Owen, 1988). Cold indifference in

their interactions with inmates is necessary in order to

protect their physical safety and cope with the situational

exigencies in prison (Kauffman, 1988). This custodial role is

influenced by a mistrust and fear of inmates, and frustration

from repeated hassles with inmates (Webb & Morris, 1978). This

"tough facade" is also present in their relations with fellow

officers. Fear of rejection and a desire to be "one of the

boys" promotes the adoption of a custodial role. It is claimed

that these officers try to conform in word and deed to what

they perceive as the attitudes and beliefs of fellow officers.

"Pluralistic ignorance" refers to the systematic misperception

concerning the orientation of coworkers.[4] This term as applied

to prison guards, is the misperception among officers who are

---

[4] "Pluralistic ignorance" was a term used to describe the
misperceptions of inmates concerning the beliefs of other
inmates. (see Stanton Wheeler, 1958; 1961). Kauffman (1978,
1981) applied the term to correctional officers.

sympathetic toward inmates that they are in the minority; whereas officers who hold negative views toward inmates believe they are in the mainstream of opinion (Kauffman, 1981). Hence dominant norms of behavior represent a particular social reality and conceal other views. Some researchers suggest this custodial type is typically a minority among prison guards (Johnson, 1984; Klofas & Toch (1982).

Another major type is the "functionary" (Kauffman) or "ritualist" (Crouch & Marquart) or "just doing the job" type (Owen). This type has been described already, so a brief sketch is only needed. "Functionaries" have no illusions that they are serving a productive, useful role in society. They have no inclination to strictly enforce rules or to incorporate more human service activities. They have found a niche and are simply going through the motions of the job. The "burnout" (Kauffman) or "discouraged subculturalist" (Klofas & Toch) is another prevailing type in the literature. This type has also been discussed, so a brief characterization will be provided. The "burnout" has a negative orientation toward both inmates, officers, and the administration. They have a basic mistrust and hostility toward both groups. They are unable to cope with the realities of prison and remain in the job for the extrinsic rewards of compensation and benefits.

The "human service officer or "people worker" (Johnson (1984), "supported majority" (Toch & Klofas, 1982), "white hat" (Kauffman, 1988), and the "professional correctional Officer"

(Owen, 1988) is another predominant social type. Johnson (1984) discusses the custodian type as the prison officer's public agenda or primary identity. He suggests that officers have a private agenda or latent identity in which they seek to enrich their job through decreased social distance from inmates and personalized relations.[5] Officers desire to provide human services and refer inmates to appropriate services and programs; however they perceive other officers as custodial which inhibits their feelings of human service (Lombardo, 1985). "Many of these officers get lonely as closet social workers and assume a custodial pose to secure companionship and support" (Johnson & Price, 1981).

These officers rely on interpersonal skills rather than coercion in their interactions with inmates. They seek to advise, support, console, refer, and generally try to assist inmates with institutional and personal problems (Johnson & Price, 1981). Johnson (1979) found in his interviews with correctional officers that some officers took great pride in their ability to play helping roles and were proud that treatment staff routinely turned to them for assistance in managing inmates. Johnson & Price (1981) argue that these types of officers may also stimulate colleagues and inmates to respond to the needs of their fellow human beings.

---

[5] Many correctional officers who stressed human service in their work felt they were violating an unofficial code that calls for a tough custodial pose.

Summary of Research on Correctional Officer Types

Previous research has focused on attitude-based definitions of types. Types of officers have been examined along a continuum from the custodial officer to the human service officer. Attitudes toward inmates and coworkers were used as the sole basis for classification of officers. Their orientation toward rule enforcement, exchange or negotiation, extent of mutual obligations among officers, and their orientation toward human service delivery were left unexplored.

Prior studies have examined certain work variables in relation to officer roles. The association between shift and officer type was investigated. The finding was that custodial officers were clustered on the night shift which involved the least contact with inmates. Research has also emphasized career stage in relation to officer types. Findings are contradictory in this area. Kauffman (1988) and Webb and Morris (1978) found newer officers to hold a more favorable, sympathetic attitude toward inmates. Older officers become hardened or "con-wise" through time and exposure to inmates. Conversely, Klofas and Toch (1982) found newer officers to hold negative attitudes toward inmates and to have a more punitive outlook. More experienced officers "mellowed" and developed a more positive attitude toward working with inmates. Owen (1988) found variability in the career stages of officers depending on the individual officer and their adjustment to the authority inherent in the job. She found newer officers to emphasize rule

enforcement and going by the book. As the officer adjusted to the job, he developed his own workable way of solving problems.

Previous research also examined the individual variable, gender, and roles among correctional officers. Rule enforcement strategy, attitudes toward inmates and coworkers, and orientation toward human service delivery were among the dimensions analyzed. Findings suggested that patterns of adaptation developed in response to problems endemic to the job and to women working in a nontraditional, predominantly male job.

As mentioned earlier, a number of interactional themes between inmates and officers, including orientation toward rule enforcement and exchange or negotiation with inmates,extent of norms of mutual obligation, and interest in expansion of the role to include human service, and their relationship to officer types were not fully explored in prior work. These major themes are present in the occupational culture of correctional work and need to be examined in relation to the official system. My choice of these dimensions will be discussed in greater detail in a subsequent section.

Previous research on correctional officer types also does not locate their findings in any theoretic framework. In addition, the impact of the prison organization on the formation and perpetuation of types needs to be discussed. The variation in the organization, such as leadership style, differences in classification, inmate management strategy, age,

and size, affects opportunities for interaction and the character of interactions with inmates. For instance, Kauffman utilizes a diversity of prison settings, maximum and medium prisons, a reformatory, and even a state hospital. She does not consider how the structural and organizational differences in each setting might affect interactions between inmates and officers and influence the formation of types.

This research will develop a typology of officers based on a number of salient dimensions, such as approach to rule enforcement, which have not been fully examined within the organizational context of the prison. Findings will be interpreted within this context and the theoretical framework of Allaire and Firsirotu (1992) which is elaborated in a subsequent chapter.

Chapter III

THE PRISON ORGANIZATION

It is important to consider the prison, how it varies organizationally and structurally; and its impact on social types among correctional officers in order to analyze the formation and perpetuation of types. It is also important in understanding patterns of interactions between officers and inmates.

The prison is a relatively isolated social system with a structure composed of a superordinate group and a subordinate group. "The mandate given to the prison by society is to isolate those of its members who have been defined as refractory and threatening to the social order" (Grosser, 1968: 9). The ruling group has almost total authority which is not based on any contractual relationship with the ruled; the primary emphasis is on control and domination of the subordinate group (Grosser, 1968). "The struggle for institutional power shapes formal and informal relationships" (Owen, 1988:16). The institution is charged with conflicting functions and directives, rehabilitation vs. control which results in a conflict between the demands of custody and the demands of treatment (Cressey, 1959). No matter what the stated goals or mission of the correctional system or administrator; custody and security are usually the dominant concerns.

The prison is also unique because of its severely overcrowded conditions and the effect of these conditions on

organizational members.[6] Many inmates are double-celled in cells designed for one inmate. Recreation areas, classrooms, and gymnasiums have been converted to dormitories to accommodate the swelling prison population. Overcrowding strains prison resources and staff. Officers must tighten their daily schedule to ensure that large numbers of inmates receive services and programs. Scheduling and supervisory demands strain prison staff. Inmates become angry and irritable waiting for prolonged periods for meals, activities, and programs. Officers must worry about a subsequent violent outburst or a grievance filed.

The potential for violence is another distinctive aspect of the prison environment. Toch (1985) argues that certain contextual features of prison promulgate violence among inmates: payoffs for violent behavior, immunity or protection for aggressors, opportunities for violence, temptations, challenges, and provocations, and justifications for violence. An inmate receives a payoff for violent behavior in the form of accrued status among other inmates. The aggressor secures peer admiration for the violent act as well as for enduring the subsequent punishment in segregation. Immunity or protection is also provided for violent inmates. Strong norms of silence are enforced by inmates. There is an explicit taboo against

---

[6] Federal court orders have been issued against 41 states for overcrowding (Stojkovic & Lovell, 1990). One out of every 7 correctional facilities was under court order or consent decree for conditions related to overcrowding (Fox & Stinchcomb, 1994).

"ratting" to "the man". This results in inmate reluctance to report a violent incident for fear of retaliation.

Toch (1985) also points to the emphasis on routine and predictability in prison in order to maintain order and control. Paradoxically, it is precisely these routines which give rise to opportunities for victimization. Inmate aggressors "map out" the institution for supervision patterns and monitored areas. The author contends that the inmate aggressor is much like the residential burglar who knows home-owner vacation patterns & can plan time and locus of the victimization.

The existence of temptations, challenges, and provocations is another feature of the correctional environment (Toch, 1985). Prison consists of "strong" & "weak" groups of inmates; inmates who are pitted against one another. There are creditors and debtors, exploiters and marks, and rival gangs. The inmate population has become more fragmented and violent with the increasing number of more serious, non-white, younger, often gang-affiliated inmates (Carroll, 1988). Gangs threaten institutional order and security (Hunt, Riegal, Morales, & Waldorf, 1993). Organized along racial, ethnic, and geographic lines, gangs are responsible for much of the violence and illegal activity in many prisons (Hunt, et al.,1993). Rival gang membership may be a primary justification for violent behavior in prison. Other justifications may include the status of the inmate as "tough". Other inmates may feel the

need to challenge that "toughness" to increase their status. Conversely, the status of an inmate as "weak" may provoke further victimization.

There is also the potential for violent interaction between officers and inmates. Correctional officers may resort to the use of force when other attempts at gaining inmate compliance have failed. Marquart (1986) found prison guards relied on physical coercion as a functional response to a situation. A "willingness to fight" inmates was a way to gain acceptance among colleagues. However, there are certainly norms among officers concerning when to use force with inmates. The use of coercion by officers is also limited by the following factors. Officers cannot rely on force since they are vastly outnumbered and unarmed in prison. A forceful overture might provoke an answering response from inmate(s). The use of force is limited legally. The courts have generally ruled that the use of force against prisoners may be justified under the following conditions: self-defense, defense of a fellow officer, visitor, or inmate, to maintain order and enforce institutional rules, to prevent crime, and to prevent escapes[7] (Stojkovic & Lovell, 1990).

Institutional reforms also constrain the use of force against inmates, such as ombudsman and inmate grievance committees. These reforms are now part of policy and procedure

---

[7] The *necessity* of the use of force at the time of the incident and the *reasonableness* of the degree of force are the deciding factors in legal cases.

in most institutions. In addition, norms of secrecy among inmates, as well as officers, promulgates violence and a segmentation between the two groups. The strong inmate code of silence, "never rat on another inmate" and "don't cooperate with prison officials" has been discussed in prison literature (eg. Carroll, 1974; Irwin, 1980; Messinger & Sykes, 1960). In-group loyalty and solidarity are major features of the inmate social system with harsh, often violent retaliation for violation of the norms. Norms of secrecy and mutual obligations are also evident among prison guards. A tacit understanding of certain norms of behavior safeguards the secrecy and justifiability of their actions (see Kauffman, 1988).

Types of Prisons

The physical aspects of the prison also affects the development and affirmation of types among officers. It influences opportunities for interaction and shapes the character of the interaction between correctional officers and inmates. The physical aspects, function, and inmate composition of a prison denote classification as minimum, medium, or maximum security.

Minimum Security Prison

A minimum security prison appears much different than institutions with higher security classifications. Externally there are no massive stone walls, gun towers, or outside patrol; the perimeter is usually surrounded by a fence. Inside there are no cells with bars and no obvious security devices

(Fox & Stinchcomb, 1994). The prison generally consists of dormitories or individual housing units situated around an open area, where an officer is permanently stationed. The inmate management style is usually direct supervision of inmates. No barrier separates inmates from officers in order to decrease social distance, encourage interaction, and develop personalized relations between inmates and correctional officers. Inmates may watch TV, play cards, or engage in other recreational activities in the day room. The inmate population in a minimum security prison consists of less serious, non-violent offenders. Many offenders are serving shorter sentences than inmates classified at higher security levels. Many inmates are also working or attending classes in the community. Hence control and custody is not the primary function of the officer, but rather preparation of inmates for release into the community.

Medium Security Prisons

Medium security prisons have more of an emphasis on custody and control than minimum security facilities, yet still offer more programs and activities than maximum security prisons. The types of inmates in medium security prisons are quite diverse - virtually anyone not classified dangerous enough for maximum security, yet not classified a low enough risk for minimum security classification. "Because they (inmates) are regarded as more 'salvageable' than the hardened offenders in maximum security, medium security prisons tend to

offer more training, treatment, and work programs" (Fox & Stinchcomb, 1994: 236). In terms of physical characteristics, the perimeter of the prison is fenced, but may include a gun tower(s) or booth. Security devices, such as alarms, closed circuit TV, and locked gates are used. Direct inmate supervision, remote surveillance from a control center and intermittent surveillance (infrequent officer patrols) are all strategies used in the management of medium security prisons. Direct supervision has already been described. With remote surveillance, the officer is in a glass-enclosed booth reducing face-to-face interaction with inmates. Communication with inmates is accomplished through an intercom. Intermittent surveillance is another inmate management strategy which provides limited direct contact with inmates. Interaction is through bars as the officers patrol. Emphasis is on increased social distance between officer & inmates due to security concerns.

Maximum Security Prisons

Maximum security prison may have huge stone walls or double fencing with concertina wire surrounding the perimeter, armed gun towers, and elaborate security measures, such as searchlights, alarms, and electronic detection devices. Remote surveillance from a control center and intermittent surveillance are the inmate management approaches in maximum security prisons. Interaction with inmates is constrained to supervisory patrols or escort to meals, programs, or

activities. Dangerous inmates comprise the prison population and hence the primary concerns of guards are control, supervision, and custody.

Hence organizational and physical aspects of the prison are extremely important in setting the stage and affording opportunities for interactions between correctional officers and inmates, and for the development and function of social types among officers. This description of the prison organization will provide the background for an analysis of social types among correctional officers.

CHAPTER IV

AN INTEGRATED APPROACH TO SOCIAL TYPES

In order to understand how types fit within the prison organization, a model was constructed of the 5 themes in the occupational culture and the 4 predominant officer types identified from the literature review. This model will be discussed later in this chapter. This dissertation will utilize the conceptual framework of an organization offered by Allaire and Firsirotu (1992). They provide a more comprehensive perspective in which to view roles and interactions within an organization. Previous research has overlooked the importance of the organizational setting, the formal and informal structure of an organization, and the role of individual members in developing and sustaining types among organizational members. In this framework, an organization is viewed as having three interrelated components: the individual actors, a sociostructural system, and the occupational culture. While discussing and describing all 3 components, this dissertation will focus on the occupational culture since this is where informal roles are likely to develop as officers interpret and organize ways of doing their job in response to official policies and procedures.

Component 1: The Individual Actors

The first component of the model is the individual actors as importers, molders, and contributors of meaning. Correctional officers bring attitudes, values, and beliefs from their unique experiences, social history, and personalities into the prison. These attitudes, values, and beliefs are then influenced and molded by experiences and interactions with organizational members.

> "All actors, however, strive to construct a coherent picture to orient them to the goings-on in the organization. Their mode of relationship to the cultural system ('cultural competence') and the extent of sharing of meanings with other actors are variable and contingent phenomena. However, as all actors fabricate their 'meaning' from the same cultural raw materials, a considerable degree of sharing of meaning will tend to evolve among actors interacting in the same social context for a prolonged period of time" (Allaire & Firsirotu, 1992).

The individual variables of gender, race, age, and education, were examined to more explicitly describe the individual component of the model and to further distinguish among officer types. Gender was included because correctional officers have reported some important differences in their perceptions of their work experience than their male counterparts (Wright & Saylor, 1991). This may have an impact on the emergence of types among female officers. Wright & Saylor (1991) found that female officers reported greater job-reported stress and feel relatively less safe in prison. Yet the women regarded working in prison as a positive experience and felt they were personally effective in working with male inmates. In another

study, female correctional officers were more likely to identify intrinsic reasons, such as an interest in human service delivery, for becoming a correctional officer (Jurik & Halemba, 1984). Other research has demonstrated that gender was not found to be significantly related to officers' attitudes toward inmates (eg. Jurik & Halemba, 1984; Jurik, 1985; Whitehead, Lindquist, & Klofas, 1987).

Studies which have examined race and its association to officers' attitudes have yielded conflicting results. Some studies have found no significant relationship between race and attitudes toward inmates (Jacobs & Craft, 1978; Crouch & Alpert, 1982). Other research has found a greater likelihood that nonwhite officers prefer social distance from inmates (Toch & Klofas, 1982). Age was chosen because of the conflicting research on this variable and its association with correctional officer orientation. Klofas & Toch (1982) have demonstrated that younger, newer COs prescribe to the custodial officer type identified in the literature. As officers mature they become more interested in human service delivery. However, some research suggests that older officers may be less able to empathize with an inmate population that is growing increasingly younger (Irwin, 1980). Kauffman (1988) and Webb & Morris (1978) found newer officers to have more favorable attitudes toward working with inmates.

The final demographic variable, education, was found to have no significant relationship to the orientation of

correctional officers (eg. Crouch & Alpert, 1982; Jurik, 1985).
However, this variable will be incorporated because of recent
attempts to "professionalize" correctional work through
increasing educational requirements.

Component 2: The Sociostructural Component

The sociostructural component consists of the formal
structures, formal goals, leadership style, policies and
procedures, rules and regulations, and management processes.
In a correctional organization, the sociostructural system is
characterized by a high degree of formalization and rigid
adherence to authority. The high degree of formalization is
evident in extensive, detailed rules and regulations, and
documentation of any and all actions.   There is an
administrative emphasis with strong military overtones, such as
distinctions of status, rank (officer, sergeant, lieutenant,
captain), chain of command, and privilege.   The organization
encourages homogeneity of its members through uniformity in
dress and work actions and conformity to rules, regulations,
and procedures. Routine is also stressed in the prison. The
importance of routine in maintaining order has been discussed
in a number of works (Crouch, 1980; Irwin, 1980). Routine
facilitates the process of formalization by providing
certainty, stability, or lack of variety that makes writing
rules and regulations more manageable (Hage & Aiken, 1969).

The myriad of rules and regulations and policies and
procedures which govern the behavior of inmates influences

interactions between the two groups. Inmates are deprived of their liberty by confinement <u>to</u> and <u>within</u> an institution. Inmates are also deprived of their autonomy. The assignment of a uniform or a uniform style of clothing and a number is the symbol of their identity in reference to the formal structure (Carroll, 1974). The power to make decisions concerning their daily life is stripped away. They must remain in their cells until given permission to do otherwise. There are rules controlling every aspect of inmate behavior. Inmates are subordinate to the guard's discretion in enforcing rules and in making decisions concerning their activities. Furthermore, prisoners are deprived of their right to privacy. Security concerns violate their right to privacy of their body, mail, and belongings. Inmates can be strip searched and have their cells searched for contraband at any time in the name of institutional security. Officers are expected to enforce the rules, maintain order, and keep control over inmates.

Rigid adherence to authority or the chain of command and centralized decision making is another characteristic of the sociostructural component of the organization. The prison is organized in a bureaucratic fashion with a hierarchical ordering of authority and decision making. Correctional officers are expected to defer to the chain of command. Decision making is centralized within the organization with those in upper level management issuing directives.

Communication concerning policies and procedures is top-down[8].

In order to more fully understand the sociostructural component of each prison, certain work characteristics were examined. Seniority, shift, work assignment, and reason for becoming a correctional officer were selected. Seniority was chosen because research has found officers with more seniority had an increasingly more negative orientation and were more cynical toward inmates. Shift was selected because the literature indicated that officers on the day shift held more favorable attitudes toward inmates and were human service oriented. Klofas and Toch (1982) attributed this finding to the fact that day shift officers had more of an opportunity to mingle with management and treatment staff.

The reason that individuals became officers is also important. Jurik (1985) found that officers' reasons for taking the job significantly influenced their attitudes toward inmates. Officers who were interested in the job for intrinsic reasons (eg. human service work) held more favorable attitudes toward inmates. Finally, work assignment was included because prior research has not explored its relationship to officer

---

[8]This may be changing with unit management and team concepts being utilized in some facilities.

types. Work assignments may involve direct or indirect inmate contact, prolonged or limited contact, and interaction with particular types of inmates, such as more troublesome or mentally disturbed inmates. These factors may prove important in influencing officer types.

Component 3: The Occupational Culture

The final component of the conceptual framework is the occupational culture of correctional work. The cultural system is important in examining values, attitudes, beliefs, and norms which affect interaction with inmates. It may be described as "an ordered system of shared and public symbols and meanings which give shape, direction, and particularity to human experience" (Allaire & Firsirotu, 1992). "It includes cognitive knowledge, how one performs the role, and entails modes of feeling and shared sentiments, as well as social values" (Manning, 1995). Culture is manifested in the meanings shared by interacting social actors. It is molded by an organization's history, leadership, and a variety of factors, such as age and size of an organization, composition of workers, etc., and the interplay between the structural and cultural elements.

A typology of officers provides a valuable construct for analysis with respect to style and values of the informal culture. Typing an individual gives that person an informal status which is a modification of the formal status (Klapp, 1971). The officer is oriented to his/her role within the

organization through selftyping and using role models as a frame of reference within the occupational culture.

> "The incumbent of such a social role is expected by other members of the in-group to act in the typical way defined by this role. On the other hand, by living up to his role the incumbent typifies himself; that is, he resolves to act in a certain way defined by the social role he has assumed. He resolves to act in a way in which a businessman, soldier, judge, father, friend, gangleader, sportsman, buddy, regular fellow, good boy, American, taxpayer, etc., is supposed to act. Any role thus involves a self-typification on the part of the incumbent" (Schutz, 1964).

Hence types emerge as officers develop, perpetuate, and affirm norms and values, and clarify behavior toward inmates. Colleagues may serve as a frame of reference in order for officers to orient themselves to their roles within the prison organization. Typification affords a means of discerning how officers define their role personally and collectively and how this definition affects interaction with inmates.

An occupational culture consists of certain values, meanings, and polarities reflected in themes, relevant to that particular group, and distinctive to the occupation. Values and meanings are collective understandings developed from patterns of interaction among organizational members. Polarities may be described as two possible ends of a value continuum given varying weight by organizational members (Manning, 1993).

Manning (1993) provides a useful framework for analyzing the occupational culture of policing which can be applied to correctional work to illustrate the values, sentiments, and

modes of thinking of each segment of the organization.[9] In this conceptualization, he divides the police organization into segments: the "lower participant" or officer segment, the middle management segment, and the top command segment. The correctional organization can be similarly segmented. This conceptualization is useful in describing the position of line officers in relation to the "higher" segments in the hierarchy of decision making. The line officer segment is occupied by those holding the rank of sergeant or below. Sixty-four percent (64.0%) of these officers belong to a union (American Correctional Association, 1991). They are oriented internally to what occurs inside the organization. Supervision of inmates and maintaining order in cellblocks or pod units, work details, recreational areas, industrial shops, or school are primary tasks of officers. Preserving order and routine are paramount in maintaining institutional stability.

Individuals become officers after a relatively brief period, an average 5-9 weeks in training. In terms of job skills, emphasis is on concrete knowledge. "Hands-on" experience and on-the-job training is the primary knowledge and training needed for a correctional officer. This fosters the idea that management and the general public cannot possibly understand the task complexities and realities of correctional

---

[9] Manning and Farkas (1995) apply this conceptualization in their paper comparing policing to correctional work presented at the American Society of Criminology (ASC) meeting in Boston, 1995.

work because they are not working "on-the-line" with inmates. Officers generally have little input into decision making and feel that management cannot understand the reality of their work situation (Cheek & Miller, 1982, 1983).

Line officers feel isolated from management and alienated from coworkers (Cheek & Miller, 1982). "The competition over the scarce rewards of working in the pen, the conflicts over definitions of the job and working styles may divide the workers among themselves" (Owen, 1988:22). Poole and Regoli (1981) identify 2 features of the CO role which inhibit the development of extensive work camaraderie and in-group solidarity: (1) interaction with coworkers is minimal, limited to brief periods of contact in the dining room, at shift end, or staffings, and (2) officers are expected to perform the functions of their particular work assignment alone.

The middle management segment is a "mixed group stagnating at the rank, or having achieved their desired level, and those hoping to rise" (Manning, 1993:13). They may identify with either line officers or top command. Middle management often serves as a link between line officers and administrators, interpreting policies and directives. They are internally oriented; their concern is maintaining order and security within the prison and hence ensuring that line officers are "doing their job". "When they are not responding to trouble, the lieutenants roam about the institution making checks and

shakedowns on inmates and lower-ranking guards" (Jacobs &

Retsky, 1980: 183).

> "Discipline parallels that of the military: the line
> officer is scrutinized as closely as the inmate under his
> surveillance. Alleged trafficking in contraband is said
> to justify periodic shakedowns of the line officers.
> Lieutenants inspect both guards and inmates to see that
> they are working properly on an assignment. Just as
> guards are required to write tickets (disciplinary
> reports) on inmates' rule violations, so too do
> superiors" (Jacobs & Crotty, 1978:6).

Thus middle management has the responsibility for

disciplinary write-ups and for evaluating the job performance

of line officers. They may also investigate inmate allegations

against officers. Activities are conducted with an "eye" for

promotion.

The warden and the administration occupy the top command

in the hierarchy. "The top command segment rarely have time to

exercise first-hand supervision of the general prison area"

(Jacobs & Retsky, 1980: 199). For those in the upper levels of

the hierarchy, concerns with inmates are secondary (Owen,

1988). Instead they are consumed by administrative duties and

paperwork. The top command, as in the police organization, is

oriented to "external audiences".

> "For those occupying formal positions of power,
> maintaining and increasing their power base becomes a
> preoccupation. Making the right allegiances, developing
> 'juice' through personalized relationships, and extending
> one's turf and upward mobility are key activities
> associated with these roles" (Owen, 1988:20).

Prison administrators are "answerable" to a variety of external

and internal groups. Prison reform groups, legislative bodies,

the media, and the courts are some of the major external groups

which constrain the policies and decisions of administrators. In the 1960s, the courts assumed a "hands on" approach, intervening in the administration and operation of prisons.[10] Many policies and procedures are either court mandated or developed within court-mandated guidelines.

> "In many states, for example, the courts have ordered that minimal due process procedures be followed in all disciplinary actions and that objective classification systems be implemented. And all states must conform to statutes or case law guaranteeing certain prisoner rights" (Irwin & Austin, 1994: 72).

Moreover, the top command segment must "answer" to internal audiences. The Department/Division of corrections and employee unions are the primary internal groups affecting the actions of administrators. Irwin and Austin (1994) claim that with the more centralized approach to managing contemporary prisons, administrators no longer have the autonomy and discretion which they once possessed. They now defer to the regulations and procedures imposed by the central office (the Department/Division of Corrections). Administrators must also consider the interests of unions in their management processes. Relationships between employees and the administration are now more formalized, with the rights and obligations of each side stipulated by a labor contract (Clear & Cole, 1994). Jacobs (1977) discusses how union issues involving the management of prisons hold the greatest potential for conflict in the future,

---

[10] The courts have since adopted a more "balanced" stance, called the "Restrained Hands Approach", toward inmate litigation in an attempt to balance the rights of inmates and the security interests of correctional administrators.

particularly concerning contract clauses "ensuring safety and security at all times for officers".

Themes in the Occupational Culture

Drawing on previous fieldwork in correctional setting and readings in the literature review; 4 principal themes characterize the nature of the relationship between officers and inmates. These themes are: (1) orientation toward rule orientation, (2) orientation toward exchange or negotiation for order in prison, (3) the extent of norms of mutual obligations among officers, and (4) orientation toward expansion of the role to include increased human service delivery. These items are indications of the values, meanings, interpretations, and patterns of interaction among each type.

1. <u>Orientation toward Rule Enforcement</u>

Orientation toward rule enforcement concerns the expressive dimension of the role, displaying and maintaining order and control within the institution. It is the daily regimentation, routines, and rituals of subordination and domination, eg. shakedowns, head counts, body searches, which establish patterns of subordination and domination for inmates and officers (McCleery, 1961). "For the correctional officer, authority over inmates is legitimate according to prison rules and regulations" (Progrebin, 1980). The official authority of officers has its base in legitimate power, the structural position of the correctional officer which provides its

incumbent with the formal authority to command (Hepburn, 1985).

However, to view this type of authority as the primary means of

social control within a correctional institution belies inmate

complicity in maintaining order. "No active social system can

keep its subjects in permanent obeisance" (McCleery, 1961). It

is the informal system where norms are identified which

regulate acceptable behavior by inmates and officers (Cloward,

1960; Thomas, 1984; Light, 1991).

> "Whether the order relates to a search, to a move to
> another area, or to general routine and discipline,
> prisoners constantly evaluate the legitimacy of the
> command in relation to powerful unofficial norms. Conduct
> by the officer which is perceived as arbitrary,
> capricious, spiteful, unnecessary, or petty may be viewed
> as an occasion for resistance" (Light, 1991:258).

2. Orientation toward Exchange/Negotiation

The degree of belief in exchange or negotiation as the

basis for order in the prison is another major theme.

> "One's management of power relations shapes one's approach
> to the job and the perceptions held by others... E a c h
> type and strategy of the correctional worker is directly
> related to the individual's alignment to the power
> structure and material interests, and abilities to get
> through the day" (Owen, 1988: 97.)

It is in the best interests of both officers and inmates

to negotiate each situation with a minimum of disruption.

Neither group wants continual confrontation and dissention.

> "The desire to get through the day, accomplish the tasks
> at hand (mail delivery, meals, visits, training, work
> assignments, and the like) and avoid confrontation,
> hassle, and violence are shared interests of worker and
> prisoner. This realization of common or shared interests
> influences the officer's approach to the job and his
> orientation toward inmates. Through interaction and
> conversation, each comes to recognize these mutual
> interests in an individualized way" (Owen, 1988: 22).

Limitations on the formal means of social control have resulted in "guards typically resorting to various informal patterns of social accommodation" (Cloward, 1960:36). For instance, the use of solitary confinement as a formal punishment is hampered by limited segregation facilities in prison and by statutory provisions in some jurisdictions on the length of time in segregation. The reward power of officers has also been limited. Officer influence in reward decisions has been reduced by counselors, therapists, or special committees deciding job and program assignments. The abolishment of parole and good time in some states has eliminated officer influence in the use of good time or parole as a reward.

Officers are dependent on inmates and forced to rely on their tacit cooperation for compliance with rules and regulations.

> "To a large extent the guard is dependent on inmates for satisfactory performance of his duties; and like many individuals in positions of power, the guard is evaluated in terms of the conduct of the men he controls. A troublesome, noisy, dirty cellblock reflects upon the guard's ability to 'handle' prisoners" (Sykes, 1958: 40).

Order is negotiated through informal arrangements, obligations, and relationships (Thomas, 1984). Officers overlook minor rule violations, exchange information or material goods and services, or grant special privileges to inmates (Carroll, 1974; McCleery, 1961; Sykes, 1958). In turn, inmates comply with rules and regulations and assist officers

with the performance of duties. Cloward (1960) identified 3 informal patterns of social accommodations among guards: material accommodation, power accommodation, and status accommodation. Material accommodation is an arrangement in which inmate compliance is achieved through bargaining for goods and services. The guard controls access to certain goods and services and hence is in a position to "bargain." Power accommodation involves access to key information, services, and officers. Officers can bargain with an inmate for a job change or cell change, or for the assistance of staff with a problem. Status accommodation provides opportunities for "upward mobility" for inmates. Deference may be given to certain inmates in order to minimize their potential for disruptive behavior. The inmates are conferred the status of "tough guys" through non-interference by guards in their activities.

3. The Extent of Norms of Mutual Obligation

The extent of norms of mutual obligation among correctional officers is another major theme in the occupational culture. It is important in order to comprehend the officer's shared interests with colleagues in working together and managing large groups of inmates. It is also important in assessing the impact of colleagues as a reference group for the selection or formation of types. Although some research suggests that correctional officers may not be aware of common interests and do not understand coworkers' perspectives (Toch & Klofas, 1982; Kauffman, 1988). "The

competition for the scarce rewards of working in the pen, the conflicts over definitions of the job, and working styles may divide the workers among themselves" (Owen, 1988:22). However, Kauffman (1988) contends that officers are aware of common interests and mutual obligations and possess a distinct subculture within the prison with their own beliefs and code of conduct.[11] She has identified 9 norms of mutual obligation in her study of prison guards:

(1). Always assist an officer in distress.
(2). No "lugging" drugs for inmate use.
(3). Don't "rat out" a CO to an inmate and to never testify against a fellow officer.
(4). Never make a fellow officer look bad in front of inmates.
(5). Always support a CO in a dispute with an inmate.
(6). Always support officer sanctions against inmates.
(7). Never show sympathy for or identification with inmates.
(8). Maintain officer solidarity v. all outside groups.
(9). Show positive concern for coworkers.

The extent to which these norms are present, or adhered to, may vary by institution. The extent to which correctional officers at each prison "buy into" or support these norms is related to their allegiance to organizational goals and attitude toward coworkers and inmates. For instance, if an officer feels alienated from coworkers, he is less likely to support these norms. Instead he may follow his own "code of behavior."

---

[11] Kauffman suggests that this officer code is evidence of a distinct subculture among officers which is contrary to the conclusions of Klofas (1984).

4.<u>Orientation Toward Human Service Delivery</u>

Another dominant theme is the orientation toward the inclusion of human service delivery in correctional work. This involves an interest in decreased social distance from inmates and the use of interpersonal skills in relations with inmates. However, many officers complain of the dilemma they feel trying to incorporate human service delivery into their custodial role. Role conflict is the term for the dilemma felt by officers as to whether to be tolerant and helpful to inmates on the one hand and tough and decisive on the other (Pogrebin, 1980).

> Officers are expected to remain socially distant while
> establishing close, supportive relations with inmates;
> they are to maintain the rules while exercising lenient
> rule enforcement; they must preserve their own authority
> and simultaneously encourage the inmate to make his own
> decisions (Hepburn & Albonetti, 1980: 447).

Jacobs (1977) in his Stateville prison study describes the difficulties of transforming the role of guard from "turnkey" and disciplinarian to counselor and agent of rehabilitation. Vague role prescriptions of being more cognizant of the uniqueness of individual inmates and their needs, yet still maintaining order, enforcing rules, and preventing predatory inmate behavior resulted in extreme frustration on the part of guards. For officers, the introduction of rehabilitation has led to difficulties and confusion in interaction with treatment personnel and in incorporating treatment into their daily activities (Crouch, 1986).

In contemporary corrections, some prisons have developed

a dual career track for correctional officers: one in correctional custody (correctional security officer) and the other in correctional counseling and treatment (correctional program officer). Hepburn & Knepper (1993) examined the relationship of the dual career track and the job satisfaction and role strain attributed to vague, inconsistent, or contradictory administrative directives. Preliminary findings indicate that correctional program officers (CPOs) have a significantly lower level of role strain than correctional security officers (CSOs), and CPOs have greater overall job satisfaction. The authors suggest that the position and responsibilities of being a CPO appear to increase the intrinsic rewards of the job which reduces role strain; thereby increasing the officer's job satisfaction. However, more research is needed to examine the complex relationship between job type and role conflict or ambiguity.

A Hypothetical Model of Officer Types and Cultural Themes

An examination of these themes in relation to correctional officer types is perhaps more illuminating through the use of a model. Figure 3 presents a model of the 4 predominant officer types and the 4 cultural themes constructed from the literature review. The model will explore each type in relation to the 4 types beginning with the "subcultural custodian" or "hard ass". The plus and minus signs indicate the degree of emphasis placed upon each dimension by each type in their approach to the job. A double plus sign signifies a

very strong emphasis, while a negative sign signifies little or no emphasis. A plus *and* minus sign means that the theme may or may not be a consideration depending on the situation or attitude of the officer. The descriptions of each type will rely upon characterizations in the previous studies.

As shown in Figure 3, the "subcultural custodian" (also referred to as "hard ass" or "John Wayne/Clint Eastwood type") is "badge heavy" and strongly emphasizes rule enforcement in relations with inmates. This type feels that inmates should not be allowed to get away with anything. Every rule infraction should be enforced, no matter how minor. Rules are enforced for a variety of reasons. First and foremost, rules are used to punish inmates. Strict enforcement of rules is a means to compel inmates to obey. Secondly, a heavy emphasis on rules is a means of establishing and asserting one's authority over inmates. It is a way to demonstrate power over inmates.

Correctional Officer Types (Columns)

Themes (Rows)	SUBCULTURAL CUSTODIAN Or HARD ASS	FUNCTIONARY	BURNOUT	PEOPLE WORKER
RULE ENFORCEMENT	++	+/-	+/-	+/-
EXCHANGE/ NEGOTIATION	-	+/-	-	++
MUTUAL OBLIGATION	++	-	-	+/-
DESIRE FOR HUMAN SERVICE	-	-	-	++

FIGURE 3 - HYPOTHETICAL MODEL OF OFFICER TYPES AND CULTURAL THEMES

As can be seen in Figure 3, the "subcultural custodian" has no interest in negotiation or exchange in relations with inmates. They are not interested in negotiating any informal arrangements with inmates in order to obtain rule compliance or maintain order. It is unacceptable because it would mean relinquishing some of their coercive power over inmates. This type is out to gain as much power as possible in relations with inmates. Continuing down the column, norms of mutual obligations are strong. They subscribe to an "us against them" mentality. They believe that the majority of officers share their punitive, negative attitude toward inmates. They feel their attitude and actions are based on commonly shared beliefs and norms, hence the subcultural terminology. The final theme is a desire for human service delivery to be more strongly incorporated in their role. "Subcultural custodians" are not interested in human service delivery. This type does not desire decreased social distance from inmates because they do not trust inmates. They believe that more personalized relations with inmates would compromise their authority and have a corrupting influence on them. They "go by the book" with inmates and are not interested in using interpersonal skill in handling inmates. "Subcultural custodians" do not see their role as "counselor" or "advocate" for inmates, but as "enforcer" and "controller."

The next type following to the right in Figure 3 is the "functionary" or "ritualist" or "just doing the job". As can be seen, this type does not place much importance on rule enforcement. They may at times ignore rules or simple security procedures, and at other times enforce them. They are interested in negotiating each situation with the least amount of effort. "Functionaries" are not active or strong rule enforcers like the "subcultural custodian", because they do not want the extra paperwork and documentation. They also have no desire to expend the extra effort to be a strict rule enforcer. "Functionaries" just want to get by and go through the motions of the job.

Unlike the "subcultural custodian", this type may or may not use negotiation or exchange in their interactions with inmates. They will make accommodations with inmates if it will enable them to do their job easier and "get by". Whereas the "subcultural custodian" has strong norms of mutual obligation, "functionaries" do not feel a strong allegiance to the norms and values of other officers. "Functionaries" feel little obligation to other officers because they do not want to extend themselves in any way. They have no interest in helping another CO and they are indifferent to the norms among officers. They essentially shut themselves off from ties to coworkers. As shown in Figure 3, the "functionaries", similar to the "subcultural custodians", have no desire for human service delivery. They are as ambivalent and indifferent to inmates as

they are to other officers. "Functionaries" are nonproductive and hence not interested in the time and effort necessary for human service delivery. As mentioned previously, they close themselves off from everyone in the prison world. To cope in prison, they anesthetize themselves from caring about inmates and their needs.

The next officer type is the "burnout" or "discouraged subculturalist". Similar to the "functionary", this type may or not enforce prison rules and regulations. Their rule enforcement strategy is erratic and inconsistent. Their cynical attitude may result in strict rule enforcement or they may let things go because they feel overwhelmed and "burned out." They share an abhorrence of paperwork, documentation, and expended effort with the "functionaries." As indicated, the "burnout" type is not willing to negotiate and exchange with inmates for order and rule compliance. Their distrust and dislike of inmates would not allow them to make accommodations with inmates. Paranoia characterizes their relations with inmates. Similar to "subcultural custodians", they feel that negotiation and exchange with inmates would compromise their authority and relinquish power to inmates. Norms of mutual obligation are nonexistent. Unlike the "subcultural custodians", the "burnouts" do not have a strong allegiance to fellow officers. Instead relations with coworkers are strained and tense. They do not want to help coworkers or maintain good working relations. They are alienated and disillusioned with prison

work. They also have no desire to engage in human service delivery which is similar to "subcultural custodians" and "functionaries." They thoroughly dislike and distrust inmates and have no desire to help or counsel them. Their basic belief is that if an officer is nice or helpful to an inmate, he will get backstabbed or taken advantage of. They want to maintain a distance from inmates.

The final type in the last column of Figure 3 is the "people worker". This type has a rule enforcement strategy comparable to the "functionary" and the "burnout." It is variable and inconsistent. At times, "people workers" will enforce rules if they think it will resolve a situation or in some way benefit the inmate (eg. teach a lesson). They rely more on interpersonal skills and communication to resolve a situation rather than strict rule enforcement. They will give a lot of chances to inmates. The "people workers" rely on exchange/negotiation in their relations with inmates which differentiates them from the other types. They will make accommodations with inmates in order to help inmates or give them a break. They believe that negotiating with inmates is a more effective way to handle inmates than enforcing every rule.

As can be seen, "people workers" differ from the other types on the mutual obligation dimension. They endorse norms of mutual obligations with officers who share their human service orientation, however they do not feel any loyalty or obligation to officers who share a more punitive attitude

toward inmates. They will not support officers who abuse, ridicule, or treat inmates unfairly. Finally, "people workers" can also be distinguished from the other types by their very strong desire to expand human service delivery and advocacy for inmates. They want to help inmates and to develop more personalized relations with inmates. "People workers" rely on interpersonal skills and communication in their interactions with inmates. They have a more positive attitude toward inmates than the other types and do not fear or mistrust inmates.

Summary of Theoretical Approach

The organizational model by Allaire and Firsirotu (1992) integrates 3 major components of an organization: the individual actors, the sociostructural system, and the cultural system. The individual actors are important as importers, interpreters, and contributors of meaning. The sociostructural system, in essence, defines and imparts the official mission, values, and modes of conduct. The cultural system contains official prescriptions about values and patterns of behavior which actors adopt, transform, or reject. It is the interrelationship between these 3 components which molds types and patterns interactions between COs and inmates. Figure 3 illustrates how officer types may be related to the 4 major themes in the cultural component of the Allaire and Firsirotu approach. The officer types and the themes were constructed from the literature review.

This study proposes that these major types are present within each prison and that they may be differentiated by the aforementioned cultural themes. There may also be other types which have developed. Furthermore correctional officer types may be distinguished by the individual characteristics described in the individual component and the work variables described in the sociostructural component of the Allaire & Firsirotu theoretical approach. Finally, variation among the types is also anticipated based upon the context of the prison.

Chapter V

METHOD AND PROCEDURE
Introduction

The overall purpose of this study was to develop a classification of correctional officers and to describe the underlying dimensions of each type. It will also situate the analysis within a theoretical framework. The study is comparative in order to assess the influence of differences in prison context on officer types. Two state prisons were investigated. The methods employed were qualitative; archival research and interviews with COs.

Access for the Research

Access for the research was approved by a research review board of the MIDWEST state Department of Corrections (DOC). The procedure for gaining access involved submission of a research proposal with specific eligibility criteria. The proposal was then considered by the review board. The initial proposal which incorporated observation of officers, interviews, and a survey as methodologies was declined. It was disapproved for the following 3 reasons: (1) staff time is at a premium and officers cannot spare the time to interview or fill out a survey; (2) observation is not possible because of the severely overcrowded conditions in prison; and (3) the purpose of the research for the DOC is unclear. After much negotiation and the intervention of concerned colleagues, the proposal was approved with some revision. Specifically, the elimination of

observations of officers and the survey instrument. Interviews would be allowed with certain restrictions, such as no interviews conducted on "work time" and respecting the time limitations of officers. The interviews were to be conducted during shift change or breaks. Although a preference was indicated for research sites, the DOC had final approval. The research sites requested in the proposal were approved: the medium security facility, Prison A, and the medium/maximum security institution, Prison B.

Research Sites

The study was conducted in 2 prisons in order to increase the generalizability of the findings. A comparative study increases the scope of the investigation and moderates its limitations so that the findings are relevant to more than just one case. The utilization of 2 research sites also provided the opportunity to examine differences in organizational context and how they shape correctional officer types at the prisons. The 2 sites will be called Prison A and Prison B to protect the identity and guarantee the anonymity of the officers in the study. The cities and the state will also be concealed for the same purpose. The cities will be referred to as CITY A and CITY B and the state as MIDWEST state.

FIGURE 4 provides a brief comparison of some of the major features of the research sites. A more in depth discussion of the prisons will be forthcoming.

SITE	SETTING	YEAR OPENED	SECURITY CLASSIFICA TION	INMATE	AVERAGE DAILY POPULATION	# OF COs
PRISON A	Medium city	1986	Medium	MALE FELON	527	138
PRISON B	Medium city	1991	Medium/ Maximum	MALE FELON	465	224

FIGURE 4 - COMPARISON OF PRISON SITES

As indicated, both prisons are located in medium-sized cities. Prison A was opened in 1986 in a region in which residents welcomed the added boost their economy. Community residents were very familiar with prisons, having at least 5 prisons in close proximity to the city. Prison B opened in 1991 despite a backlash of community opposition. This was an area in the southeastern region of MIDWEST state in which residents were unfamiliar and wary of a prison. The primary impetus for the building of the prison came from the state legislature who wanted the economic boost to an area with a relatively high unemployment rate. The officials also claimed that the majority of inmates came from this part of the state so it would be easier for families to visit.

Prison A is classified as medium security and targets male felons. It also targets sex offenders since it has a sex offender program. The average daily population is 527 and the staff consists of 138 correctional officers. (MIDWEST Blue Book, 1994). Prison B has a medium/maximum security classification because it has 2 units for maximum security

inmates. It targets male felons serving shorter sentences and Department of Intensive Sanction (DIS)inmates. DIS inmates serve approximately one year in prison and are then placed on electronic surveillance. However, any serious rule infraction while under electronic surveillance can send them back to prison. Hence the inmate population is more transient at Prison B. The correctional staff consists of 224 officers. The prison sites will now be discussed in greater detail.

Prison A

Prison A is a medium security facility located in a medium-sized city (City A) in the Northwestern area of MIDWEST state. Whites constitute the majority of the population (92.0%) with Blacks numbering approximately 6.0%. (Census of the Population - MIDWEST state, 1990). City A is experiencing a robust economy, particularly in the area of manufacturing (paper, printing, and machine manufacturing) and service jobs (American Tally Statistics and Rankings, 1990). The unemployment rate is 4.8% for the city which is very close to the state average of 4.6%. This rate may be a reflection of the growth in manufacturing and service jobs. Correctional work is included in service jobs. There are approximately 5 prisons, including Prison A, in close proximity to City A.

Community Reaction/Support

According to newspaper articles, the community of City A was apparently receptive and supportive of a prison being built and its subsequent expansion. The location of 5 prisons and a

large mental health facility within minutes of the city may have contributed to the receptiveness of residents.

In addition, local residents were aware of the potential for employment. The fact that a local firm designed the facility meant that local workers were involved in its construction. Newspaper articles heralded the potential for a $6 million boost in the area economy and employment opportunities. The administrator of the State DOC, promised that the state would make special efforts to recruit local workers, and that most of the workers hired would be area residents (Northwestern, Sept. 25, 1984).

Description of Facility:

Prison A occupies a site of approximately 80 acres on the northern end of the city. In 1986, the 300-bed medium security prison for adult male felons was opened. The physical aspects of Prison A include a double-razor-ribbed fence, electronic detection system, four gun towers, and a roving patrol on the perimeter road. There are high mast lights to fully illuminate the grounds. The interior design of the facility is a module/pod design (National Directory of Corrections Construction, 1988). The prison is divided into apartment-like living units. Inmates reside in unlocked rooms within a secured area.

The prison reached its rated bed capacity of 300 in less than 9 months (Prison A Annual Report, 1993). The expansion of another 450 beds, including a 50-cell segregation unit, a 100-

room Close Custody Living Center, and a 150-bed Productive Learning Center, opened in July, 1994.

Programs

The correctional institution has a number of vocational, educational, work, mental health, AODA, religious, and recreational programs. Of note is that Prison A has an intensive sex offender treatment program (SOTP) in which offenders live on site.

> "The 122-bed program is voluntary and participants may quit at anytime, but not before an attempt is made to discourage them. Staff members also can "terminate" participants if they engage in sexual activity, are merely going through the motions and are not motivated, or if their behavior or attitudes undermine program goals" (CITY Sentinel, June, 1993).

The program targets repeat offenders and takes 2-3 years to complete. In addition, Prison A has special management units, the Constructive Learning Center for inmates with a mental disturbance or disability and a Productive Learning Center for housing inmates with behavioral problems.

Staffing & Inmate Population

For the year 1992, there were 138 correctional officers employed at Prison A. Fifteen minority (non-white) officers and 46 female officers work at the institution. There was an average daily population of 527 inmates in 1992. The majority of inmates are White (60.0%) with an average age of 34, (Prison A Fact Sheet, 1994).

Leadership

Of importance is that the correctional institution has had continuity in leadership with the same warden since 1986. The warden came to the prison from a medium security facility for men where he worked as treatment director. His employment history includes a period as a high school teacher and football coach. He has a Master's degree in education and guidance counseling. The warden was chosen because of his work experience and his "program orientation and overall philosophy of treatment".

Newspaper articles contained interviews with the new warden concerning his basic correctional philosophy. He stated that he wants his correctional officers to be "people who will become involved with inmates and not treat them or their visitors as second-class citizens."

> "Correctional officers should not view themselves as 'guards', 'screws', 'the man'. This is militaristic and does not foster a helping relationship. The correctional officers and supervisors are in a position to make some of the most positive contributions to the men's lives." (Interview with warden, Northwestern, Aug.21, 1985).

The warden stressed treatment as a goal and indicated that all staff members will be responsible for some counselling of inmates. However, he also stated that security will be the top priority of the new prison and that staff would be in control.

Prison B

Prison B is located in a medium-sized city in MIDWEST state. Whites constitute the majority of the population (75.0%) with Blacks numbering approximately eighteen percent. Hispanics (8.0%) compose a growing minority. (1990 Census of Population -MIDWEST state). CITY B is considered an important manufacturing community, providing employment for nearly a quarter of its working adult population in the making of tractors, wax/cleaner products, automobile equipment, lithographed materials, and other products (1995 Geographic Reference Report: BTA Economic Research Institute). Because the local economy is so closely tied to industries susceptible to economic downturns in the national economy, the economic recessions of the last two decades have resulted in a relatively high unemployment rate (7.6%), well above the state (4.6%) and national averages (U.S. Department of Labor, 1990).

Community Reaction/Support

Gaining community acceptance was much more difficult for Prison B. According to newspaper accounts, residents were vehemently opposed to a prison being built in their community. They feared a decrease in property values, added demands on the county's sewer lines and police and fire departments, a negative image for City B, and increased crime and drug traffic as a result of inmate visitors (Journal Times: August, 1987). Newspaper accounts were replete with accounts of community opposition and outrage. Currently, the situation appears

resolved. There are plans to expand the facility and there has been no community protest as a reaction.

Description of Facility:

Prison B occupies approximately 50 acres of a 150 acre site. The medium-maximum prison opened in 1991. The facility consists of 8 housing units: 5 medium supervision units, 2 maximum supervision units, and 1 segregation unit. There is also a recreation building and a central control unit. The physical aspects include a double fence with razor wire, a sophisticated intrusion detection system, 4 armed gun towers, high mast lighting, and a patrol road.

Programs

Alcohol and drug abuse treatment programs are a primary focus of Prison B. In addition, the prison also offers vocational education through programs, such as Food Service and computerized data entry offered by Gateway Technical college. Adult Basic Education, Literacy, and GED self-development are also offered. Recreational, religious, and counseling services are also available.

Staffing & Inmate Population

There are 224 correctional officers employed at the facility. There are 109 officers working the first shift, 68 officers on second shift, and 47 officers on third. Twenty-eight minority (non-white) officers and 49 female officers work at Prison B. There were 465 inmates on an average daily basis (MIDWEST STATE Blue Book, 1993-1994). The typical inmate

profile is similar to Prison A; a White male aged 31. However, he is more likely to have an alcohol or drug problem because of the special programming. The population of inmates is more unstable than at Prison A. There is a high turnover of inmates since many inmates are serving shorter sentences or are Department of Intensive Sanction (DIS) inmates. These inmates serve a year in prison and then are placed on electronic monitoring in the community.

Leadership

Historically, leadership at Prison B has been much less stable than that of Prison A. Since the facility opened in 1991, there has been 3 wardens. The first warden was touted as a "top notch professional with solid experience" (The Journal Times, Feb. 10, 1990). He had a Ph.D. in educational policy and administration. He was head of a juvenile correctional facility and New Facilities and Planning Coordinator for a maximum security prison prior to his appointment at Prison B. The fact that he was a minority was important because "he could relate to inmates, as well as the guards, and the community."

After two years as warden at Prison B, he was "removed" for "subpar performance". An analysis of newspaper reports (Journal Times, July 1, 1993; CITY Sentinel, July 1, 1993; CITY Journal, July 1, 1993) indicated that the reasons for the warden's reassignment were the following. First, the prison's records office was a chronic problem. Chaotic recordkeeping resulted in the unlawful release of five inmates based on

sentence miscalculations. In addition, the records department failed to provide the Department of Justice with complete and timely information with regard to inmate litigation resulting in default judgements. Second, there was a very high incidence of drug use by inmates. The rate of positive urine tests was higher than any other state prison, 2 1/2 to 3 times the department's average. Third, there was an overall failure to process inmate complaints leading to a backlog of 400-500 unprocessed complaints. Fourth, unauthorized group strip searches of female inmates brought to the facility for medical and dental treatment were permitted. The final reason was overall poor communication with the DOC administration, staff, and the public.

The second warden served as "acting warden" for 9 months until someone was found to fill the vacancy left by the previous administrator on a permanent basis. He had 19 years of experience with the DOC and had served as deputy warden to the former head of the prison. He applied for the position in a nation-wide search for a new warden. When he was not chosen, he became the deputy warden for the new warden.

The present warden is a 27 year veteran of Corrections. He has been the warden of Prison B for almost one year. His management experience includes 17 years as superintendent of minimum security centers. He was also a state correctional officer for eight years. He has a strong military background having served as an infantryman and managed a Marine Corps

br

De

or

st

de

se

co

in

tas

ins

Loy

May

Tra

tra

Hos

of

bat

Tra

tra

Inn

(199

inst

rela

well-

brig. He also continues to serve in the Army Reserve. Department of Corrections officials described him as "detail-oriented, firm, fair, with the ability to get along with the staff wherever he has been," (Journal Times, May 18, 1994). His detail orientation was undoubtedly an important factor in his selection given the history of poor recordkeeping and communication problems at the correctional institution. In his initial interviews as warden, he describes the most important task of a warden as "knowing what's going on in your institution and feeling secure with the people working for you. Loyalty from employees and staff is crucial" (Journal Times, May 18, 1994).

Training

Correctional officers in MIDWEST State receive 8 weeks of training. They are offered training in First Aid and CPR, Hostage Negotiations Training for Non-Negotiators, Principles of Subject Control (including use of the Subject Control baton), firearms, Disruptive Groups Identification, Restraint Training, Stress Management, and Report Writing. Not all of the training is mandatory.

Inmate Management

Both prisons utilize a unit management system. Houston (1995) describes unit management as an approach to inmate and institutional management designed to improve control and relationships by dividing large numbers of inmates into small, well-defined, and manageable groups. General units and special

program units are the two general types of units. The special
program unit serves inmates with a special program need, such
as alcohol or chemical abuse programs. General units are used
to house inmates based on such variables as age or prior
record. For example a unit may be used to house weaker inmates
who are susceptible to victimization (ACA Design for Secure
Adult Correctional facilities, 1983). A multidisciplinary staff
or team (social workers, psychologist, correctional officer,
center director or unit manager) is permanently assigned to
work with a small group of inmates (50-120). The social workers
and psychologists have offices in the inmate housing centers.
Correctional officers work in the same units.

> "The team is responsible for all aspects of inmate
> program planning and monitoring, including program
> assignments, implementation of treatment programs,
> coordination of leisure activities, participation in
> disciplinary hearings, making parole recommendations, and
> conducting prerelease programming. The team is
> also responsible for sanitation, the physical appearance
> of the unit, and custody and control of the inmates"
> (ACA,1983: 46).

Both the officers and the treatment staff are under the
supervision and authority of a unit manager. The unit manager
is defined as "generalist who consults with specialists, such
as education supervisor or social worker, to effectively manage
all phases of the unit" (Training material, 1995). He or she
not only supervises the team, but represents the unit at
institution-wide administrative meetings and usually reports to
an assistant warden.

The advantages of unit management are that better

communication and understanding develop from the close association between staff and inmates, resulting in a more positive living and working environment for inmates and staff (Houston, 1995). Tension and conflict between security and treatment staff is ameliorated since both groups have input into decision making. Conversely, there are the following disadvantages. It is costly, costlier than the traditional type of hierarchical organization. Unit management takes time and resources in order to implement: fund allocation, position identification, staff training, etc. Finally, it threatens the established hierarchical order. "Power is redistributed, information flows to the unit manager, and security and case management decisions are made by unit supervisors" (Houston, 1995:261).

The aspects of the unit management system should be considered in relation to patterns of interactions between officers and inmates. Correctional staff must manage groups of inmates (50-120) depending on type of housing unit (special management unit or general). Inmates are not locked in cells or rooms, but circulating in the central area of the unit. In addition, some officers must work in special units with disturbed, disruptive inmates on a daily basis. In addition, the age-old conflicts, as discussed earlier, between treatment and security staff may arise.

All

ind

Pri

Pri

com

val

app

itse

may

popu

The

extr

the

secu

inst

one

pror

conc

spec

olde

expe

worka

stabl

Summary of Research Site Profiles

In order to summarize the profiles of each prison, the Allaire and Firsirotu model (1992) will be utilized. The individual component includes the officers themselves. At Prison A, respondents were more experienced than those at Prison B. Many have worked at other institutions prior to coming to Prison A. Thus they carry attitudes, norms, and values from their prior work experience which influences their approach to the job. They are predominantly White and the city itself has a largely White population. This means the officers may have some difficulty relating to a more diverse prison population coming from the southeastern part of the state. Their reason for entering corrections was essentially for extrinsic reasons. Since there are so many prisons in the area, they were undoubtedly aware of the good benefits and the job security of state employment.

The facility itself is a medium security correctional institution for male felons. The sociostructural component is one which emphasizes order and security, but also strongly promotes a counseling role for officers. It utilizes the concept of unit management and emphasizes programming for special types of inmates, specifically sex offenders. It is older than Prison B by 5 years and thus has had more time to experiment with inmate management concepts and formulate workable policies and procedures. Formal leadership has been stable and strong with the same warden since its opening. The

warden has expressed a strong commitment to rehabilitation and toward expanding the correctional role to include human service delivery.

The third component of the model is the cultural component. CITY A residents were familiar with institutions and thus, very receptive to the building of another prison. Prison A can be characterized as a "prison town". The culture of the prison is strongly influenced by the fact that many officers are from the city or surrounding area. Officers may have fathers, other relatives, or friends who have worked at one of the other prisons in the area. Hence stories, advice, and encouragement to enter corrections may have been given to the officers.

Prison B will also be examined in terms of the components of the Allaire and Firsirotu model. Similar to Prison A, the individual officers are predominantly White and hence may have some difficulty with the more diverse inmate population. The city has a high unemployment rate which may have encouraged many officers to apply for the job. The officers are less experienced than at Prison A which means that they are still learning and adapting to a more unstable inmate population and new leadership.

The sociostructural component is one which emphasizes rank, deference to authority, and chain of command. The institution is orderly and accountability is stressed. The warden has a strong military orientation which is conveyed to

h

t

i

h

s

i

t

g

wa

hi

mi

st

dr

ov

or

"c

th

th

re

an

and

yea

cor

his staff. As aforementioned, this was not always the case. The history of leadership had been unstable with 3 wardens in less than 4 years. Hence the goals and official mission of the institution had been unclear and changing. The new warden with his dynamic style holds the promise of clear objectives and stability in leadership.

The cultural component of the model may also be discussed in terms of Prison B. The culture appears to be one in which the majority of officers reproduce the formal organizational goals. This may be due to the following reasons. First, the warden is a strong role model of militaristic conduct. Second, historically, it has been plagued by problems, such as mismanagement, recordkeeping problems, poor communication with staff and DOC officials, and a very high incidence of inmate drug use and trafficking. This instability may result in staff over-identifying with official goals in order to find stability or something to believe in. There is a feeling of mistrust of "outsiders" and "closing the ranks", which may be a result of the negative press concerning Prison B. Some officers, and even the warden, mentioned their mistrust of reporters and researchers. Finally, identifying strongly with official goals and "going by the book" may provide protection from scrutiny and even corruption. The "massive drug probe" of less than 2 years ago may have fostered this fear of accusation and corruption.

two

news

ward

"ge

that

alt

tha

by

as

dat

int

The

int

co

cl

Pr

su

25

Th

Sample

The sample of correctional officers was obtained from the two state prisons. Subjects were recruited through a monthly newsletter and a posted announcement (see Appendix C). The wardens suggested that this would be the most expedient way to "get the word out" about my research. Subjects were informed that the interviews could be conducted at the facility, at an alternate site, or by telephone. Attempts were made to ensure that the sample was representative of the employee population by examining the percentages of officers along such dimensions as race, gender, and age with respect to official personnel data. A total of 79 state correctional officers were interviewed; 7 officers participated in followup interviews. The follow up interviews were with COs who expressed an interest in "telling me more" and discussing items without time constraints. These interviews examined issues in more detail or clarified questions from the initial interviews.

Prison A Sample

Table I represents the demographic characteristics of subjects from Prison A. Thirty-five officers (approximately 25.3% of the total guard force) participated in the interviews. The sample was predominantly White (80.0%) and male (77.1%). Blacks comprised 5.7% of the respondents. One Hispanic, 1 Native American, 2 Pacific Islanders, and 1 Asian (14.2% of respondents from Prison A) were also part of the sample and constituted the "Other" category under Race/ethnicity. This

co

fa

wh

(a

(2

gu

pa

Ap

Th

ra

in

le

te

corresponds to the actual composition of officers at the facility. Over 90.0% of correctional officers at Prison A are White and male (1993 Annual Report -Prison A). Only 15 officers (approximately 6.0%) are minorities.[12] Eight female officers (22.8%) were interviewed. Females comprise 18.0% of the total guard force (1993 Annual Report - Prison A. Table I is a partial table constructed from the complete table XVI in Appendix A.

TABLE I - PRISON A SAMPLE -DEMOGRAPHICS
% of Respondents - Prison A

DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTIC	PRISON A n=35
RACIAL & ETHNIC COMPOSITION	WHITE = 28 (80.0) BLACK = 2 (5.7) OTHER = 5 (14.2)
GENDER	MALE = 27 (77.1) FEMALE = 8 (22.8)
AGE	MEAN = 32 YEARS *RANGE =22-53 YEARS
EDUCATION	MEAN = 13 GRADE *RANGE = 12-48 YEARS

The mean age for subjects was 32 years old with officers ranging in age from 22 to 53 years old. Officers were asked to indicate the highest grade they completed. The mean educational level was the 13 grade. This means 1 year of college or technical schooling.

---

[12] I was unable to obtain a breakdown of this minority, nonwhite category.

from

the

from

were

samp

(28

with

add

hig

not

of

ret

sup

sh

Te

Table II contains the work characteristics of the sample
from Prison A. This table is also a partial table derived from
the complete table XVII in Appendix A. The table will be read
from left to right beginning with rank. As can be seen, there
were more officers with the rank of CO II in the Prison A
sample. Respondents consisted of 10 officers ranked as CO I
(28.5%), sixteen officers ranked CO II (45.7%) and 9 officers
with the rank of CO III (25.7%). The rank of CO II requires an
additional reclass retraining of 12 weeks. The end result is a
higher rank, 2 stripes, and a higher pay scale. Job duties did
not appear to vary from the job description of CO I. The rank
of CO III is a promotion based on job evaluations and the
retaking of the civil service exam. It involves largely
supervisory duties. Thirteen officers (37.1%) worked first
shift and twelve COs (34.2%) worked second shift at Prison A.
Ten officers (28.5%) worked the third shift.

whi

at

per

me

in

co

ra

(5

TABLE II -PRISON A SAMPLE -WORK CHARACTERISTICS
% Of Respondents -Prison A

WORK CHARACTERISTIC	PRISON A n=35
CO RANK	CO I = 10 (28.5%) CO II = 16 (45.7%) CO III = 9 (25.7%)
SHIFT	FIRST = 13 (37.1%) SECOND = 12 (34.2%) THIRD = 10 (28.5%)
SENIORITY (PRISON)	Mean = 4 yrs. Range =8 wks.-9yrs.
TOTAL TIME IN CORRECTIONS	Mean = 6 yrs. Range = 4mos.-20yrs.
WORK POST	Unit (Rg.) = 19 (54.2) Unit (Mx). = 8 (22.8) Solitary = 8 (22.8)
REASON FOR BECOMING A CO	Extrinsic = 18 (51.4) Intrinsic = 9 (25.7) Misc. = 8 (22.8)

As indicated, the mean seniority at Prison A was 4 years which does not include the 8 week academy training. Experience at the facility ranged from 8 weeks to 9 years. This time period does not include their 8 week training at the academy.

In terms of the total time working in corrections, the mean seniority was 6 years. The total time in corrections includes the training period, work experience at other correctional facilities, and experience at Prison A. Experience ranged from 4 months to 20 years. Approximately one half (51.0%) of subjects had worked at other correctional

institutions prior to their hire. As Table II indicates, the majority of participants worked on posts which involved the most inmate contact. Approximately 54.2% of respondents worked on regular housing units, which included housing units and inmate supervisory areas, and 22.8% worked on maximum units, which included special units and segregation. Relief positions were included with regular housing since they tend to be on the regular housing units. These positions are filling in for officers on off days, vacation, holiday, or sick leave. Most officers had worked this assignment in order to gain familiarity with different positions and units. Appendix B briefly describes the work assignments of officers in the sample.

The reasons for becoming a CO entailed a variety of explanations which are also presented in Table II. A little over half (51.4%) of respondents at Prison A identified extrinsic reasons for entering corrections. Approximately 1/4 (25.7%) of sampled officers mentioned intrinsic factors.

Prison B Sample

Forty-four officers (approximately 19.6% of officers) were interviewed at Prison B. Table III lists the demographic characteristics of the sample. This table was constructed from a complete table XVI in Appendix A. Most officers were White (77.2%) and male (68.1%). Of the sample, 6 Blacks (13.6%) and 4 "Other" (9.0%) comprised the sample. "Other" included 3 Hispanics and 1 Asian. This corresponds to a guard force of

76.3% White and 23.6% minority officers (1993 Annual Report -
Prison B).

TABLE III- PRISON B SAMPLE -DEMOGRAPHICS
% of Prison B Respondents

DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS	PRISON B n=44
RACIAL & ETHNIC COMPOSITION	WHITE = 34 (77.2) BLACK = 6 (13.6) OTHER = 4 (9.0)
GENDER	MALE = 30 (68.1) FEMALE = 14 (31.8)
AGE	Mean Age = 32 years Range 22-48 yrs.
EDUCATION	Mean education = 13 grade Range = 12-16 grd.

Less than half (31.8%) of the sample was represented by
females. Females make up 28.7% of the population of officers at
Prison B (1993 Annual Report -Prison B). The mean age was 32,
although ages ranged from 22-48. Mean education was the 13th
grade.

Table IV was also derived from a whole table XVII in
Appendix A. The table shows that almost half (45.4%) held the
rank of CO I (20). Twelve officers (27.2%) were ranked as CO II
and twelve officers (27.2%) were classified as CO III. Of these
officers, 38.6% worked on first shift. There were 17 officers
(38.6%) also sampled from second shift and 10 COs (22.7%) from
third shift. The mean seniority of the sample was 2 years.
Experience ranged from 4 weeks to 4 1/2 years. Again this

seniority does not include the 8 weeks of academy training. The mean total time in corrections, including academy training and work experience at other correctional facilities, was 3 years. Experience ranged from 11 weeks to 10 years. Only 16.0% of participants had worked at another correctional facility prior to their hire.

TABLE IV- PRISON B SAMPLE -WORK CHARACTERISTICS
% of Respondents -Prison A

WORK CHARACTERISTIC	PRISON B n=44
CO RANK	CO I = 20 (45.4) CO II = 12 (27.2) CO III = 12 (27.2)
SHIFT	FIRST = 17 (38.6) SECOND = 17 (38.6) THIRD = 10 (22.7)
SENIORITY (PRISON)	Mean = 2 yrs. Range = 4 wks.-4 1/2 yrs.
TOTAL TIME IN CORRECTIONS	Mean = 3 yrs. Range = 11 wks.-10 yrs.
WORK ASSIGNMENT	UNIT (RG.) = 21 (47.7) UNIT (MX.) = 11 (25.0) SOLITARY = 12 (27.2)
REASON FOR BECOMING A CO	EXTRINSIC = 28 (63.6) INTRINSIC = 9 (20.4) MISC. = 7 (15.9)

As shown in Table IV, most officers in the sample had worked on posts with the most inmate contact. Approximately 47.7% of respondents worked in the regular units which includes supervising inmates in activities and 25.0% worked in maximum units which includes special and "seg" units. A little over 1/4 (27.2%) worked on solitary positions with limited or no inmate

contact. Comparable to Prison A respondents, the reason for entering corrections tended to be extrinsic factors. Approximately 63.6% of respondents cited extrinsic reasons. Only 20.4% of the respondents from Prison B chose intrinsic factors and 15.9% chose miscellaneous reasons.

Summary of Demographic and Work Characteristics

In terms of demographics, the respondents from each prison were similar on 4 major points of comparison. They were typically White, male, in their early thirties, and had a mean education of the 13th grade. They typically worked on units with the most inmate contact and became officers for extrinsic reasons. A closer examination of work characteristics reveals some differences. Officers in the sample from Prison A tended to have more experience. There were more officers with the rank of CO II. In addition, the mean seniority at the prison was 4 years as compared to 2 years at Prison B. Respondents at Prison A also tended to have more total time in corrections. This may be attributed to the newer age of Prison B; it is at least five years younger than Prison A. In addition, the location of Prison A may be another explanation. It is located within close proximity of at least 4 other correctional institutions. Because of this, recruitment efforts were undoubtedly easier. Officers from these institutions could easily transfer to this new facility and still retain their seniority.

Data Collection Procedures

Archival Information

The primary data-gathering techniques consisted of an analysis of documents, policies, and records and interviews with correctional officers. These data provided a major source of information concerning the sociostructural component of correctional work. The information consisted of the following documents: annual reports, union contracts (national and local agreements), guidebooks for visitors, job descriptions of officers, facility descriptions, training manuals, policy and procedure manuals, and the inmate rule book. Additional documents included a 1992 staff brief from the MIDWEST Legislative Council concerning the background and current status of the MIDWEST Prison System, and Bureau of Census information concerning the cities. It was also necessary to search through newspapers on microfiche in both cities for information concerning such issues as, community reaction to the proposed prisons, construction or expansion plans, wardens and their backgrounds, and problems (overcrowding, officer or inmate unrest). These materials were important in understanding the degree of formalization of the organization, as well as the specific characteristics of the organization, such as leadership.

1

c

i

i

i

t

c

m

n

fe

as

Al

th

in

qu

ar

mi

sh

th

22

or

a

of

sub

<u>Interviews</u>

Interviews were also conducted with correctional officers. The interviews were used to explore the major themes in the occupational culture of correctional work. Three types of interviews were utilized: interviews at the correctional institutions, interviews at alternate sites, and telephone interviews. Follow-up interviews with officers who expressed the desire to "tell me more about their job" were also conducted. The major reason for using interviews as a methodology was the opportunity to probe responses and the meaning of behaviors (Kerlinger 1986). Interviews provide a feel for the situation in which respondents are thinking and acting, which is the context of social life (Babbie, 1986). Also, interviews typically achieve a higher completion rate than self-administered questionnaires. In addition, the interviewer has the opportunity to explain an ambiguous question to the respondents and examine their interpretation of an event for accuracy. "If the respondent clearly misunderstands the intent of a question or indicates that he or she does not understand, the interviewer can clarify matters, thereby obtaining relevant responses" (Maxwell & Babbie, 1995: 228). Correspondingly, the interviewer may probe an ambiguous or interesting response. He may also act as observer and note a respondent's reaction to a question. Moreover, the quality of the interaction can also be recorded, such as whether the subject was hostile or appeared uncomfortable (Babbie, 1993).

The advantages of interviewing at the prison site were the accessibility to subjects and the opportunity to observe COs in their work environment. The advantage of interviewing officers at various locations provided the opportunity to use a more conversational and less structured approach with officers. At the correctional institution, the time constraints of officers would have made it awkward or inappropriate to use this approach. It also provided the opportunity to observe officers in more informal settings. Goffman (1959) refers to these informal settings as "back regions" or "backstage," where the impression fostered by a performance is knowingly contradicted as a matter of course. "Here the performer can relax; he can drop his front, forgo speaking his lines, and step out of character" (Goffmann 1959:112). Analyzing the "backstage" provided a means of distinguishing official responses from responses given when officers are relaxed and informal.

Telephone interviews were conducted as part of the study whenever officers indicated that they did not have time to interview at the prison or another location. Pragmatically, the benefits of interviewing officers by telephone included money and time savings. The cost in terms of gas mileage, time, and effort driving to and from the facility were eliminated. Another advantage of telephone interviewing is that the indignity and aggravation of security checks at the institutions was also spared. In addition, the researcher may dress in any fashion since appearance will not affect interview

responses. Finally, respondents may be more open over the telephone for two reasons: their reactions to the questions cannot be observed and the interviewer's reaction to the response cannot be observed. "And sometimes respondents will be more honest in giving socially disapproved answers if they don't have to look you in the eye" (Maxfield & Babbie, 1995: 230).

There are, however, distinct disadvantages with using an interview methodology. A major shortcoming of interviews is that individuals may refuse to participate in the study because of shyness, embarrassment, or time constraints (Philliber, Schwab, & Sloss, 1980). The method involves a lengthy expenditure of time. The duration of the interviews at the sites was usually dependant on the amount of time available. On the average, they lasted approximately an hour. Some officers came in early for their shift or stayed late so the interviews lasted longer. Since interviews were conducted at the start or end of the shift, COs did not have much time to expend. As part of the research agreement with the DOC, there was a stipulation that COs be informed that interviews must not take place on work time. Hence, some officers informed me that "they weren't getting paid, so why waste the time". Officers were encouraged to leave a telephone number in order to make other arrangements, however some recruits were lost. They were unavailable for contact after repeated attempts. With telephone interviewing or contacting, the researcher confronts the risk

of "subject avoidance tactics", such as call screening. Another difficulty with interviews, is that the duration may depend in large part on the characteristics of the subject. Some correctional officers were very candid and communicative and eager to share their opinions and experiences. Others were less forthright and it was more difficult to "draw them out."

Interviews present a number of further difficulties for the researcher in terms of validity. Findings may be affected by a lack of accuracy or truth from respondents. Field research depends in large part on establishing friendly and trusting relations with participants, in order for subjects to provide truthful accounts of their experience (Douglas, 1976). For on-site interviews, it may be more difficult to cultivate friendly and trusting relations in the prison atmosphere of mistrust, secrecy, and potential conflict. The subjects may project their mistrust of other organizational members onto the researcher, or simply not trust the researcher, resulting in a lack of accuracy or truth in their responses.

Correspondingly, the tendency to lie, embellish, or conceal information is another concern in this interview situation. The interviewer-interviewee relationship is a fleeting relationship between two strangers. Interviewers have it on faith that the respondents are telling the truth (Denzin, 1986). "Respondents may not be telling the truth or distorting their actual beliefs or facts about their lives" (Philliber, Schwab, and Sloss, 1980: 100). The interviewer is faced with

the difficult task of deciding who is telling the truth in an environment where deceit and secrecy are a way of life (Kauffman, 1988). Correctional officers may feel reluctance or hostility toward revealing certain information out of a sense of loyalty to the organization and a fear of divulging confidential information. Some officers were very concerned about who would have access to the data and whether their responses could possibly be identified.

The interview relationship has a volatile and emergent nature since the interviewer is trying to penetrate the private world of experience and feelings (Denzin, 1986). This may present a source of invalidity if the researcher cannot maintain an open exchange of information. Reactive effects influence the reliability of interview data. The presence of the interviewer may affect a respondent's perception of a question or answer given. The "characteristics of the interviewer, such as race, age, ethnicity, sex, can influence the responses of participants, particularly if the variables under investigation are related to these characteristics" (Babbie, 1973: 102). "Interviewer bias" is an additional problem with interview data. The interviewer may communicate his/her own ideology, values, beliefs, or emotions concerning an issue through word, inflection, or gesture affecting the respondent's answer. This may distort the study's findings.

Interview Instrument

The interview instrument was a standardized interview in which the wording and order of all questions were exactly the same for every respondent (See Appendix C). This was used in order to increase the reliability of findings.

> "The purpose being to develop an instrument that can be given in the same way to all respondents. All questions must be comparable so that when variations between respondents appear, they can be attributed to actual differences in response, not to the instrument" (Denzin, 1986: 104).

In order to investigate its content validity, the interview instrument was pretested on a small sample of correctional officers (6) who were acquaintances or former students of mine. Four were state officers and 2 were local correctional officers.[13] The COs were asked to evaluate the content of the interview in terms of relevancy to an understanding of correctional work. According to Kerlinger (1986), content validation is *judgmental,* each item must be judged for its presumed relevancy to the subject being measured. Upon completion of the interview, officers were asked about their general reaction to the questionnaire and to the content of specific items. Ambiguities or inaccuracies in wording or content were also identified and corrected before the actual administration of the instrument. One particular

---

[13] None of the 6 officers constituted part of the sample. Problems with obtaining approval from the DOC prompted me to conduct a pilot study of correctional officers from my previous research (whom I maintained contact with) and students from my Corrections classes.

concern was that the scenarios were representative of situations which might occur in prison. One scenario concerning an officer returning from break was problematical. The state COs immediately informed me that they do not get a formal "break" and that breaks are "hot" union issues. The scenario was reworded with the reference to breaks eliminated.

Measures to Safeguard the Integrity of the Research

In order to safeguard the anonymity of the respondent, the interview questionnaire was coded. There were no names on the instrument. Subjects' identities were kept strictly confidential and any reports of research findings will not permit associating subjects with specific responses or findings. The final reports will refer to the research sites as Prison A and Prison B to further guarantee the anonymity of officers. At the interview, each participant was given a consent form with the provisions concerning the voluntary nature of subject participation, the anonymity of their responses, and the confidentiality of their identity. The form indicated that the subject gave his or her consent by participating in the interview. A consent form is included in the appendix section (see Appendix C).

Data Analysis Procedures

The analysis involved examining relevant documents and data collected from interviews. The documents provided an important supplement to the interview data. The field interviews were always typed before the next trip to the site.

A familiarization with the acronyms for various items, people, or places, such as "ERT" for emergency response team, proved invaluable when typing up the interviews. Abbreviations could be used which made typing much easier. The field notes were coded before each next set of interviews. Coding field notes while one is still interviewing prevents the researcher from getting sloppy and tired. It enables the researcher to have the most recall of the actual interviews.

> "Late coding enfeebles the analysis. Coding is not just something one does 'to get the data ready' for analysis, but something that drives ongoing data collection. It is, in short, a form of continuing analysis," (Miles & Huberman, 1991: 63).

At first, the interviews were coded manually. General pattern codes were used to identify the preconceived themes of orientation toward rule orientation, orientation toward exchange or negotiation with inmates, extent of mutual obligations, and desire to incorporate human service delivery. These general pattern codes were then broken down into subcodes to explain the context. For example, RULES was a general pattern code used to identify responses to questions concerning the rule enforcemrnt orientation of officers. RULES was then subdivided into RULE:STR (strict or by the book rule enforcement, RULE:DISC (discretionary rule enforcement, RULE:NON (lax rule enforcement) as these patterns emerged. The computer program ETHNOGRAPH was used to classify and organize the interviews by codewords. Since the program lists the demographic and work characteristics of subjects, an

examination of the association between types of officers and these characteristics was able to be conducted.

Coding reliability was determined by using the *test-retest method* in which one person (the researcher) codes the same interview twice with some time elapsed between coding operations. "Test-retest procedures can be used when only one person is doing the coding; reliability can be computed in the same way as it would be if the interrater method were used" (Miles & Huberman, 1991: 291).

Classification of Officers

Correctional officers were classified according to four general themes: orientation toward rule enforcement, orientation toward negotiation or exchange in working with inmates, extent of norms of mutual obligation, and desire or interest in human service delivery. Orientation toward rule enforcement, exchange or negotiation, and human service was assessed by responses to two case scenarios. The first case scenario involved a minor rule violation:

> An inmate is standing in the doorway leading to the recreation area. You inform him that there is a rule against blocking a doorway. You order him to move. He refuses to comply. You reissue the order. He still refuses to move. Describe what your action would be in this situation and why.

The second instance concerned a major rule infraction:

> While on your post, an inmate comes up to you and calls you a "blank" idiot. Without warning he suddenly swings at you with his fist and hits you on the side of the face. Describe what your action would be in this situation and why.

The consistency of responses to these scenarios resulted in

classification into types based on their comments. For example, "enforcers" tended to respond that the inmate would get written up, and in the later case taken to segregation. They would oftentimes cite the actual number of the rule infraction. They were also very concerned about following established procedures and documentation. As another example, "people workers" would consistently try to "work things out" or negotiate. In the situation in which they were struck, they would attribute the inmate's behavior to a problem and try to reason with the inmate.

Scenario 3 was used to assess the extent of norms of mutual obligation among the officer in order to further differentiate and classify into types. The scenario involved a situation in which an officer appeared to be in need of assistance.

> You are on your post, you notice an inmate yelling in the face of another officer. The officer appears to be having trouble resolving the situation. Please describe your action and why.

Again the consistency of responses to the scenario resulted in classification into types. A typical response of a "social isolate" was "I wouldn't get involved", or "I'd let the officer handle it himself". This type felt no obligation to help the other officer.

The final scenario was eliminated because it was a situation which elicited a standardized response from the officers. It was impossible to differentiate different approaches in a uniform response situation.

The scenario involved a fight breaking out in a unit.

> You are supervising inmates at lunch, suddenly two inmates start yelling and swearing at each other. A fight breaks out with the two punching and kicking each other. Please describe your course of action and why.

The standard response was to press the alarm button and wait for backup. This scenario did not allow for variability in responses, since training emphasized immediately hitting the alarm button the moment a fight breaks out. Training also stressed never getting in the middle of inmates fighting.

Responses to an item concerning how an officer earns respect from inmates, their job assignment preference, and the reason why they became an officer were also examined in relation to the themes. For example, "enforcers" would consistently respond that enforcing the rules and maintaining order was the way to get respect. They also preferred to work on posts with less direct inmate contact. "Enforcers" tended to identify extrinsic factors as the reason they became COs.

Additional interview items, such as asking officers to describe their job duties, give advice to a new officer, and describe the most rewarding and difficult aspects of correctional work were also used to identify the themes and compile the typology of officers. Individual and organizational variables were specified in order to investigate their influence on types. Documents, including policy and procedure manuals, training manuals, rule handbooks, were utilized to characterize the sociostructural component and the types of officers in relation to the formal structure.

Summary of Analysis

The analysis of the qualitative data involved examining archival data and interview data. One of the propositions of the dissertation was that there would be distinct types of officers (some types would be recognizable from the literature review) and the distribution would vary by prison. Another proposition was that the types are shaped by the interplay between the individual officers, the sociostructural component, and the cultural system. The archival data was useful in characterizing and developing an understanding of the sociostructural component of the prison organization. This information also provided a way to characterize the structural and organizational context of each prison in order to examine the theoretical proposition that types are influenced by the context of the prison. The work variables of seniority, shift, work assignment, and reason for becoming an officer were also useful in describing the sociostructural component. Data from the interviews with COs allowed an exploration of the four major themes in the occupational culture. The individual variables, gender, race, age, and education and their association with each type were examined as part of the individual component of the model. They also helped to more fully describe variation in types to demonstrate their influence in shaping types.

The results of the study will be interpreted in the following way. The findings will be located within each component, individual, sociostructural, and cultural, of the theoretical model developed by Allaire and Firsirotu (1992). The individual component will examine the individual officers in relation to selected demographic characteristics, gender, race, age, and education. The sociostructural component will explore the association between each type and the sociostructural system. It will describe the types in relation to specified work characteristics, seniority, shift, work assignment, and reason for becoming a correctional officer. Finally the cultural component will examine the types and their relationship to the 4 major themes characterizing the occupational culture of correctional work.

Correctional officers were classified into 5 types, "enforcer", "hard ass", "people worker", "consolidated" and "social isolate" based on interview data. Three additional types were described by respondents, "officer friendly", "lax officer", and "wishy washy" type. A brief discussion of these additional types will be included toward the end of the results section. Figure 5 will provide a brief overview of the 5 types. Figure 5 provides a means of conceptualizing the social types in relation to the 4 major themes characterizing the occupational culture: orientation to rule enforcement, extent of mutual obligation, orientation to negotiation or exchange in

relations with inmates, and decreased social distance from inmates. The plus and minus signs indicate the degree of emphasis placed on each dimension by each type in their approach to the job. For instance, a double plus sign signifies a very strong orientation toward rule enforcement. A minus sign indicates little or no emphasis on this aspect of their work.

Correctional Officer Type (Columns)

Themes (Rows)	Enforcer	Hard Ass	Consolid-ated	Social Isolate	People Worker
Rule En-forcement	++	++	+	+	-
Exchange/ Negotiation	-	-	+/-	-	++
Mutual Obligation	++	+/-	-/+	-	+/-
Desire for Human Service	-	-	-/+	-	++

FIGURE 5- MODEL OF OFFICER TYPES AND THE CULTURAL THEMES

As Figure 5 demonstrates, "enforcers" place a strong emphasis on rule enforcement in their relations with inmates. "Enforcers" use rules to teach inmates to obey and "how things are done" in order to maintain order. They are not willing to negotiate with inmates for order in their unit or supervisory area. They rigidly uphold norms of mutual obligation. Finally this type does not desire increased human service delivery. "Hard Asses" also place a heavy emphasis on rule enforcement.

However it is the degree and purpose of enforcement in which they differ from "enforcers". They enforce rules to punish, play games or ridicule inmates. They may abuse their authority in rule enforcement. They will not exchange or negotiate with inmates because this would be relinquishing some of their power and control to inmates. Norms of mutual obligation are not as strong for this type. They feel loyalty to officers who share their negative attitude toward inmates and their punitive philosophy. Norms of mutual obligation are weak, if nonexistent, toward correctional officers who have more personalized, positive relations with inmates. "Hard Asses" are similar to "enforcers" in their desire to keep a distance from inmates. They have no interest in human service delivery because of their dislike and distrust of inmates.

As shown in Figure 5, "consolidated" types enforce rules, but not as rigidly as "enforcers", or as harshly as "hard asses". They are rather inconsistent in rule enforcement, attitude, and behavior. This type may or may not exchange or negotiate for order with inmates. Again it depends on their mood or the situation. "Consolidated" may or may not feel an allegiance to the norms and values of other COS; it depends on their mood or the situation. They may or may not be interested in human service delivery. At times they may assume a human service role.

"Social Isolates" will enforce rules, however not as strictly as "enforcers" and "hard asses." They are not

interested in exchange or negotiation with inmates because of a basic mistrust and wariness of inmates. They feel alienated and isolated and hence there are little, if any, norms of mutual obligation. They are not interested in human service delivery or more personalized relations with inmate, largely because they fear corruption of authority or manipulation by inmates.

Finally, "people workers" are at the opposite end of the continuum from "enforcers". They are more lenient in rule enforcement and prefer to rely on interpersonal skill in resolving situations. They will exchange or negotiate for order with inmates. They rely on reciprocity in their relations with inmates. Norms of mutual obligation are present for those officers who share their human service philosophy, but they strongly disapprove of officers who abuse their authority and have negative attitudes towards inmates. "People workers" strongly desire decreased social distance and increased opportunities for human service delivery in their work.

Distribution of Officers by Types

The next section will present the distribution of types in each prison. As mentioned earlier, a proposed finding is that the distribution of types will vary by prison based on the difference in context. Table V contains the percentages of types of all respondents in the total sample and by prison. The table will be read from left to right beginning with the "enforcer" category. As shown, "enforcers" were the most common

classification among officers in the sample. Forty-three percent (43.0%) of respondents were typified as "enforcers." This type was also the most common type in each prison, although there were more "enforcers" at Prison B. At Prison A, 37.1% of respondents were categorized as "enforcers" as compared to 47.7% at Prison B. Table V also reveals that 13.9% officers in the sample were typed as "hard asses". Of interviewees at Prison A, only 8.5% were classified as "hard asses" in Prison A. There were over twice as many officers in this type at Prison B. Approximately 18.1% of the Prison B sample were typed as "hard asses."

TABLE V -
DISTRIBUTION OF OFFICERS BY TYPES
% of Type of All Respondents

TYPE	COMBINED SAMPLE n=79	PRISON A n=35	PRISON B n=44
"ENFORCER"	43.0 34	37.1 13	47.7 21
"HARD ASS"	13.9 11	8.5 3	18.1 8
"PEOPLE WORKER"	21.5 17	28.5 10	15.9 7
"CONSOLIDATED"	13.9 11	20.0 7	9.0 4
"LONER"	7.5 6	5.7 2	9.0 4

As can be seen, "people workers" were the next most common type. Approximately 21.5% of the combined sample could be classified as "people workers." There were more "people workers" at Prison A (28.5% as compared to 15.9% at Prison B). Of respondents, 13.9% were categorized as "consolidated". More

"consolidated" types were represented at Prison A. Twenty percent (20.0%) of "consolidated" types worked at Prison A as compared to only 9.0% at Prison B.

Finally, the category of "social isolates" actually had the smallest number of respondents. Few Cos (7.5% of the combined sample) were classified as "social isolates." Only 5.7% of respondents from Prison A were classed as this type and only 9.0% respondents at Prison B.

Analysis of Types within the Theoretic Framework

The next section will examine the social types in relation to the components of the Allaire and Firsirotu model. Each type is located within this model and discussed in relation to the four major themes in the occupational culture. The demographic and work characteristics of each specific type are contained in tables of percentages derived from complete tables located in Appendix A. Percentages will be reported for the combined sample in each table. Only the highly significant percentages (10.0% difference) will be reported in the columns comparing the two prisons. Each table will be read from left to right starting with the first characteristic of gender.

"ENFORCER"

The "enforcer" type may be characterized as "rule bound", "inflexible in discipline" and as having an "esprit de corps" with others sharing their enforcement philosophy.

The Individual Component

The selected demographic characteristics of the "enforcer" type are shown in Table VI which again was constructed from a complete table in Appendix A.

TABLE VI- "ENFORCER TYPE"-DEMOGRAPHICS
% Enforcer of All Respondents

		COMBINED	PRISON A	PRISON B
GENDER	MALE	43.9 57	37.0 27	50.0 30
	FEMALE	40.9 22	37.5 8	42.9 14
RACE	WHITE	38.7 62	32.1 28	44.1 34
	BLACK	50.0 8	1.0 2	33.3 6
	OTHER	66.6 9	40.0 5	1.0 4
AGE	LESS THAN 25	68.1 22	71.4 7	66.6 15
	26-36	38.4 39	30.0 20	47.3 19
	37 & UP	22.2 18	25.0 8	20.0 10
EDUCATION	HSE	33.3 27	15.3 13	50.0 14
	SC/AD	42.4 33	40.0 15	44.4 18
	BD/MD	57.8 19	71.4 7	50.0 12

As can be seen in Table VI, 43.9% of all male respondents were classified as "enforcers" and the remaining 56.1% were divided among the other types. Similarly, 40.9% of all female

respondents were typed as "enforcers and the remaining 59.1% distributed among the other types. As indicated, gender is non-significant as a distinguishing characteristic of "enforcers." An examination of race reveals that 38.7% of White officers were typed as "enforcers" as compared to 50% Black and 66.6% "Other." The "Other" category included Hispanic, Asian, Native American, and Pacific Islander officers. Comparing the 2 prisons, only 1.0% of Black respondents were typed as "enforcers" at Prison A as compared to approximately 1/3 (33.3%) at Prison B. Forty percent (40.0%) of "Other" respondents were labeled "enforcers" at Prison A compared to 1.0% at Prison B.

Age is the next demographic characteristic to be examined. "Enforcers" tended to be younger officers (68.1% age 25 or less as compared to only 22.2% age 37 and older). Education is the final demographic variable. "Enforcers" were more likely to have a college degree (57.8% had a baccalaureate or master's degree as compared to 33.3% with a high school education). The comparison of prisons shows that more "enforcers" at Prison A had a college degree than Prison B (71.4% as compared to 50.0% at Prison B). There were also fewer "enforcers" with only a high school education at Prison A than Prison B (15.3% as compared to 50.0% at Prison B).

The Sociostructural Component

"Enforcers" embrace the formal goals and values of the sociostructural system and conform closely to the official

policies and procedures, and rules and regulations. Distinctions of rank, chain of command, and rigid adherence to authority characterize their relations with one another. They adopt a militaristic approach toward inmates expecting deference to their authority and obedience to their orders. "Enforcers" follow the established procedures, rewards, and punishments in working with inmates. They interpret their official mandate to be custody and control and "maintaining proper conduct." Enforcing rules is important in order to preserve official values and officer authority. It is also important in order to provide structure and maintain order. Documentation for official reports is followed closely. They are concerned about following rules and regulations essentially to "cover their ass." Seniority, shift, work assignment or post, and reason for becoming a CO were variables selected to further describe the "enforcer" type in relation to the sociostructural component. These work characteristics are shown in Table VII.

TABLE VII - "ENFORCER TYPE" -WORK CHARACTERISTICS
% Enforcer of All Respondents

		Combined	Prison A	Prison B
SENIORITY	2 yrs or less	51.3 37	57.1 7	50.0 30
	3-6 yrs.	44.4 27	50.0 14	38.4 13
	7yrs.& up	20.0 15	14.2 14	1.0 1
SHIFT	First	30.0 30	23.0 13	35.2 17
	Second	48.2 29	41.6 12	52.9 17
	Third	55.0 20	50.0 10	60.0 10
WORK POST	Reg. unit or activity	47.5 40	36.8 19	57.1 21
	Max. or special unit	47.3 19	50.0 8	45.4 11
	or seg. Solitary	30.0 20	25.0 8	33.3 12
REASON FOR BECOMING A CO	Extrinsic	54.3 46	50.0 18	57.1 28
	Intrinsic	16.6 18	11.1 9	22.2 9
	Misc.	40.0 15	37.5 8	42.8 7

Table VII presents the work variables associated with the "enforcer" type. As indicated, "enforcers" were more likely to be newer officers (51.3% with 2 years or less experience compared with 44.4% with 3-6 yrs. experience and 20.0% with 7 or more years experience). They were also more likely to work the later shifts (30.0% of "enforcers" worked the first shift compared with 48.2% second and 55.0% third). "Enforcers" typically worked on posts involving inmate contact (47.5% worked on regular housing units and inmate supervisory areas and 47.3% on maximum, special, and segregation units). They

were less likely to work on solitary posts. Thirty percent (30.0%) of "enforcers" worked solitary posts with little or no inmate contact. The "enforcer" type generally chose corrections for extrinsic reasons, job security, benefits, and job availability (54.3% of "enforcers" chose extrinsic factors as compared to 16.6% choosing intrinsic factors and 40.0% choosing miscellaneous factors).

The Occupational Culture

Orientation to Rule Enforcement

The "enforcer" views his job as keeping inmates from doing things, "loitering, passing property or food, gathering in groups more than six, seeing inmates obey rules." Enforcing the rules is tantamount to maintaining order in the unit and teaching inmates discipline. As one officer explained,

> "Watching them (inmates) is what makes them change. If they violate a rule, you must keep tabs on them. They may think you can't remember who did what with so many inmates. Notebook helps a lot. I carry a memo book to write down violations with inmates' names. They know I'm watching."

A rule violation poses a serious challenge to their authority and is dealt with accordingly.

> "Rule violation - there is no question that he is going to move next. I would ask him if we are going to do it the easy way or the hard way."

Advice to a new officer was to learn the rules fast and know them inside and out. Ignorance of the rules will allow inmates to manipulate an officer into letting inmates "get away with something."

> "A good correctional officer knows the rules and when to

enforce them. He follows what he learned in training."
This officer "goes by the book" and follows procedures to the
letter. He stresses documentation of any and all incidents and
notification of a supervisor.

Orientation to Negotiation or Exchange

"Enforcers" are not willing to negotiate or use exchange
as a strategy to gain inmate compliance. Negotiation belies the
importance of the rules. A rule violation is considered a
direct challenge to an officer's authority.

> "Rule violation - If he refused my direct order to
> move, I would write him up. I don't have time to argue or
> negotiate. This is a challenge to my authority."

Negotiating with inmates does not maintain order, instead it
disrupts order by relinquishing some control to inmates. This
type feels order is maintained largely by the presence of
rules.

> "Order is maintained through laying down rules and
> enforcing them. You have your rules and they have theirs.
> We all have our bosses."

> "You've got to know the rules and not be afraid to
> enforce them. Inmates will test you and if you fail - you
> will lose face with them. Once that happens you will have
> problems getting them to obey you."

The "enforcers" follow the established system of rewards
and punishments in working with inmates.

Extent of Norms of Mutual Obligation

Norms of mutual obligation are particularly strong and
well-defined among the "enforcer" type. Officers are expected
to do their job. These norms are learned fairly quickly in
training and on the job. The following mutual obligations were

identified among "enforcers".

(1). *Officers are expected to back their fellow officers.*

"No *blue on blue*. Don't stab another correctional officer in the back. Support each other's decisions when the shit hits the fan."

They are expected to support an officer's decision/action in an incident with an inmate(s). A CO <u>never</u> contradicts another officer in front of an inmate, coworkers, or management. "Fronting" which is questioning or criticizing an officer <u>in</u> <u>front</u> of inmates is frowned upon by most officers. Taking an inmate's side is the ultimate taboo. As one officer commented,

"I might disagree, but I'd never contradict him in front of an inmate. That's a big NO,NO. You are taught this from day one at the academy. It would get around the institution fast, other officers would 'cold shoulder' me. Inmates would take advantage of the situation and try to cause trouble between him and I saying, "Officer So and So said this about you." I would offer my comments to the officer later on if I felt he made a mistake in handling the inmate -that way he doesn't lose face."

The technique of *bracketing* which is learned in training helps to establish this idea of officer backup and support.[14]

(2). *Officers are expected to carry their weight.* Many "enforcers" stated that they felt it was important for an officer to do his/her job and manage their workload. A

---

[14] *Bracketing* involves an officer standing behind an inmate who is involved in an altercation with another officer. The inmate is in effect sandwiched between the 2 officers as in "brackets." The officer's presence is passive, he doesn't actively intervene in the situation. He lends a physical show of support without undermining the other officer's authority.

correctional officer should not leave unfinished work for the next shift officer. If there's a problem with an inmate on a shift, it should be resolved before the new shift comes on.

(3). *Deference to the experience and wisdom of more experienced officers* was also considered a norm. It was important to experienced officers that the newer COs acknowledge their expertise by asking questions of them. "Know-it-alls" and "Gungho" types were disliked and ostracized by veteran staff. It is expected that newer COs seek advice from seasoned officers, particularly in terms of "how things are done on a unit." They should develop a thick hide and not be offended if they are criticized. It's the only way to learn how things are done.

(4). *Minding your own business is a norm of mutual obligation*. Gossiping about other officers was disfavored by many officers. This again is related to the "no blue on blue" sentiment. If an officer has a problem with a coworker, he should go directly to that officer first and not to management. That's the protocol at both facilities. Spreading rumors about an officer's work or personal life was equally disfavored.

> "One male officer was spreading rumors about a female officer having an affair with a married sergeant. Nobody really listened to him. We just thought he was an idiot."

Another reason gossiping is prohibited is that "inmates have big ears" and this information could be used against officers.

(5). *Don't abuse one's authority or get too friendly with inmates*. Belittling inmates, playing games with inmates, or

being overly punitive toward inmates were regarded as equally
inappropriate and as an abuse of authority. Conversely, getting
too friendly with inmates was also mentioned as unacceptable
behavior. It might compromise correctional authority.

> "Keep a professional distance. <u>Never</u> tell inmates about
> your private life or what your first name is. It can be
> used against you later."

(6). *Cover your ass and do not admit to mistakes on*
paper." Documentation is important to "enforcers". If an
officer writes up a report admitting his error in judgment, the
sergeants who review the reports will be quick to inform him
that he has violated a norm.

> "THERE'S THIS UNWRITTEN RULE THAT YOU COVER YOUR ASS. I
> wrote up a report admitting my part in causing an
> incident. I was simply unaware of a rule and allowed an
> inmate to do something. He became angry when another
> officer said he had to stop. A fight broke out between
> them. Well, I admitted my fault. Several sergeants came
> up to me and said never admit to blame. I told them that
> I screwed up and I admit it. They walked away shaking
> their heads. Some officers are uncomfortable with me
> because I don't cover my ass. I won't turn others in, but
> I admit my mistakes."

Orientation toward Human Service Delivery

"Enforcers" are not oriented toward a human service role
for correctional officers. In fact, the majority of officers
in this classification expressed a preference to work on job
assignments with less inmate contact, such as control or
perimeter patrol. They feel a human service role is
inappropriate or compromising for officers. There is a basic
mistrust of inmates. Advice to new officers included "don't
ever trust an inmate" and "watch out for the con."

"I don't like to get too close to inmates. I don't want to hear their problems. They want to get your sympathy or catch you with your guard down. They're always trying to 'get something over on you'."

"HARD ASS"

The "hard ass" is essentially a subtype or rather an extreme paradigm of the "enforcer". Respondents described these types as hard, aggressive, "power hungry", inflexible with rules, and possessing little interpersonal skill. This type is analogous to the custodial types in the literature; the "hard ass" (Kauffman, 1988), "subcultural custodian" (Klofas & Toch, 1982), and the "Clint Eastwood/John Wayne Type" (Owen, 1988).

Individual Component

The individual component includes the individual officers with their unique characteristics and experiences. Table VIII presents the demographic characteristics of "hard asses". Of all male respondents, 19.2% were typed as "hard asses" and the remaining 80.8% divided among the other types. Gender is significant in characterizing this type since there were no female officers categorized as "hard asses."

TABLE VIII -"HARD ASS" -DEMOGRAPHICS
% Hard Ass of All Respondents

		Combined	Prison A	Prison B
GENDER	Male	19.2 57	11.0 27	26.6 30
	Female	0.0 22	0.0 8	0.0 14
RACE	White	16.1 62	7.1 28	23.5 34
	Black	0.0 8	0.0 2	0.0 6
	Other	11.1 9	20.0 5	0.0 4
AGE	25 or less	9.0 22	0.0 7	13.3 15
	26-36 yrs.	20.5 39	15.0 20	26.3 19
	37 & up	5.5 18	0.0 8	10.0 10
Education	HSE	25.9 27	23.0 13	28.5 14
	SC/AD	9.0 33	0.0 15	16.6 18
	BD/MD	5.2 19	0.0 7	8.3 12

Race is the next characteristic of interest. As Table VIII indicates, 16.1% of "hard asses" were White as compared to 0.0% Black, and 11.1% "Other". In comparing the two prisons, race is also significant. At prison A, only 7.1% of "hard asses" were White as compared to 20.0% "Other". All of the "hard asses" were White at Prison B (23.5%). "Hard asses" were generally between 26-36 years old (20.5% as compared to 9.0% 25 or under and 5.5% age 37 and older). They were more likely to have only a high school education. A little over 1/4 (25.9%) had completed high school, while only 5.2% had earned a baccalaureate or master's degree.

Sociostructural Component

The "hard ass" is another type which strongly supports the formal goals and values of the organization. Similar to "enforcers", they were likely to have a military background, and hence endorsed the militaristic values of the formal organization: distinction and deference to rank, chain of command, and authority vested in the position. At times, however, they abuse their authority and become abusive and aggressive toward inmates. "Hard asses" perceive being "tough" or "hard" as how a correctional officer is <u>supposed</u> to act in accordance with official mandates to maintain order and control. However, they actually disavow the official goals and values when they abuse their authority with inmates. Respondents gave examples of how "hard asses" would toy with inmates by promising something and then not delivering and how they joked about inmates with each other. Work characteristics will also be used to describe the sociostructural component.

TABLE IX -"HARD ASS"-WORK CHARACTERISTICS
% Hard Ass of All Respondents

		Combined	Prison A	Prison B
SENIORITY	2 yrs or less	18.9 37	0.0 7	23.3 30
	3-6 yrs.	7.4 27	7.1 14	7.6 13
	7yrs.& up	13.3 15	14.2 14	0.0 1
SHIFT	First	3.3 30	0.0 13	5.8 17
	Second	20.6 29	16.6 12	23.5 17
	Third	20.0 20	10.0 10	30.0 10
WORK POST	Reg. unit or activity	0.0 40	0.0 19	0.0 21
	Max. or special unit or seg.	47.3 19	37.5 8	54.5 11
	Solitary	10.0 20	0.0 8	16.6 12
REASON FOR BECOMING A CO	Extrinsic	21.7 46	16.6 18	25.0 28
	Instrinsic	0.0 18	0.0 9	0.0 9
	Misc.	5.5 15	0.0 8	14.2 7

As indicated in Table IX, 18.9% of "hard asses" had 2 years or less seniority and 13.3% had worked over 7 years. A comparison of the prisons more clearly defines the differences in seniority among this type. "Hard asses" had more work experience at Prison A (14.2% of "hard asses" had worked 7 or more years as compared to 7.1% with 3-6 years experience). No "hard asses" had worked less than 2 years. At Prison B, "hard asses" had less work experience (23.3% of "hard asses" had 2 years or less seniority, while 7.6% had worked 3-6 years). There were no "hard asses" with 7 or more years of experience at Prison B. "Hard asses" tended to work the later shifts (only

3.3% of "hard asses" worked the first shift as compared to 20.6% second and 20.0% third). This type was also more likely to work on maximum security, special, or segregation units (47.3% worked on these posts as compared to 10.0% on solitary posts and 0.0% on the regular units). As can be seen in Table IX, "hard asses" were more likely to choose extrinsic factors for entering corrections (21.7% chose extrinsic factors, while no "hard asses" chose intrinsic reasons and only 5.5% chose miscellaneous factors).

Occupational Culture Component

Orientation toward Rule Enforcement

"Hard asses" strictly enforce rules for the purpose of punishment and to show inmates who's the boss. Taken to the extreme, rules are used to play games with inmates and to aggravate them. This differs from the "enforcer" who enforces rules primarily to maintain order and teach discipline.

> "Rule violation - I would tell the inmate that a refusal
> would result in a lockup and that I would be more
> than glad to do that."

Orientation toward Negotiation or Exchange

"Hard asses" are not willing to rely on the tacit cooperation of inmates for compliance with rules. They believe a tough, punitive approach is what gains compliance.

> "If you want the inmates to respect you - you've got to
> be tough. You can't be afraid of them. I don't let them
> get away with any shit. They do what I say."

Negotiation would be a sign of weakness. "Hard asses" will not show a dent in their armor of toughness. The negative

attitude toward inmates also precludes them from negotiating with inmates. Their attitude is punitive and mistrustful. Inmates are perceived as "always trying to get away with something". They are referred to by various pejorative terms, such as the "criminal element" or "scumbags."

> "The difficult part of correctional work is putting up with all the crap from inmates. They're always trying to put something over on you."

> "These guys (inmates) are nothing but scumbags, they'll sucker you in. Don't trust an inmate."

> "We deal with some real nasty individuals. These are inmates 'recycles' who have caused problems at other institutions and now we've got them."

Extent of Norms of Mutual Obligation

"Hard asses" identify strongly with the officers on their unit and with officers who share their orientation toward inmates. Norms of mutual obligation are upheld as long as it is their interest. For example, "hard asses" stated that they would not criticize a coworker's decision or action for two reasons: it would undermine their authority and other officers would "cold shoulder" them. They would, however, violate a norm by actively intervening in a confrontation between an inmate and officer. Although their primary concern appears more to control the inmate than to assist or support the officer. In the self-typification, COs stated that "hard asses" were not liked because they are "escalation types." They react without thinking of the consequences.

> "Hey, you've got to show that you're not afraid of a
> confrontation with an inmate - that you won't back down.
> Otherwise the 'guys' will think that you don't have any
> balls."

This desire to display a tough facade may lead to confrontation

and escalation in prison.

Orientation toward Human Service Delivery

"Hard asses" generally feel that inmates have it "too

easy" in prison; they have too many privileges. This type

resents having to provide services to inmates.

> "I don't like segregation units because I have to do too
> many things for inmates. I can't punish them if they're
> disrespectful because they're already being punished by
> being in "seg."

"Hard asses" prefer to work on post with limited or no inmate

contact. However, segregation would be their choice if they <u>had</u>

to choose a post involving interaction with inmates.

> "I prefer any post that keeps me moving and away from
> inmates."

"PEOPLE WORKERS"

"People workers" are characterized by respondents as

"professionals trying to be social, responsible, and trying

their very best." This was essentially the "ideal type" of

officer promoted in training manuals (Training materials,

1995). Pat phrases, such as "fairness and consistency in rule

enforcement" and "uses communication skills to verbally de-

escalate the situation," were parroted by officers throughout

their descriptions of this officer type. This classification is

comparable to the "human service worker" (Johnson, 1984), the

"supported majority" (Klofas & Toch, 1982), "the professional" (Owen, 1988), and the "white hat" (Kauffman, 1988).

The Individual Component

The demographic characteristics of "people workers" are contained in Table X. As is shown, 21.0% of all male respondents were classified as "people workers" with the remaining 79.0% divided among the other types. Correspondingly, 22.7 % of all female respondents were typed as "people workers" with the remaining 77.3% split among the additional types.

TABLE X- "PEOPLE WORKER"-DEMOGRAPHICS
% People Worker of All Respondents

		Combined	Prison A	Prison B
GENDER	Male	21.0 57	29.6 27	13.3 30
	Female	22.7 22	25.0 8	21.4 14
RACE	White	25.8 62	32.1 28	20.5 34
	Black	0.0 8	0.0 2	0.0 6
	Other	11.1 9	20.0 5	0.0 4
AGE	25 or under	18.1 22	28.5 7	13.3 15
	26-36 yrs.	15.3 39	25.0 20	5.2 19
	37 & up	38.8 18	37.5 8	40.0 10
Education	HSE	29.6 27	46.1 13	14.2 14
	SC/AD	15.1 33	20.0 15	11.1 18
	BD/MD	21.0 19	14.2 7	25.0 12

Hence gender is nonsignificant as a distinguishing characteristic of the "people worker" type. An examination of race reveals that "people workers" tended to be White and to be

older correctional officers. As indicated, 25.8% of White officers were classified as "people workers" as compared to 11.1% "Other" officers. There were no Black officers typed as "people workers" and this was true for both prisons. Prison A had more "people workers" who were "Other" (20.0% as compared to 0.0% at Prison B). "People workers" were typically older officers. Of officers age 37 and older, 38.8% were classed as "people workers" (18.1% were age 25 or less and 15.3% were aged 26-36 yrs.). An examination of education reveals that 29.6% of "people workers" had attained a high school education and 21.0% had earned a Baccalaureate or Master's degree. This finding becomes clearer when we examine each prison. "People workers" at Prison A tended to have only a high school education. Approximately 46.2% of officers with a high school education were typed as "people workers" as compared to 14.0% at Prison B. "People workers" at Prison B tended to have more education. Approximately 1/4 (25.0%) of "people workers" had attained a baccalaureate or master's degree at Prison B as compared to 14.2% at Prison A. Correspondingly, 46.1% of "people workers" at Prison A had only a high school education in comparison to 14.2% at Prison B.

The Sociostructural Component

"People workers" modify the formal goals and militaristic values of the official culture of correctional work. They do not identify strongly with the official culture. They mediate the formal rules and regulations, policies and procedures to a

more workable, comfortable style of working with inmates. "People workers" were more flexible in rule enforcement and disciplinary measures. They have their own informal reward and punishment system. This type feels that the way to gain inmate compliance is through interpersonal communication and personalized relations. Hence they gave little credence to an authoritarian, rule-oriented approach toward inmates. Certain work variables help to distinguish this officer type in relation to the sociostructural component.

TABLE XI-"PEOPLE WORKER" -WORK CHARACTERISTICS
% People worker of All Respondents

		Combined	Prison A	Prison B
SENIORITY	2 yrs or less	16.2	28.5	13.3
		37	7	30
	3-6 yrs.	14.8	7.1	23.0
		27	14	13
	7yrs.& up	46.6	50.0	0.0
		15	14	1
SHIFT	First	36.6	46.1	29.4
		30	13	17
	Second	13.7	16.6	11.7
		29	12	17
	Third	10.0	20.0	0.0
		20	10	10
WORK POST	Reg. unit or activity	30.0	36.8	23.8
		40	19	21
	Max. or special unit or seg.	5.2	12.5	0.0
		19	8	11
	Solitary	20.0	25.0	16.6
		20	8	12
REASON FOR BECOMING A CO	Extrinsic	6.5	11.1	3.5
		46	18	28
	Instrinsic	55.5	66.6	44.4
		18	9	9
	Misc.	26.6	25.0	28.5
		15	8	7

Table XI presents the work characteristics and their association to officer types. As can be seen, "people workers" were more likely to have worked 7 or more years at the institution (46.6% as compared to 16.2% working less than 2 years and 14.8% working 3-6 years). This was markedly true at Prison A where 50.0% of "people workers" had worked 7 or more years. None of this type had 7 or more years experience at Prison B. Approximately 23.0% of "people workers" at Prison B had worked 3-6 yrs. as compared to only 7.1% at Prison A. The next variable of interest is shift, "people workers" were inclined to work the first shift and to work on regular units or supervising inmate activities. As is shown, 36.6% of "people workers" worked on first shift with only 13.7% working the second shift and 10.0% working on third. Thirty percent (30.0%) of "people workers" worked on the regular units and supervising inmate activities, as compared to 5.2% on maximum or "seg" units and 20.0% on solitary work posts. Finally, the reason for becoming a CO tended to be intrinsic reasons. Over half (55.5%) of "people workers" chose intrinsic factors in comparison to 26.6% who selected miscellaneous reasons and only 6.5% of "people workers" choosing extrinsic factors.

The Occupational Culture

Orientation toward Rule Enforcement

"People workers" may be characterized by a more flexible approach to rule enforcement. "Enforcers" believe that an "effective" correctional officer writes a lot of conduct

reports. In contrast, "people workers" feel that conduct reports are an indication that an officer is not using common sense and interpersonal skills to resolve a situation.

Their action or inaction depends on the circumstances and the inmate's attitude. "People workers" are concerned with <u>why</u> the inmate has committed the rule violation.

> "Rule violation - a lot depends on how well I know the inmate, but I would probably ask him what's going on. From his response, I would decide what to do next. I would do this in an attempt to read the inmate's actions or words."

> "You become familiar with the inmates and I like the officer I work with. We have the same *style* - by style I don't mean that we come off as drill sergeants. We work with the inmates by explaining the rules and communicating. You can't treat them like babies and expect them to act like mature adults."

Generally they will try to resolve minor violations through communication and reason. The rule is explained and the consequences for a violation. The inmate is treated as a human being and one that can be *reasoned with*. The inmate is, in effect, given a second chance.

Orientation toward Negotiation or Exchange

Communication skills and "good judgement" are valued in relations with inmates. "People workers" stress handling problems on an individual basis with an inmate. In other words, taking the inmate to the side to censure an inmate, instead of *"fronting"* him (embarrassing him in front of peers). Negotiating or trying to resolve the situation with the least amount of trouble is another characteristic of this type.

"I would give the inmate his options. I would inform him of the consequences. I'd tell him that he is being stupid -you don't want to get locked up for a dumb thing like this."

According to COs in the sample, some human service officers will employ more creative methods of teaching inmates the rules.

"Rather than clog up the disciplinary process with minor violations, they have an inmate take care of a need for a unit, such as cleaning the back dock instead of writing a ticket. It's the time, effort, and embarrassment factors."

Extent of Norms of Mutual Obligation

The norms of mutual obligation are not as pronounced as in the previous types. Although there is a clear norm of non-intervention in an incident involving another CO and an inmate, these officers would violate it for the sole purpose of resolving it. They are more concerned with resolution than with hurting an officer's pride or undermining his authority. It is the belief of "people workers" that if an incident is "getting out of hand" or "escalating", it is their responsibility to resolve the situation.

"I'd find a way to intervene. Distract his (inmate) attention to me and try to get an understanding of what the circumstances are. When everything's under control, I'd have a discussion with the other CO about rights and wrongs to see whether he handled it right."

"I would maybe have the officer walk away and I'd settle the matter hopefully the same as he was going to. He may have antagonized the inmate. He (inmate) will calm down with someone else."

According to these officers, an effective correctional officer relies on "verbal skills" and common sense in handling

inmates. In other words, the officer doesn't allow the situation to escalate, but defuses it himself. They feel that an officer should not become dependant on the emergency response team. Instead he should develop his interpersonal skills. Many of these officers cited their ability to calm inmates down or defuse a situation as an essential quality for an "effective" correctional officer.

> "I have learned to rely on my communication skills and not just on a Team One Response."

> "Your personality is what starts it - how you display yourself- communication skills, this is what defuses a situation."

> "The best way to handle people is through talking to them, not always physically forcing them."

Orientation toward Human Service Delivery

A positive attitude toward "people work" or human service was reflected in their job assignment preference. They enjoyed the challenge of working with inmates and the experience of building more personalized relations. Many officers in this classification preferred jobs with more inmate contact. Unit work was described as challenging and fulfilling.

> "I like to work in a unit in which I am familiar with the inmates. I know the inmates and their personalities. I know what they're like and who I can reason with."

Most officers in this type planned to have a career in corrections simply because they like the work; it is "interesting" and "challenging." A frequent response was that correctional work was rewarding because of the opportunity to help an inmate or make a difference in his life. Although a few

interviewees found working with inmates stressful, fellow officers and management were a more common source of stress.

> "Difficult aspect - the uncertainty. We know what our jobs are, but we are confused by center directors and managers and their changing rules and policies."

> "Dealing with management in general is stressful."

"CONSOLIDATED TYPE"

This officer was essentially a consolidation of the "enforcer" and the "people worker". There was no consistent pattern of responses indicating a specific type. Instead it appeared that this type was really a blend of approaches to the job. They tried to blend rule enforcement with interpersonal skills.

<u>The Individual Component</u>

The demographic characteristics of respondents categorized as the "consolidated" type are presented in Table XII.

TABLE XII -"CONSOLIDATED" -DEMOGRAPHICS
% Consolidated of All Respondents

		Combined	Prison A	Prison B
GENDER	Male	12.2 57	18.5 27	6.6 30
	Female	18.1 22	25.0 8	14.2 14
RACE	White	14.5 62	25.0 28	5.8 34
	Black	25.0 8	0.0 2	33.3 6
	Other	0.0 9	0.0 5	0.0 4
AGE	Less than 25	4.5 22	0.0 7	6.6 15
	26-36 yrs.	12.8 39	20.0 20	5.2 19
	37 & up	27.7 18	37.5 8	20.0 10
Education	HSE	11.1 27	15.3 13	7.1 14
	SC/AD	18.1 33	26.6 15	11.1 18
	BD/MD	10.5 19	14.2 7	8.3 12

As shown in Table XII, only 12.2% of all male respondents were typed as "consolidated" with the remaining 87.8% divided among the other types. Similarly, 18.8% of all female officers in the study were classified as "consolidated" with the remainder 81.2% distributed among the additional categories. Gender was not significant as a variable distinguishing this type from the other types. An examination of race reveals that "consolidated" officers were more likely to be White at Prison A and Black at Prison B. One-fourth (25.0%) of "consolidated" types were White at Prison A in contrast to only 5.8% at Prison B. Approximately 1/3 of the "consolidated" (33.3%) were Black at

Prison B, whereas there were no Black officers represented among the "consolidated" at Prison A. "Consolidated types" tended to be older; 27.7% of "consolidated" types were 37 and older as compared to 12.8% ages 26-36 and only 4.5% 25 or less. As with gender, education was also nonsignificant as a distinguishing characteristic of the "consolidated" type (11.1% of "consolidated" types had a high school education, 18.1 % had some college or an associate degree, and 10.5% had a baccalaureate or a master's degree. Although the "consolidated" at Prison A were more likely to have some college or an associate's degree than at Prison B (26.6% as compared to 11.1% at Prison B).

The Sociostructural Component

The "consolidated" types try to modify the formalized policies and procedures to emphasize organizational directives and interpersonal skills. They follow rules and regulations closely, yet they try to consider the circumstances. However, they are careful not to deviate too far from procedure in the interest of "covering their ass." They differ from the "people workers" in their identification and acceptance of official goals and values and in their caution and mistrust in working with inmates. "Consolidated" officers maintain a distance for fear of corruption of authority. They view their primary mission as "maintaining order and control" in the prison. Table XIII represents the work characteristics of the "consolidated" type.

TABLE XlII -"CONSOLIDATED" -WORK CHARACTERISTICS
% of All Respondents

		Combined	Prison A	Prison B
SENIORITY	2 yrs or less	8.1 37	14.2 7	6.6 30
	3-6 yrs.	18.5 27	21.4 14	15.3 13
	7yrs.& up	20.0 15	21.4 14	0.0 1
SHIFT	First	20.0 30	23.0 13	17.6 17
	Second	10.3 29	16.6 12	5.8 17
	Third	10.0 20	20.0 10	0.0 10
WORK POST	Reg. unit or activity	20.0 40	26.3 19	14.2 21
	Max. or special unit or seg.	0.0 19	0.0 8	0.0 11
	Solitary	15.0 20	25.0 8	8.3 12
REASON FOR BECOMING A CO	Extrinsic	10.8 46	22.2 18	3.5 28
	Instrinsic	22.2 18	22.2 9	22.2 9
	Misc.	13.3 15	25.0 8	14.2 7

As shown in Table XIII, the "consolidated" typically were more experienced officers (18.5% had 3-6 years of experience and 20.0% had 7 or more years as compared with only 8.1% with 2 years or less). They were also more likely to work the first shift. Twenty percent (20.0%) of the "consolidated" type worked first shift in comparison to 10.3% working second and 10.0% working third. "Consolidated" types had a greater likelihood of working on regular units or supervising inmates in certain areas, such as the recreation area. Twenty percent (20.0%) of "consolidated" types worked on these units or areas, while 15.0% worked on solitary assignments. No "consolidated" types

worked on the maximum, special, or segregation units. The final
work characteristic is the reason for becoming an officer. As
can be seen, "consolidated" types at Prison A gave more varied
reasons for becoming officers (10.8% cited extrinsic factors,
22.2% identified intrinsic factors, and 13.3% reported
miscellaneous reasons). At Prison A, "consolidated" types were
more likely to choose extrinsic reasons for becoming a
correctional officer than those at Prison B. Approximately
22.2% of the "consolidated" chose intrinsic reasons as compared
to only 3.5% who chose extrinsic factors at Prison B. Prison A
"consolidated" types were also more likely to select
miscellaneous reasons for entering corrections than those at
Prison B. One fourth (25.0%) of officers classified as
"consolidated" chose miscellaneous factors as compared to 14.2%
at Prison B.

The Occupational Culture

Orientation to Rule Enforcement and Desire for Human Service

Strict enforcement of rules <u>and</u> interpersonal skills are
juggled in their interactions with inmates. Their strategy in
handling inmates appeared to be highly *situational*.

> "Rule violation - it would depend on the inmate. If he
> seemed to be doing it seriously, I would notify a
> supervisor. If he didn't seem to be serious I would talk
> to him and convince him to move along."

> "Depends on his attitude. I would inform him of the rule
> and ask him to move. I would talk to him and see if
> something is bothering him. If he becomes
> confrontational, call supervisor and place him in TLU."

Whatever action taken depended on the circumstances. They would use their communication skills and resolve the situation; however a tough, rule-oriented approach was never far behind if the situation warranted. There is caution in working with inmates. These officers believe that a CO can be nice and listen to their problems, but he must not be taken advantage of.

> "A CO must have rapport with inmates but still maintain order."

> An "effective" correctional officer is someone who treats inmates fairly and with respect, but enforces all the rules and doesn't take all the crap inmates try to give you."

> "I talk to inmates when I do my rounds. Being female, they (inmates) tried to sweet talk me. One inmate asked to date me when he gets out. I chewed him out good and that ended it."

Advice for a new officer included,

> "Never leave your *guard* down. No one has ever seen it all, you learn something new everyday."

> "Cons are cons........ be skeptical of what they tell you."

Norms of Mutual Obligation

Norms of mutual obligations were evident as officers reported the difficulty of seeing a staff member in trouble with inmates or management. Many stated that they would be there to support or back the officer.

"SOCIAL ISOLATES"

The Individual Component

The demographic characteristics of "social isolates" are represented in Table XIV. As indicated, gender is significant as a distinguishing characteristic of this type. More females were represented among the "social isolates". Of all female respondents, 18.1% were "social isolates", the remaining 81.9% were distributed among the other types. Similarly, 3.5% of all male respondents were "social isolates", with the remaining 96.5% divided among the types. This type also tended to be Black. One fourth (25.0%) of "social isolates" were Black as compared to 4.8% White and 11.1% "Other". Although a comparison of the two prisons indicates that "social isolates" were more likely to be "Other" at Prison A and to be Black at Prison B. Twenty percent (20.0%) of "social isolates" were "Other" at Prison A as compared to 3.5% White. No Blacks were represented in this category at Prison A. Approximately 1/3 of this type (33.3%) were Black at Prison B, as compared to only 5.8% were White. No "social isolates" were in the "Other" category.

TABLE XIV -"SOCIAL ISOLATE" -DEMOGRAPHICS
% of All Respondents

		Combined	Prison A	Prison B
GENDER	Male	3.5 57	3.7 27	3.3 30
	Female	18.1 22	12.5 8	21.4 14
RACE	White	4.8 62	3.5 28	5.8 34
	Black	25.0 8	0.0 2	33.3 6
	Other	11.1 9	20.0 5	0.0 4
AGE	25 or less	0.0 22	0.0 7	0.0 15
	26-36 yrs.	12.8 39	10.0 20	15.7 19
	37 & up	5.5 18	0.0 8	10.0 10
Education	HSE	0.0 27	0.0 13	0.0 14
	SC/AD	15.1 33	13.3 15	16.6 18
	BD/MD	5.2 19	0.0 7	8.3 12

As shown in Table XIV, "social isolates" were more likely to be between the ages of 26-36 years old and this held true for both prisons. Approximately 12.8% of "social isolates" were in this age group in comparison to only 5.5% age 37 or older. No "social isolates" were age 25 or less. They tended to have some college or an associate's degree (15.1% as compared to only 5.5% with a baccalaureate or master's degree). There were no "social isolates" with only a high school education.

The Sociostructural Component

"Social isolates" accept and identify with the formal goals and values of the organization, although they have problems identifying or feeling loyalty to coworkers. They conform strictly to policies and procedures and rules and regulations for 2 reasons: (1) to provide validation of their authority as an officer to inmates and coworkers, and (2) to avoid making a mistake. They feel they are more closely watched for mistakes because of their female and/or minority status.

Examining work variables provides another way to distinguish among officer types. Table XV contains the work characteristics of the "social isolate" type. As indicated, they were typically more experienced officers (14.8% with 3-6 years as compared to only 5.4% with 2 years or less experience). No "social isolates" worked 7 or more years. Shift was nonsignificant as a distinguishing characteristic of this type. As shown, 10.0% of first shift respondents, 6.8% of second shift respondents, and 5.0% of third shift officers in the sample were designated "social isolates." This type had a greater likelihood of working on solitary assignments. One-fourth (25.0%) of "social isolates" worked on solitary posts as compared to 2.5% working on regular units. There were no "social isolates" assigned to maximum, special, or segregation units at either prison.

TABLE XV - "SOCIAL ISOLATE" - WORK CHARACTERISTICS
% of All Respondents

		Combined	Prison A	Prison B
SENIORITY	**2 yrs or less**	5.4	0.0	6.6
		37	7	30
	3-6 yrs.	14.8	14.2	15.3
		27	14	13
	7yrs. & up	0.0	0.0	0.0
		15	14	1
SHIFT	First	10.0	7.6	11.7
		30	13	17
	Second	6.8	8.3	5.8
		29	12	17
	Third	5.0	0.0	10.0
		20	10	10
WORK POST	Reg. unit or activity	2.5	0.0	4.7
		40	19	21
	Max. or special unit or seg.	0.0	0.0	0.0
		19	8	11
	Solitary	25.0	25.0	25.0
		20	8	12
REASON FOR BECOMING A CO	Extrinsic	6.5	0.0	10.7
		46	18	28
	Instrinsic	5.5	0.0	11.1
		18	9	9
	Misc.	13.3	25.0	0.0
		15	8	7

As indicated in Table XV, the reason for becoming an officer was also not significant as a differentiating characteristic of "social isolates". Only 6.5% of this type chose extrinsic factors in comparison to 5.5% who chose intrinsic factors and 13.3% who chose miscellaneous factors. An examination of the 2 prisons, reveals that 1/4 (25.0%) of respondents classified as "social isolates" at Prison A selected miscellaneous reasons for becoming an officer. At Prison B, this type chose a variety of reasons for entering corrections. Approximately 10.7% of "social isolates" chose extrinsic reasons as compared to 11.1% who selected intrinsic factors.

<u>The Occupational Culture</u>

Orientation toward Rule Enforcement

"Social isolates" went by the book in rule enforcement for fear of making a mistake. They feel they were watched more closely for mistakes because of their status as a female. This type also indicated that they felt they had to continually "prove" themselves to coworkers and management.

> "Because I am female, I am tested by both inmates and the officers I work with. Inmates try to manipulate me. I also feel that I am watched closely for mistakes. That's why I try to stay away from everyone - I don't have to prove myself to anyone."

> "I hate it when I have to ask for backup, because they (male officers) make me feel like I can't handle myself.

Orientation toward Exchange or Negotiation

They were unwilling to negotiate for inmate compliance, essentially because of their fear of being seen as "soft" or "unable to handle oneself." They distrust inmates and do not want be manipulated by them. Exchange or negotiation with inmates provides opportunities for manipulation and treachery by inmates.

Extent of Mutual Obligations

This officer type was ambivalent toward relations with coworkers. They did not feel accepted by other officers. They also did not identify with fellow officers, but instead preferred to keep to themselves. "Social isolates" felt alienated from coworkers and hence did not endorse norms of mutual obligations.

> "Advice for new COs - keep to yourself and do your job. There's a lot of backstabbing - talking about officers."

> "Officer respect - I don't care if they respect me. I feel no allegiance to them - all they do is gossip about everybody."

When asked to define the most difficult aspect of the job, they were more likely to mention relations with coworkers.

> "The difficult aspect of correctional work - interacting with other officers. There are times when I work with male officers who don't talk directly to me the entire shift."

> "Difficult aspect - dealing with male officers on power trips."

Orientation to Human Service

"Social isolates" were also ambivalent toward inmates. There was a basic mistrust, even fear of working with them. They believed inmates were always trying to set officers up or take advantage of them.

> "There's just too many inmates to watch. Staff members have been assaulted by gang members."

> "Inmates not changing, no matter what you do. They'll set you up, be nice to your face and badmouth you behind your back. They're always trying to get favors."

"Social isolates" preferred to work at posts with social distance from inmates and other officers, such as towers or outside observation.

> "I prefer to work alone. I am a loner who likes to do the job alone.

RESIDUAL TYPES IDENTIFIED BY RESPONDENTS

There were also 3 types which were identified by COs when asked to describe types of officers working at the prisons. The "lax officer", "officer friendly", and the "wishy washy" officer were described by respondents in the interviews, however these types were not found in the data analysis. The reasons will be discussed at the end of this section.

These 3 types are officers who reject the official values and goals of the formal organization. Their rule enforcement is erratic, inconsistent, or nonexistent. They have compromised their authority by their inaction or allowing themselves to be manipulated by inmates. They have developed their own method or "nonmethod" of working with inmates. Some simply go through the motions of the job.

"LAX OFFICER"

"Lax Officers" were officers described as passive, apathetic, or timid. This type was similar to the "functionary" characterized by Kauffman (1988). Officers stated that "lax officers" were generally more experienced male correctional officers who are simply fed up with arguing with inmates and writing conduct reports to no avail. They were lax in rule enforcement because they didn't want to hassle inmates or contend with a myriad of paperwork.

> "The type who fools around and ignores most of what's going on. They just don't want to put the effort in. They don't give a damn really."

Conversely, the "lax officers" might be newer male or female officers. The laxness in rule enforcement is due to fear or uncertainty about working with inmates. They do not want to cause any "ripples", or trouble, because they doubt their ability to handle it. They remain anchored to their desk hesitant to intermingle among inmates.

They had no desire to help inmates or listen to their problems. "Lax officers" were in corrections for the paycheck, benefits, or job security of state employment. One officer gave this description of the type.

> "This officer, he asked me why I write so many CRs. He said I was nuts, it was too much paperwork. He said he was an 'eager beaver' like me when he was younger. He said he paid his dues and was waiting to retire. "

"Lax officers" were just "doing their time like the inmates until their release or retirement. They simply wanted to get through the day with a minimum of effort. Norms of mutual obligation were weak. They felt no collective responsibility. As one officer complained,

> "Some guys are 'goof-offs'. I don't feel safe working with them. They have no control and they don't try to have control. I don't know if they'd back me in a situation. I know they wouldn't back me to management. They wouldn't stick their necks out."

Their fellow officers do not like or respect them. They *don't do their job* was the biggest complaint. Coworkers were also critical of these officers because they are the ones who have to restore order and discipline.

> "For the rest of us, they make our jobs hell. We have to try to bring back discipline."

"If the unit is loud and unruly, I have to come in and straighten things out."

"OFFICER FRIENDLY"

"Officer friendly" types were subtypes of "people workers". They got too close to inmates and violated the norm of a "professional distance." They wanted to be liked by all inmates, to be thought of as "cool" or a good guy. Their orientation to rule enforcement was lenient; they usually gave inmates a lot of chances. They were easily manipulated by inmates since they don't know how to say the word "no." They negotiated with inmates in order to maintain order or gain inmate compliance by overlooking minor violations or doing favors. Norms of mutual obligation were weak. They typically had little loyalty or affinity to other officers. They felt that coworkers were too hard on inmates.

> "The 'soft type" - they're always trying to help inmates or make things easier for them by bending rules. They feel sorry for inmates. They think that inmates will help them if there's a problem and that inmates will obey you if you're nice."

According to interviewees, females were strongly represented among this type. An extreme subtype is the "mother" who treated all inmates like her sons. This categorization was similar to the "inventive role" of female officers defined by Zimmer (1986). She got too involved in their problems and referred to inmates in terms of endearment. This alienated other officers who felt that her treatment of inmates was too soft and inappropriate in a prison setting.

> "One of the women I work with calls the inmates "her
> guys". She'll walk in and say, "How are my guys tonight?"
> I think that you have to keep a certain distance. This is
> not kindergarten and these are not choir boys. She thinks
> I am too tough with them (inmates)."

WISHY-WASHY OFFICERS"

This type was portrayed as "unpredictable", "moody",
"running hot and cold," and "inconsistent." It was equivalent
to the "Wishy Washy" type described by Kauffman (1988). Rule
enforcement was inconsistent and uncertain.

As one officer stated,

> "One day it's O.K. for an inmate to do something, the
> next day it's not. They enforce some of the rules some of
> time and all of the rules some of the time."

"Wishy-washy officers" communicated and helped inmates at one
time and then were distant and rule-oriented at another. They
were likely to be accused of favoritism by inmates since they
would be nice to one inmate and not to others. They were not
liked by inmates because of their unpredictability. Inmates
were hesitant to approach them because they would "get their
head bitten off." Inmates mistrusted this type because they
did not follow through on promises. Norms of mutual obligations
were just as uncertain and unclear among these types of
officers. The "Wishy Washy" officer was described as:

> "The kind of officer that you never know what to expect
> from. You don't know if you can count on him. He brings
> problems to work and takes it out on everyone. He doesn't
> pull his weight."

As aforementioned, these 3 types were not identified in the findings. The absence of these types may be attributed to the fact that the interview scenarios called for _action_ on the part of the respondent to a rule violation, an officer in need of assistance, an inmate fight, etc. _Inaction_ was what distinguished these 3 types. Nonenforcement was a key characteristic of the lax officer. Inconsistent rule enforcement was an attribute of the "wishy-washy" CO and "Officer Friendly" was lenient in rule enforcement.

Summary of Results

Five distinct types of officers were identified in this study: "enforcers", "hard asses", "people workers", "consolidated", and "social isolates". Three additional types, "lax officer", "officer friendly", and "wishy washy" were identified by respondents. The types differed in their orientation toward the sociostructural component of the organization. Officers reproduced, modified, or rejected official goals, values, and interpretations. The types could also be distinguished based upon the 4 major themes in the occupational culture: orientation to rule enforcement, orientation to exchange/ negotiation with inmates, extent of norms of mutual obligation, and desire to include human service in their role. Some officers developed their own values, beliefs, interpretations, and patterns of interaction. In addition, individual and work variables could be used to differentiate types. There was also variation within each type by prison reflecting their organizational features.

"Enforcers" were common types at both prisons; although there were more at Prison B. They replicated the formal goals, objectives, and values of the organization in their approach to the job. They conformed closely to official policies and procedures, and rules and regulations. They would not negotiate for compliance and order with inmates. Norms of mutual obligation were strong and well-defined for these types of officers. "Enforcers" were not interested in a human service

role largely because it was considered inappropriate and would compromise their authority. A variety of individual and work variables characterized this type. Gender was nonsignificant as a distinguishing characteristic of "enforcers." In terms of race, the "Other" category was more common among "enforcers"; this was particularly true at Prison A. "Enforcers" at Prison A also were more likely to have a college degree. Overall they tended to be younger officers (25 years or under). An examination of work characteristics indicates that "enforcers" tended to be less experienced officers and to work the later shifts (second and third). They typically worked on posts involving inmate contact and were less likely to work on solitary assignments with limited or no inmate contact. "Enforcers" were more likely to choose corrections for extrinsic reasons.

Similar to "enforcers", "hard asses" reproduced the formal goals, objectives and values; however they compromised them by misusing their authority in relations with inmates. They strictly enforced rules for the purpose of punishing or "toying" with inmates. They were aggressive in their approach toward inmates and did not use negotiation or exchange with them. They were definitely not interested in developing more personalized relations with inmates or assuming a counseling role. This type had an esprit de corps with other "hard asses" or other workers who share their punitive philosophy toward inmates.

"Hard asses" comprised only 13.9% of all respondents; however there were more of this type at Prison B. They were overwhelmingly male. At Prison A, they tended to be in the "Other" category, while at Prison B "hard asses" were more likely to be White. They typically worked the later shifts. Unlike the "enforcers", they were more likely to work on posts with more troublesome inmates, such as special management units, maximum security, and segregation. They tended to be between the ages of 26-36 and have only a high school education. "Hard asses" had more work experience at Prison A. Similar to "enforcers", this type was also more likely to choose extrinsic factors for entering corrections.

"Social isolates" also duplicated the formal organizational goals, objectives, and values as their way of doing their job. Overly concerned with the possibility of making a mistake, they went "by the book" and closely followed policies and procedures. They would not negotiate or exchange with inmates for fear of compromising their authority. Norms of mutual obligations were weak or nonexistent. They were ambivalent toward relations with coworkers and inmates, thus they were not interested in any type of human service role. This type constituted the smallest percentage of respondents. They were typically female and tended to be a member of a minority group. At Prison A, they were a member of the "Other" category, while at Prison B they were more likely to be Black. "Social isolates" were more likely to be between the ages of

26-36 and to have some college or an Associate degree. They were generally more experienced COs with 3-6 years work experience. Shift was nonsignificant as a distinguishing characteristic of this type. "Social isolates" were more likely to work on solitary assignments with little or no inmate contact. The reason for entering correctional work was not significant.

Another type, "people workers," modified or softened the official definitions and imperatives in order to incorporate their human service approach to correctional work. They relied on interpersonal skills in their relations with inmates rather than strictness or aggression. They would use negotiation/exchange in their interactions with inmates in the interests of resolving a situation with a minimum of trouble. They were generally older, White officers. "People workers" had more officers age 37 and older than the other types. Similar to "enforcers", gender was not significant as a distinguishing characteristic. At Prison A, "people workers" tended to have only a high school education. At Prison B, they were more likely to have a college degree. Unlike the "enforcers" and the "hard asses", "people workers" typically worked the first shift. They also differed from the "hard asses" because they tended to work on regular units and inmate supervisory activities rather than maximum, special, or segregation units. Finally, "people workers" generally chose corrections for intrinsic reasons, the interest or challenge of the job. This

also differed from "enforcers" and "hard asses" who typically entered corrections for extrinsic reasons.

The "consolidated type" also modified their position in relation to the formal organizational structure by trying to blend a strict, "by the book" approach with communication skills. They wanted to provide human service, yet still follow policy and procedures. They were concerned about documentation and accountability. The norms of mutual obligation appeared situational; they would help a coworker as long as their "ass" was not on the line. The "consolidated" comprised 13.9% of respondents. They numbered more at Prison A. Gender and education were not significant as differentiating characteristics of this type. In terms of race, they tended to be White officers at Prison A and Black officers at Prison B. Similar to "people workers", they were generally older officers age 37 and above. "Consolidated" types tended to work first shift, have more experience (7 or more years), and work on the regular units similar to "people workers". Reasons for becoming a CO were more varied among the "consolidated; however at Prison A they were more likely to choose intrinsic factors.

Finally, 3 additional types were described by respondents: "lax officer", "officer friendly", and "wishy-washy." These types ignored or rejected official proscriptions. "Lax officers" were described as lax in rule enforcement due to fear, timidity, or laziness. They were not interested in human service and did not feel any obligation to other COs. "Officer

friendly" types violated the official norm of getting too close to inmates. They allowed themselves to be manipulated and fooled by inmates. Females were purported to be strongly represented in this classification. The third type are "wishy-washy" officers who project an erratic, inconsistent manner of working with inmates. They are portrayed as unpredictable in rule enforcement and moody in disposition. Norms of mutual obligation are uncertain and unclear.

CHAPTER VII

DISCUSSION

This study demonstrates that any discussion of correctional officer types must include an exploration of their relationship to the 3 major components of an organization: the individual actors, the sociostructural system, and the cultural system. These components are important in order to understand how types emerge and the purposes they serve for officers. There has been a tendency in past research to overlook the importance of these components and to regard them as independent of officer types. The official system plays a dominant role in relating the officer to the formal organization by defining the mission, approved values, and approved modes of conduct. The occupational culture orients the officer to the informal norms and values, alternative interpretations, and other approaches to the work. The individual officers are meaningful in the analysis because it is through their interpretations, values, beliefs, and interests which influences their approach to the job.

Findings indicated that there were distinct and diverse styles of working with inmates among officers in the occupational culture of correctional work. There were officers who reproduced the official organizational goals, sentiments, and values and conform closely to rules and regulations in their patterns of interaction with inmates and other members.

And there were officers who developed their own values, beliefs, interpretations, and patterns of interaction despite the formal organization's definitions and imperatives. "Enforcers", "hard asses", and "social isolates" were officer types which reproduced the formal goals, sentiments, and values. "People workers" and "consolidated" types modified them. "Lax officers", "officer friendly types" and "wishy-washy types" rejected or ignored them. "Enforcers" and "hard asses" followed organizational policies and procedures "to the letter". It was to their advantage to maintain this legalistic approach in order to "cover their ass." Their authoritarian approach toward inmates and distance in interactions was justified by their view of inmates as manipulative and untrustworthy, and even dangerous. Thus it is in their best interests to maintain formalized relations with them. "Hard asses" justified their aggression and toughness toward inmates because of the official mandate to enforce rules, maintain order and control, and because of their experience with more, troublesome, dangerous inmates.

Types of officers were actually modes of accommodation to the structural and organizational factors of each prison. Findings indicated that there were more "enforcers" and "hard asses" at Prison B. This was indicative of the influence of a variety of organizational factors which are distinctive to Prison B: its newness as a prison; a majority of young, inexperienced officers; overcrowded conditions; more

troublesome inmates, an unstable history of leadership; a history of administrative problems including poor recordkeeping and communication with staff; and a history of extensive drug usage and trafficking among inmates. The newness of the institution coupled with young, inexperienced officers means that both are in a stage of adjustment, experimentation, and development. The administration and staff are both learning to work with new management concepts, overcrowded conditions, and more difficult inmates in the maximum security and segregation units. "Hard asses" tended to work on units with more troublesome inmates, maximum security and segregation units. They indicated that a tough approach was necessary in order to handle the more difficult inmates. Thus, identifying strongly with the formal organization provided COs with a mode of accommodation to an unfamiliar, unpredictable situation with large numbers of inmates and more difficult inmates. It provided a means to conceal their fear and uncertainty. Prison B also had a strong reference group in the occupational culture consisting of "enforcers" or "hard asses" which influences category membership. Given the well-defined norms of mutual obligations among these groups and correctional officers in general; it is probable that newer officers tended to identify with either type. Officers identified with these types simply because they were the predominant styles of working with inmates at the facility or in a particular unit. In other words, in order to "fit in" at the prison, officers

accommodated their approach to the job to what they deemed to be the appropriate or accepted style among coworkers.

Moreover, Prison B experienced an erratic history of leadership and has been plagued by administrative problems, such as poor recordkeeping and poor communication with staff and upper levels. The new warden holds the promise of order and stability. He has a strong military background, is currently in the army reserves, and is known for his attention to "detail" and "ability to get along with staff." Officers at Prison B conceivably selected the "enforcer", and even the "hard ass" type, because they perceived them to be favorable to the administration. Correctional officers incorporated perceived goals or the leadership style into their approach to the job. The prison also had an organizational history of extensive drug use and trafficking among inmates. Approximately one year ago, a "massive drug probe" resulted in the prosecution of 30 inmates at Prison B for drug trafficking in a state prison (Journal Times, Feb.10, 1994). Many officers were there during the year long drug investigation since the average seniority is 2 years. For officers, reproducing formal goals, values, and sentiments served 2 purposes: (1) it provided protection from opportunities for corruption and suspicion of involvement, and (2) presenting themselves as an "enforcer" or "hard ass" reaffirmed formal organizational values and sentiments for themselves, and in essence, brought back a sense of order and control.

Another officer type which strongly supports the formal goals and policies of the organization and strictly follows procedures, rules, and regulations was the "social isolates." There were few officers in this type at either site. However, the category was strongly represented by females and minorities. They were usually newer officers who do not identify with coworkers and hence do not have a reference group from which to choose a style of working with inmates. The "social isolates" followed the book essentially out of fear of making a mistake. They felt they were watched more closely for their mistakes because of their status as female and/or minority. "Going by the book" and "keeping a distance" provided protection from mistakes and allowed them to minimize interaction with coworkers and inmates. The "social isolate" type was a mode of accommodation to a situation in which these officers felt alienated and watched closely for mistakes.

Other types modified the authoritarian, rule-bound, militaristic approach of the sociostructural component of the organization. "People workers" and "consolidated types" developed their own interpretations, values, and modes of actions. "People workers" mediated the formal rules, policies, and procedures in order to find a more workable way to manage inmates with the least amount of trouble or confrontation. They valued common sense, good judgment, and interpersonal skills, rather than inflexible rule enforcement and an authoritarian approach. The "consolidated" type tried to

routinely follow policies and procedures, but also used interpersonal skills to resolve a situation. They tried to blend strong rule enforcement with communication skills, but were cautious and mistrustful in their relations with inmates. The "consolidated types" were concerned about "covering their ass" and not deviating too far from the book.

Findings indicated that these 2 types were more common at Prison A. Again, the organizational characteristics of the particular prison influenced the development and distribution of types. Prison A is in a prison town with a culture influenced by relatives and family members who have worked in prison. It is older by approximately 5 years and officers were generally more experienced than their counterparts at Prison B. Hence there was time for officers to experiment with alternative approaches to working with inmates than simply enforcing rules and regulations and issuing orders. There was also time for COs to become accustomed to the new inmate management concept (unit management), in which officers are in direct contact with large numbers of inmates.

The history of leadership and style of leadership also impacted modes of accommodations of officers. The warden at Prison A has been warden since the opening of the correctional institution. This has provide stability, continuity, and a sense of leadership to staff. He came to Prison A with work experience as a treatment director at another prison. In addition, he has a master's degree in education and counseling.

He professes a strong commitment to treatment and has publicly stated that he wanted his officers to have a "counseling role." He has had more time than the warden at Prison B to institute his ideas and instill his philosophy. This may account for officers trying to integrate interpersonal skills and counseling into their work and hence the greater percentages of "people worker" and "consolidated types" at Prison A. Another explanation for the greater presence of "consolidated" types may be that they have tried to consolidate conflicting goals at Prison A. The administration may espouse a treatment goal while in reality more strongly emphasize custody and control because of overcrowding and more dangerous inmates entering the prison. While counseling and treatment in his newspaper interviews, the warden also emphasized that order and security would be maintained. Officers may be receiving mixed messages and have tried to incorporate both goals in their style of guarding.

The final component of Allaire and Firsirotu's model allows us to examine the influence of individual and organizational variables on social type. For instance, gender and race distinguished the "social isolate". This type feels alienated from coworkers and inmates; which is consistent with previous research which found female officers reporting stress or difficulty in working in traditionally male occupations. This category suggests that minority officers also experience problems in working in a predominantly White, male occupation. An interesting issue is whether females and/or minorities are

choosing to work on solitary assignments as modes of accommodation to negative relations with inmates and coworkers, or whether they are assigned these positions for administrative purposes, such as to protect the women from the more difficult assignments on the maximum or special units. The small numbers of females and minorities in the sample definitely calls for more research in this area.

Age and seniority was associated with officer type in the study. "Enforcers" and "hard asses" tended to be younger, less experienced COs; while older, more experienced officers belonged to the "people worker" or "consolidated" categories. Findings are consistent with the theory that as officers mature they become more interested in human service delivery (Klofas & Toch, 1982). However, it contradicts other research which found more experienced officers to have a more negative attitude toward working with inmates (Kauffman, 1988; Webb & Morris, 1978).

Education was a variable which produced some rather interesting results. Training of officers stresses "professionalizing" correctional work. One of the tenets is to upgrade the educational requirements for COs; the assumption is that more educated officers will be more oriented toward human service delivery and less punitive or aggressive toward inmates. "Enforcers" were more likely to have a baccalaureate or master's degree (57.8% as compared to 21.0% of "people workers"). This suggests that education may not be as important

as an indicator of human service attitudes.

Shift was another organizational variable which was examined. Previous research had found that officers on the day shift were more human service oriented (Klofas & Toch (1982), since they had more of an opportunity to work with inmates and mingle with treatment staff. More custodial types of officers worked the later shifts since they were newer officers. This study also found human service oriented types, "people workers" worked the first shift; while many "hard asses" worked the later shifts. Work assignment was included because it has been overlooked in prior research. "Hard asses" were more likely to work on units with more difficult inmates, such as maximum security units, segregation, or special management units for inmates with behavior problems. This raises the question of whether these types choose to work on the more difficult units or whether the types are modes of accommodation. The "enforcer" and "hard ass" types may have adopted their "no nonsense" or tough approach to handle the more troublesome inmates. Social isolates" tended to work on posts with limited contact with inmates or other staff, such as perimeter patrol, tower, and gatehouse. "People workers" worked in housing units or on relief positions with the most inmate contact.

Finally reason for becoming a correctional officer was explored. Jurik (1985) found that officers who were interested in the job for intrinsic reasons, such as the interest or

challenge of the work held more favorable attitudes toward inmates. This study found that reason for becoming an officer was related to officer type. "People workers" were attracted the intrinsic factors of correctional work; its interesting and challenging aspects. "Enforcers" and "hard asses" became officers for extrinsic reasons: the job security and benefits of state employment followed by the availability of the job.

In summary, the major purpose of the study was to identify and describe correctional officer types and their relation to the 3 major components of an organization. The conclusions are threefold. First officer types are indeed shaped by the interplay between the individual actors, the sociostructural system, and the cultural system. As proposed, this organizational analysis was important in showing how officer types are actually modes of accommodation to the structural and organizational factors of the prison. Secondly, the comparative study also found that types are, indeed, influenced by the organizational context of each prison and that the distribution of types varied by prison. Third, as expected, findings indicated that certain individual and work variables further defined and differentiated types.

Limitations of the Study

The conclusions need to evaluated in terms of limitations of the current study. These include:

1. The use of interviews to assess correctional officer types is specified as a limitation. The DOC would not approve observation as an additional methodology. The researcher cannot be assured that, although subjects indicated what their action would be in a certain situation, they would actually behave this way in their daily experience. Hence the study was also limited due to the lack of observational data which would have helped to clarify or bolster findings from the interviews.

2. The study is somewhat limited in terms of generalizability. The results may not be replicated by another researcher because of the personal nature of the interviews and analysis of the researcher. They may be more of a particular insight than a general truth (Maxfield & Babbie, 1995).

3. The comprehensiveness and in-depth view of correctional work may in itself be limiting.

> "Because field researchers get a full and in-depth view of their subject matter, they can reach an unusually comprehensive understanding, By its very comprehensiveness, however, this understanding is less generalizable than results based on rigorous sampling and standardized measurements" (Maxfield & Babbie, 1995: 267).

Though limited, the interview approach and the analysis of relevant documents, provided an opportunity for a rich, detailed examination of styles of working with inmates. It allowed an in-depth analysis of feelings, values, and attitudes

of officers toward working with inmates, and toward correctional work in general. Finally, it afforded the opportunity to apply and refine previous research findings on correctional officer types.

CHAPTER VIII

RECOMMENDATIONS

Policy Recommendations

1. Reason for becoming an officer was a salient factor in distinguishing officer types. The more custodial officers found the job security and benefits appealing. The more human service oriented officers were attracted to intrinsic aspects, such as the interesting and challenging work. Recruitment targeting certain types of officers should consider the importance of why someone wants to become a CO.

2. Findings on age indicated that older COs are more interested in human service work. It may be that the officers who are more interested in extrinsic factors drop out or transfer to other areas in state employment leaving behind human service officers. The human service officers, who enjoy the interest and challenge of the work, are the Cos who intend on staying in corrections. Conversely, it may be the maturity and life experience of the individual which really makes the difference. If so, recruitment efforts may consider target hiring older people to work as COs.

2. In terms of recruitment policies, education does not appear to be the magic panacea for the "ideal CO", the human service officer. Other individual factors may be more salient, such as the age of the candidate.

3. Since there is evidence that some females and minorities feel alienated from coworkers and identify problems

with coworkers. Training may need to incorporate cultural sensitivity training for correctional staff to work with other staff. In addition, gender sensitivity training may be needed for correctional staff. Workshops for female officers, examining their role and special problems may prove helpful in increasing the confidence and clarifying the value of female correctional officers for themselves.

4. Target hiring of females and minorities is also needed in order to increase their numbers, and perhaps ameliorate their feelings of alienation from coworkers and job stress.

5. The findings indicate that a large percentage of officers are classified as "enforcers". However, training seems to be promoting more of a "people worker." Training programs may need to be re-evaluated to determine what is being emphasized and why there is a predominance of these types. The programs may need to evaluate its goals and directives to ensure that they are consistent with a human service approach.

6. The importance of work assignment and its impact on officer types cannot be overstated. The "hard ass" tended to work on posts which involved dealing with more troublesome inmates, such as "seg" or maximum security units. Perhaps these officers need to be rotated periodically. Rotation of officers might counterbalance the effects or "the rubbing off" (as one CO put it) of working on these units. Furthermore, "hard asses" are probably not the best choice for working with disturbed, disruptive inmates.

Research Recommendations

1. It is recommended that the research on types be extended to include an observational methodology in order to observe whether response from interviews or surveys coincide with actual behavior of subjects.

2. A comparative study of various prisons focusing on their differences in order to further examine the impact of the prison context on styles of working with inmates.

3. An exploration of norms of mutual obligations may "re-open" the issue of whether there is a subculture or subcultures among officers.

4. An examination of unit management is suggested, especially since this is a new concept for state correctional institutions. The feelings of correctional officers toward unit management would be interesting, since lack of participation in decision making has been a well-documented gripe of officers.

DISSERTATION COMMITTEE

Peter K. Manning, Chair
Criminal Justice Department

Tim Bynum
Criminal Justice Department

Dan Kruger
Labor & Industrial Relations

Harry Perlstadt
Sociology

LIST OF REFERENCES

List of References

American Correctional Association. (1983). <u>Design guide for secure adult correctional facilities</u>. Laurel Lakes, MD: American Correctional Association.

American Correctional Association. (1994). <u>Directory of juvenile and adult correctional departments, institutions, agencies, and paroling authorities</u>. Laurel Lakes, MD: American Correctional Association.

Allaire, Y. & Firsirotu, M.E. (1984). Theories of organizational culture, <u>Organization Studies</u>, <u>5</u>, 193-226.

Babbie, E. (1986). <u>The practice of social research</u>. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing.

_____. (1992). <u>Survey design and analysis</u>. Glencoe, Ill: The Free Press.

Bailey, K. (1994). <u>Typologies and taxonomies: An introduction to classification techniques.</u> Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

Bowker, L. (1977). <u>Prisoner subcultures</u>. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.

Bognan, R. & Taylor, S. (1975). <u>Introduction to qualitative research methods</u>. New York: Wiley.

Borgan, F.H & Barnett, D.C. (1987). Applying cluster analysis in counseling psychology research. <u>Journal of Counseling Psychology</u>, <u>14</u>, 456-468.

Burke, M. (1990, February 10). The man named warden of new prison. <u>The Journal Times</u>, p.3A

_____. (1993, July 1). RCI's warden removed. _The Journal Times_, pp. 1A, 9A.

_____. (1994, May 18). County man named new warden of RCI. _The Journal Times_, pp. 1A, 9A.

Carroll, L. (1974). _Hacks, blacks and cons_. Prospect Heights, Ill: Waveland Press.

Cheek, F. & Miller, Di Stefano M. (1982). Reducing staff and inmate stress. _Corrections Today_, _44_, 73-78.

_____. (1983). The experience of stress for corrections officers: A double-bind theory of correctional stress. _Journal of Criminal Justice_, _11_, 105-120.

Cicourel, A. (1960). _Method and measurement in sociology_. London: The Free Press of Glencoe Collier-Macmillan Limited.

Clear, T. & Cole, G. (1994). _American corrections._ California: Wadsworth Publishing Company.

Cloward, R.A. (1960). Social control in prison. In D. Cressey (Ed.), _Theoretical studies in social organization of the prison_. (New York: Social Science Research Council.

Correctional institution can help inmates change attitude. (1985, February 17). _The Northwestern_, p 1.

Cressey, D. (1959). Contradictory directives in complex organizations, the case of the prison. _Administrative Science Quarterly_, _4_, 1-19.

Crouch, B. (1980). _The keepers._ Springfield, Ill: Charles C. Thomas Publisher.

_____., & Marquardt, J. (1980). On becoming a prison guard. In B. Crouch (Ed.), _The keepers._ Springfield, Ill: Charles C. Thomas Publisher.

_____. & G. Alpert. (1982). Sex and occupational socialization among prison guards: A longitudinal study. _Criminal Justice and Behavior_, 9, 159-176.

Denzin, N. (1989). _Research act_. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Doege, D. (1993, June 1). Child Molester hid behind his smile. _CITY Sentinel_, p.8

Douglas, J. (1976). _Investigative social research_. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

Duffee, D. (1975). The correctional officer subculture and organizational change. _Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency_, 11, 155-72.

Emerson, R. (1983). _Contemporary field research_. Prospect Heights, Ill: Waveland Press, Inc.

Feldman, M.S. (1995). _Strategies for interpreting qualitative data_. California: Sage Publications.

Fox, V. & Stinchcomb, J. (1994). _Introduction to corrections_. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Geertz, C. (1973). _The interpretation of cultures_. New York: Basic Books.

_____. (1971). _Myth, symbol, and culture_. New York: Norton.

Genlesse, P.A. (1991, June 16). Prison boom will mean a new CITY A image. _The Post-Crescent_, pp. 1A, A9.

Goffman, E. (1959). _Presentation of self in everyday life_. New York: Doubleday Anchor Books.

Grosser, G.H. (1968). External setting and internal relations of the Prison, In L. Hazelrigg (Ed.), <u>Prison Within Society</u>, (pp.9-27). New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc.

Hage, J. & Aiken, M. (1969). Routine technology, social structure, and organization goals. <u>Administrative Science Quarterly</u>, <u>14</u>. 366-376.

Henzel, P. (1990, March 4). Effort to treat sex offenders begins in CITY A. <u>The Milwaukee Journal</u>, p.3B.

Hepburn, J. (1985). The exercise of power in coercive organizations: A study of prison guards. <u>Criminology</u>, <u>23</u>, 145-163.

_____. & Knepper, P. (1993). Correctional officers as human services workers: The effect on job satisfaction. <u>Justice Quarterly</u>, <u>10</u>, 313-335.

Hertzburg, M. (1991, April 21).CITY B's New Prison (RCI). <u>The Journal Times</u>, p1.

Hickson, M., Roebuck, J., & Murty, K. (1990). Creative triangulation: Toward a methodology for studying social types. <u>Symbolic Interaction</u>, <u>11</u>, 103-127.

Hunt,G.; S. Riegel; T. Morales; & D. Waldorf. (1993). Changes in Prison culture: Prison gangs and the case of the pepsi generation. <u>Social Problems</u>, <u>40</u>, 398-409.

Hyman, H. (1957). <u>Survey design and analysis</u>. Glencoe, Ill: The Free Press.

Hy, R., Feig, D., & Regoli, R. (1983). <u>Research methods and statistics</u>. Cincinnati, OH: Anderson Publishing Company.

Irwin, J. (1980). <u>Prisons in turmoil.</u> Boston: Little, Brown and Company,

_____., & J. Austin. <u>It's about time: America's imprisonment binge.</u> CA: Wadsworth Publishing Company.

Jacobs, J. (1977). Stateville: The penitentiary in mass society. Chicago, Ill: The University of Chicago Press.

_____. & Crotty, N.M. (1978). Guard unions and the future of the Prison. Ithaca, N.Y: Cornell University.

_____., & Retsky, H. (1980). Prison Guard, In Ben Crouch (Ed.), The Keepers, Springfield, Ill: Charles C. Thomas Publisher.

_____. & Kraft, L. (1978). Integrating the keepers: A comparison of black and white prison guards. Social Problems, 25, 304-318.

Jermier, J.M., Slocum, J.W., Fry, L.W. & Gaines, J. (1991). Organizational subcultures in a soft bureaucracy: Resistance behind the myth and facade of an official culture. Organization Science, 2, 170-194.

Johnson, R. (1979). Informal helping networks in prison: the shape of grass-roots correctional intervention. Journal of Criminal Justice, 7, 53-70.

_____. & Price, S. (1981). The complete correctional officer human service and human environment of prison. Criminal Justice and Behavior, 8, 343-373.

Johnson-Elie, T. (1993, July 1). Warden at CITY B reassigned. CITY Sentinel, p.5A.

Jurik, N. (1985). Individual and organizational determinants of correctional officer attitudes toward inmates. Criminology, 23, 523-539.

_____. & Winn, R. (1987). Describing correctional-security dropouts and rejects. An individual or organizational profile? Criminal Justice and Behavior, 14(1), 5-24.

_____. & G. Halemba. (1984). Gender, working conditions, and job satisfaction of women in a non-traditional occupation: Female correctional officers in men's prisons. Sociological Quarterly, 25, 551-566.

Kauffman, K. (1981). Prison officers' attitudes and perceptions, a case of pluralistic ignorance. Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 18, 272-74.

_____. (1988). Prison officers and their world. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Kerlinger, F. (1986). Foundations of behavioral research. Orlando, FL: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc.

Kirk, J. & Miller, M. (1986). Reliability and validity in qualitative research. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

Klapp, O. (1971). Social types: Process, structure, and ethos. San Diego, CA: Aegis Publishing Co.

_____. (1972). Heroes, villains, and fools: Reflections of the american culture. San Diego, CA: Aegis Publishing Co.

Kleinhuizen, J. (1985, August 21). Prison superintendent sets philosophy. The Northwestern, pp. 1, 2.

_____. (1987, June 3). Management system avoids staff conflicts. The Northwestern, pp. 4, 5.

_____. (1987, September 23). Inmates sharing bunks. The Northwestern, pp. 1, 2.

Klofas, J. (1984) Reconsidering prison personnel, new views of the correctional officer subculture. International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology, 28, 169-75.

Li

LC

M

E

E

_____ and Hans Toch. (1982). The guard subculture. _Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency_, _19_(2), 238-54.

Light, S. (1991). Assaults on prison officers:Interactional themes. _Justice Quarterly_, _8_, 243-261.

Lombardo, L. (1985). Group dynamics and the prison guard subculture, is the subculture an impediment to helping inmates? _International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology_, _29_, 79-90.

_____. (1989). _Guards imprisoned_. Cincinnati, OH: Anderson Publishing Company.

Manning, P.K. (1995). Toward a theory of police organization. Unpublished Manuscript. Michigan State University.

_____. & M. A. Farkas. The occupational culture of corrections and policing. Unpublished Manuscript. Michigan State University.

Marquardt, J. (1986). Prison guards and the use of coercion as a mechanism of prisoner control. _Criminology_, _24_, 347-366.

_____. (1986). Doing research in prison: The strengths and weaknesses of full participation as a guard. _Justice Quarterly_, _3_, 15-32.

Maxfield, M. & E. Babbie. (1995). _Research methods for criminal justice and criminology_. Belmont, CA.: Wadsworth Publishing Company.

McCleery, R. (1960). Communication patterns as a basis of formal authority. In D. Cressey (Ed.), _Theoretical studies in social organization of the prison_. New York: Social Science Research Council.

Messinger, S. & Sykes, G. (1960). The inmate social system. IN
     D, Cressey (Ed.), Theoretical Studies in Social
     organization of the prison. New York: Social Science
     Research Council.

Metro, G. (1993, July 30). Acting warden says fix is coming.
     The Journal Times, pp. 1B,5B.

Miles, M. & Huberman, A.M. (1991). Qualitative data analysis.
     Newbury Park, CA.: Sage Publications.

Mohr, L. B. (1977). Authority and democracy in organizations.
     Human Relations, 30, 919-947.

Mowday, R., Porter, L. & Steers, M. (1982). Employee-
     organization linkages: The psychology of commitment,
     absenteeism, and turnover. New York: Academic Press.

Prison A is slated to open in September. (1986, June 23). The
     CITY Sentinel, p.5.

Owen, B.A. (1988). The reproduction of social control: A study
     of prison workers at San Quentin. New York: Praeger.

Philliber, S., Schwab, M. and Sloss, G. (1980). Social
     research: Guides to a decision-making process. Itasca,
     Ill: F.E. Peacock Publishers, Inc.

Poole, E. & R. Regoli. (1981). Alienation in prison.
     Criminology, 19(2), 251-70.

Progrebin, M. (1980). Challenge to authority for correctional
     officers: a conflicting organizational dilemma. Journal
     of Offender Counseling, Services, and Rehabilitation.

_____., & Atkins, B. (1982). Organizational conflict
     in correctional institutions. Journal of Offender
     Counseling, Services, and Rehabilitation, 7, 23-31.

Sackmann, S. (1992). Cultures and subcultures, an analysis of
     organizational knowledge. Administrative Science
     Quarterly, 37(1), 140-162.

Schatzman, L. & Strauss, L. (1973). Field research: Strategies for a natural sociology. Englewood Cliffs, N.J: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Schein, E. (1990). Organizational culture (the changing face and place of work). The American Psychologist, 45, 109-120.

Schutz, A. (1964). Collected papers: Studies in social theory. Netherlands: The Hague.

Sieber, S.D. (1973). The integration of fieldwork and survey methods. American Journal of Sociology, 78, 1335-1359.

Smirchich, L. (1983). Organizational strategies and interorganizational networks. Human Relations, 29, 327-343.

_____. (1983). Organizations as shared meanings, In L.R. Pondy, P.J. Frost, G. Morgan, & T.C. Dandridge, (Eds.), Organizational Symbolism (pp.55-65). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

_____. (1983). Concepts of culture and organizational analysis. Administrative Science Quarterly, 28, 339-358.

Stojkovic, S. & R. Lovell. (1990). Corrections: An introduction. Cincinnati, OH.: Anderson Publishing Company.

Sykes, G. (1958). The Society of Captives. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Taylor, B. (1987, August). Residents blast prison plans. The Journal Times (p.1A).

Thomas, J. (1984). Some aspects of negotiated order, loose coupling, and mesostructure in maximum security prisons. Symbolic Interaction, 7, 213-231.

Too

Un

Wa

W

W

i

I

_____. (1993). <u>Doing critical ethnography</u>. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Toch, H. & J. Klofas. (1982). Alienation and desire for job enrichment among correction officers. <u>Federal Probation</u>, <u>46</u>, 35-44.

Unnithan, P. (1986). Research in a correctional setting: constraints and biases. <u>Journal of Criminal Justice</u>, <u>14</u>, 401-412.

Ward, J.H. & Hook, M.E. (1963). Application of an hierarchical grouping procedure to a problem of grouping profiles. <u>Educational and Psychological Measurement</u>, <u>23</u>, 69-81.

Webb, G.L. & Morris, D. (1978) <u>Prison guards: The culture and perspective of an occupational group.</u> Austin: Coker Books.

Whitehead, J. & Lindquist, C. (1989). Determinants of correctional officer professional orientation. <u>Justice Quarterly</u>, <u>6</u>(1), 69-87.

Whitehead, J. Lindquist, C., and Klofas, J. (1987). Correctional officer professional orientation: A replication of the Klofas/Toch measure. <u>Criminal Justice and Behavior</u>, <u>14</u>, 468-486.

Wick, R.J. (1980). <u>Guard: Society's professional prisoner.</u> Houston, TX: Gulf Publishing Company.

MIDWEST STATE Department of Corrections. (1992). <u>Statement of Mission and Goals</u>. MIDWEST STATE: MIDWESY STATE Department of Corrections.

MIDWEST STATE Department of Corrections. (1993). <u>CITY A correctional institution annual report</u>. MIDWEST STATE: MIDWEST STATE Department of Corrections.

MIDWEST STATE Legislative Council. (1992). <u>Background on MIDWEST STATE'S prison and community corrections system.</u> (Staff brief 92-6). MIDWEST STATE: MIDWEST STATE Legislative Council.

MI

W

MIDWEST STATE Legislative Reference Bureau. (1994). <u>State of MIDWEST Blue Book.</u> MIDWEST STATE: MIDWEST STATE Legislative Reference Bureau.

Wright, K., & Saylor, W. (1991). Male and Female employees' perceptions of prison work:is there a difference? <u>Justice Quarterly</u>, <u>8</u>, 505-524.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

TABLE XVI - DEMOGRAPHICS
CORRECTIONAL OFFICER SAMPLES
% of Respondents in Each Prison

DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTIC	PRISON A n=35	PRISON B n=44
RACIAL & ETHNIC COMPOSITION	W = 28 (80.0) B = 2 (5.7) 0 = 5 (14.2)	W = 34 (77.2) B = 6 (13.6) O = 4 (9.0)
GENDER	M = 27 (77.1) F = 8 (22.8)	M = 30 (68.1) F = 14 (31.8)
AGE	Mean Age = 32 yrs. *Range 22-53 yrs.	Mean Age = 32 yrs. *Range 22-48 yrs.
EDUCATION	Mean Education = 13 grade *Range= 12-18 grd.	Mean Education = 13 grade *Range= 12-16 grd.

Abbreviations: W = White
 B = Black
 0 (Prison A)= Hispanic(1), Asian (1), Native
 American (1), and Oacific Islander (2)
 0 (Prison B)= Hispanic (3), Asian (1)
 M= male
 F= female

TABLE XVII - WORK CHARACTERISTICS
CORRECTIONAL OFFICER SAMPLE
% of Respondents in Each Prison

WORK CHARACTERISTIC	PRISON A n=35	PRISON B n=44
OFFICER RANK	CO I = 10 (28.5) CO II = 16 (45.7) CO III = 9 (25.7)	CO I = 20 (45.4) CO II = 12 (27.2) CO III = 12 (27.2)
SHIFT	First = 13 (37.1) Second = 12 (34.2) Third = 10 (28.5)	First = 17 (38.6) Second = 17 (38.6) Third = 10 (22.7)
SENIORITY (PRISON)	Mean = 4 yrs. Range = 8 wks.- 9 yrs.	Mean = 2 yrs. Range = 3 wks.-4 1/2 yrs.
TOTAL TIME IN CORRECTIONS	Mean = 6 yrs. Range= 3mos.-20 yrs.*	Mean = 3 yrs. Range= 11 wks.- 10 yrs.*

* Number does not include the 8 weeks of training at academy.
* Number does include the 8 weeks of training at academy.

TABLE XVIII
DISTRIBUTION OF OFFICER TYPES
By Gender
% of All Respondents

	Combined Sample, n=79		Prison A n=35		Prison B n=44	
	M	**F**	**M**	**F**	**M**	**F**
"Enforcer"	43.9 25	40.9 9	37.0 10	37.5 3	50.0 15	42.9 6
"Hard Ass"	19.2 11	0.0 0	11.0 3	0.0 0	26.6 8	0.0 0
"People Worker"	21.0 12	22.7 5	29.6 8	25.0 2	13.3 4	21.4 3
"Loner"	3.5 2	18.1 4	3.7 1	12.5 1	3.3 1	21.4 3
"Consolidated"	12.2 7	18.1 4	18.5 5	25.0 2	6.6 2	14.2 2
	72.1 57	27.8 22	77.1 27	22.8 8	68.1 30	31.8 14

TABLE XIX
DISTRIBUTION OF OFFICER TYPES
By Race
% of All Respondents

	Combined Sample, n=79			Prison A n=35			Prison B n=44		
	W	B	O	W			W	B	O
Enforcer	38.7 24	50.0 4	66.6 6	32.1 9	1.0 2	40.0 2	44.1 15	33.3 2	1.0 4
Hard Ass	16.1 10	0.0 0	11.1 1	7.1 2	0.0 0	20.0 1	23.5 8	0.0 0	0.0 0
People Worker	25.8 16	0.0 0	11.1 1	32.1 9	0.0 0	20.0 1	20.5 7	0.0 0	0.0 0
Loner	4.8 3	25.0 2	11.1 1	3.5 1	0.0 0	20.0 1	5.8 2	33.3 2	0.0 0
Consolidated	14.5 9	25.0 2	0.0 0	25.0 7	0.0 0	0.0 0	5.8 2	33.3 2	0.0 0
	78.4 62	10.1 8	11.3 9	80.0 28	5.7 2	14.2 5	77.2 34	13.6 6	9.0 4

TABLE XX
DISTRIBUTION OF OFFICER TYPES
By Age
% of All Respondents

	Combined Sample, n=79			Prison A n=35			Prison B n=44		
	25 or less	26-36	37 & up	25 or less	26-36	37 & up	25 or less	26-36	37 & up
Enforcer	68.1 15	38.4 15	22.2 4	71.4 5	30.0 6	25.0 2	66.6 10	47.3 9	20.0 2
Hard Ass	9.0 2	20.5 8	5.5 1	0.0 0	15.0 3	0.0 0	13.3 2	26.3 5	10.0 1
People Worker	18.1 4	15.3 6	38.8 7	28.5 2	25.0 5	37.5 3	13.3 2	5.2 1	40.0 4
Loner	0.0 0	12.8 5	5.5 1	0.0 0	10.0 2	0.0 0	0.0 0	15.7 3	10.0 1
Consolidated	4.5 1	12.8 5	27.7 5	0.0 0	20.0 4	37.5 3	6.6 1	5.2 1	20.0 2
	27.8 22	49.3 39	22.7 18	20.0 7	57.1 20	22.8 8	34.0 15	43.1 19	22.7 10

TABLE XXI
DISTRIBUTION OF OFFICER TYPES
By Educational Level
% of All Respondents

	Combined Sample, n=79			Prison A n=35			Prison B n=44		
	HSE	SC/ AD	BD/ MD	HSE	SC/ AD	BD/ MD	HSE	SC /AD	BD/ MD
Enforcer	33.3 9	42.4 14	57.8 11	15.3 2	40.0 6	71.4 5	50.0 7	44.4 8	50.0 6
Hard Ass	25.9 7	9.0 3	5.2 1	23.0 3	0.0 0	0.0 0	28.5 4	16.6 3	8.3 1
People Worker	29.6 8	15.1 5	21.0 4	46.1 6	20.0 3	14.2 1	14.2 2	11.1 2	25.0 3
Loner	0.0 0	15.1 5	5.2 1	0.0 0	13.3 2	0.0 0	0.0 0	16.6 3	8.3 1
Consolidat ed	11.1 3	18.1 6	10.5 2	15.3 2	26.6 4	14.2 1	7.1 1	11.1 2	8.3 1
	34.1 27	41.7 33	24.0 19	37.1 13	42.8 15	20.0 7	31.8 14	40.9 18	27.2 12

Abbreviations: HSE= High school education
SC/AD = Some College/ Associate degree
BD/MD = Bachelor degree/ Master's degree

TABLE XXII
DISTRIBUTION OF OFFICER TYPES
By Seniority
% of All Respondents

	Combined Sample, n=79			Prison A n =35			Prison B n=44		
	2yrs. or less	3-6 yrs.	7 yrs. & up	2yrs. or less	3-6 yrs.	7 yrs. & up	2yrs. or less	3-6 yrs.	7 yrs & up
Enforcer	51.3 19	44.4 12	20.0 3	57.1 4	50.0 7	14.2 2	50.0 15	38.4 5	1.0 1
Hard Ass	18.9 7	7.4 2	13.3 2	0.0 0	7.1 1	14.2 2	23.3 7	7.6 1	0.0 0
People Worker	16.2 6	14.8 4	46.6 7	28.5 2	7.1 1	50.0 7	13.3 4	23.0 3	0.0 0
Loner	5.4 2	14.8 4	0.0 0	0.0 0	14.2 2	0.0 0	6.6 2	15.3 2	0.0 0
Consolidate d	8.1 3	18.5 5	20.0 3	14.2 1	21.4 3	21.4 3	6.6 2	15.3 2	0.0 0
	46.8 37	34.1 27	18.9 15	20.0 7	40.0 14	40.0 14	68.1 30	29.5 13	2.2 1

TABLE XXIII
DISTRIBUTION OF OFFICER TYPES
By Shift
% of All Respondents

	Combined Sample, n=79			Prison A n =35			Prison B n=44		
	1st	2nd	3rd	1st	2nd	3rd	1st	2nd	3rd
Enforcer	30.0 9	48.2 14	55.0 11	23.0 3	41.6 5	50.0 5	35.2 6	52.9 9	60.0 6
Hard Ass	3.3 1	20.6 6	20.0 4	0.0 0	16.6 2	10.0 1	5.8 1	23.5 4	30.0 3
People Worker	36.6 11	13.7 4	10.0 2	46.1 6	16.6 2	20.0 2	29.4 5	11.7 2	0.0 0
Loner	10.0 3	6.8 2	5.0 1	7.6 1	8.3 1	0.0 0	11.7 2	5.8 1	10.0 1
Consolidated	20.0 6	10.3 3	10.0 2	23.0 3	16.6 2	20.0 2	17.6 3	5.8 1	0.0 0
	37.9 30	36.7 29	25.3 20	37.1 13	34.2 12	28.5 10	38.6 17	38.6 17	22.7 10

TABLE XXIV
DISTRIBUTION OF OFFICER TYPES
By Work Assignment
% of All Respondents

	Combined Sample, n=79			Prison A n =35			Prison B n=44		
	Unit Rg.	Unit Mx.	Solit-ary	Unit Rg .	Unit Mx.	Solit-ary	Unit Rg.	Unit Mx.	Solit-ary
Enforcer	47.5 19	47.3 9	30.0 6	36.8 7	50.0 4	25.0 2	57.1 12	45.4 5	33.3 4
Hard Ass	0.0 0	47.3 9	10.0 2	0.0 0	37.5 3	0.0 0	0.0 0	54.5 6	16.6 2
People Worker	30.0 12	5.2 1	20.0 4	36.8 7	12.5 1	25.0 2	23.8 5	0.0 0	16.6 2
Loner	2.5 1	0.0 0	25.0 5	0.0 0	0.0 0	25.0 2	4.7 1	0.0 0	25.0 3
Consolidated	20.0 8	0.0 0	15.0 3	26.3 5	0.0 0	25.0 2	14.2 3	0.0 0	8.3 1
	50.6 40	24.0 19	25.3 20	54.2 19	22.8 8	22.8 8	47.7 21	25.0 11	27.2 12

UNIT (Rg). - Inmate housing units, recreation, visiting area, kitchen, relief, work center.
UNIT (Mx. - Maximum security or special units for disruptive inmates, segregation.
SOLITARY - Positions in which officer works alone, includes tower, perimeter patrol, armory, gatehouse, transport, sanitation.
MISC. -Recreation, kitchen, transport, visiting area

TABLE XXV
DISTRIBUTION OF OFFICER TYPES
By Reason for Becoming a CO
% of All Respondents

	Combined Sample, n=79			Prison A n =35			Prison B n=44		
	Extrin-sic	Intrin-sic	Misc.	Extrin-sic.	Intrin-sic	Misc.	Extrin-sic	Instrin-sic	Misc.
Enforcer	54.3 25	16.6 3	40.0 6	50.0 9	11.1 1	37.5 3	57.1 16	22.2 2	42.8 3
Hard Ass	21.7 10	0.0 0	5.5 1	16.6 3	0.0 0	0.0 0	25.0 7	3.5 1	44.4 4
People Worker	6.5 3	55.5 10	26.6 4	11.1 2	66.6 6	25.0 2	3.5 1	44.4 4	28.5 2
Loner	6.5 3	5.5 1	13.3 2	0.0 0	0.0 0	25.0 2	10.7 3	11.1 1	0.0 0
Consolidated	10.8 5	22.2 4	13.3 2	22.2 4	22.2 2	25.0 2	3.5 1	22.2 2	14.2 1
	58.2 46	22.7 18	18.9 15	51.4 18	25.7 9	22.8 8	63.6. 28	20.4 9	15.9 7

Key:

Extrinsic Reasons= Job security ,benefits, job availability
Intrinsic Reasons=Interest or challenge of the work
Miscellaneous=friends, use criminal justice education

APPENDIX B

WORK ASSIGNMENT DESCRIPTIONS

The primary responsibilities and duties of each work assignment have been accumulated from institutional documents and officer descriptions of their positions.

HOUSING UNITS & SEGREGATION UNITS

Maintain security and custody of inmates, staff, and community protection.

Maintain proper conduct of inmates while in the housing units and all areas of the institution.

Enforce required regulations, procedures, standards, and expectations relevant to the institution and taking appropriate disciplinary action.

Inspect inmate living quarters for any violations of cleanliness or security rules and regulations. This includes searching for contraband.

Orient new inmates to areas within housing unit. Oversee meal time, sick call, and other activities.

Establish and maintain appropriate working and livingrelationships between the officer and inmates.

Be alert to behavioral changes of individual inmates and/or groups of inmates, record changes, and where necessary make referral.

Listen to inmate complaints, questions, comments, and make appropriate referral when required.

Maintain housing unit log recording all appropriate information involving shift activities, including head counts, inmate telephone calls, issuance of inmate clothing.

Provide information when requested for review by program committee and appear at inmate disciplinary hearings when required.

Assist in training and orienting new officers.

RELIEF/UTILITY

Perform duties & responsibilities of absent staff members for your assigned post as required.

FOOD SERVICE

Supervise inmates in any preparation and handling of food to ensure that proper and safe health and sanitation procedures are followed.

Inspect food and eating utensils to be distributed to inmates to assure health and sanitation standards are met.

Maintain security and supervise inmate behavior in food service area.

VISITING ROOM

Supervise inmates during family visits and enforce rules relating to visitors in accordance with DOC policies and procedures.

Observe inmate and visitor behavior.

Check room after closing for contraband. Search inmates entering and leaving visiting area.

WORK CENTER & RECREATION AREAS

Supervise and observe inmates during work detail or recreation time and enforce rules in accordance with DOC policies and procedures.

Maintain a record of all activities, including head counts, issuance of conduct reports.

TRANSPORTATION/MOVEMENT

Escort and supervise inmates on trips to court, funerals, hospitals, work/study release placement, and approved off grounds activities.

Transport new inmates to facility and released inmates on mandatory release or parole.

TOWER/OBSERVATION

Observe all activities of individuals in recreation yard and exiting or entering buildings. Be aware of vehicles or persons outside the perimeter of the prison.

SALLYPORT OR GATEHOUSE

Control all vehicles entering or leaving the institution and the perimeter road.

Check delivery trucks. Check to ensure State vehicles are secure.

PERIMETER PATROL

Patrol (foot or vehicle) institution buildings and grounds for control of inmates, possible safety hazards, securing areas and any unusual situation which may disrupt the orderly operation of the institution.

CONTROL

Monitor institutional activities: alarms, fences, air handles, doors.

Dispatch people for jobs using State rules.

Hand out equipment, such as radios, to officers.

RECEPTION AREA

Process visitors to the institution. Check inmate visitor's ID against list of allowable visitors.

Check and screen visitors entering institution for only allowable items.

Log visitors in and out of institution.

APPENDIX C

187

CORRECTIONS OFFICERS!!!

AN INTERESTING <u>UNIVERSITY</u> RESEARCH PROJECT IS UNDERWAY & VOLUNTEERS ARE NEEDED FROM AMONG RACINE COs FOR A BRIEF INTERVIEW.

<u>HERE'S THE DETAILS:</u>
 IT WOULD BE AN INTERVIEW ABOUT CORRECTIONAL WORK: DUTIES,RESPONSIBILITIES, & FEELINGS.
* *I will respect your time limitations.

- IT WILL BE CONDUCTED IN THE WARDEN'S ADMINISTRATIVE CONFERENCE ROOM ON <u>TUESDAY, JANUARY 10</u> (1:30PM.) & <u>THURSDAY, JANUARY 12</u> (9:30PM.) PLEASE STOP BEFORE OR AFTER YOUR SHIFT. For your convenience, I am also willing to conduct telephone interviews at my expense (just leave a first name & #) or meet for coffee at another location.

- RESPONSES WILL BE KEPT ANONYMOUS & CONFIDENTIAL.

<u>PLEASE</u> COME & PARTICIPATE, I AM VERY INTERESTED IN FINDING OUT ABOUT YOUR WORK!! Too often correctional work is not given the recognition & respect it deserves!! I will be happy to answer any questions which you may have about the project.

Contact: Professor Mary Ann Farkas (Marquette U) - (414) 288-7917/353-0484

Appendix C
CONSENT FORM

Dear Corrections Officer,

Before being interviewed, I would like to inform you of the following points. This study is Michigan State University dissertation research for a doctoral degree. The purpose of the research is to explore the experience of correctional work and the role of correctional officers in order to enrich our knowledge and understanding of the occupation. The interview is anonymous which means that no one will be able to associate your responses with your name. Your identity will be held strictly confidential, hence any reports of research findings will not permit associating you with specific responses or findings.

It is important that you fully understand the voluntary nature of your participation. In other words, you may choose to participate with the understanding that you have the right to answer only certain questions or discontinue the interview at any time. You may also choose not to be interviewed at all. The interview should take approximately twenty- thirty minutes.

You indicate your voluntary agreement to be interviewed by participating in this interview.

Sincerely,

Mary Ann Farkas
11036 W. Appleton Ave.
Milwaukee, WI. 53225
(414) 353-0484

Appendix C
INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

1. Official job title: _____ 2.Shift: _____

3. Work Post: _____ 4. How long? _____

5. What are your formal job duties? What tasks do you spend the most time on?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

6. What other work assignments have you previously had at this facility? _____

_____

7. Which post do you prefer to work? Why?_____

_____

8. Which post do you least like working? Why? _____

_____

9. Time at facility: _____ 10. Length of time in Corrections: _____

11. What type of work did do you do before becoming an officer? _____

_____

12. Were you ever in the military? If so, what functions did you perform? _____

_____

13. Have you ever worked in law enforcement or private security? _____

_____

14. What made you decide to become a correctional officer?_____

_____

_____

_____

15. Did you have any relatives or friends who were officers?_____

_____

16. Where do you feel that you learned the most about your job? _____

_____

_____

17. Was there another correctional officer who acted as a mentor or "showed you the ropes"? _____ 18. If YES, could you briefly describe him/her to me.

_____

_____

_____

19. Describe for me your view of a "good' or an effective correctional officer.

_____

_____

_____

_____

20. Do you see different styles or ways of working with inmates among officers in this facility? In other words, do you see different types of officers?_____21. If YES, please describe them briefly. Is there a predominant type at RCI?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

22. How does a CO earn the respect of inmates?_____

_____

_____

_____

23. How does a CO earn the respect or become accepted by other officers?___

_____

_____

_____

24. What would be advice you'd give a new CO inre working with inmates? ___

_____

_____

_____

_____

25. Do you ever socialize outside of working hours with any of the officers you work with?_____ 26. If YES, how often & what kinds of activities do you engage in?

_____

_____

27. What is the most rewarding aspect of your job? _____

_____

_____

28. What is the most difficult aspect of your job? _____

_____

_____

29. Are you planning a career in Corrections? _____ 30. Why or why not?

_____

_____

_____

Part II

Instructions: I am going to describe some situations which you may encounter in your daily interactions with inmates. Please describe to me what your action would be in the situation and the reason why you have chosen this course of action.

31. An inmate is standing in the doorway leading to the recreation area. You inform him that there is rule against blocking a doorway. You order him to move. He refuses to comply. You reissue the order. He still refuses to move. Describe what your action would be in this situation and why.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

32. While on your post, an inmate comes up to you and alls you a "blank" idiot . Without warning he suddenly swings at you with his fist and hits you on the side of the face. Describe what your action would be in this situation and why._____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

33. You are on your post, you notice an inmate yelling in the face of another officer. The officer appears to be having trouble resolving the situation. Please describe your action and why. _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

34. You are supervising inmates at lunch, suddenly two inmates start yelling and swearing at each other. A fight breaks out with the two punching and kicking each other. Please describe your course of action and why._____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

35. Age _____

36. Race _____

37. Gender_____

38. Education (highest grade completed)_____

39. Training (weeks) _____

40. Special Trainings:_____