INFORMATION TO USERS

This reproduction was made from a copy of a document sent to us for microfilming. While the most advanced technology has been used to photograph and reproduce this document, the quality of the reproduction is heavily dependent upon the quality of the material submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help clarify markings or notations which may appear on this reproduction.

1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting through an image and duplicating adjacent pages to assure complete continuity.

2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a round black mark, it is an indication of either blurred copy because of movement during exposure, duplicate copy, or copyrighted materials that should not have been filmed. For blurred pages, a good image of the page can be found in the adjacent frame. If copyrighted materials were deleted, a target note will appear listing the pages in the adjacent frame.

3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., is part of the material being photographed, a definite method of "sectioning" the material has been followed. It is customary to begin filming at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. If necessary, sectioning is continued again—beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.

4. For illustrations that cannot be satisfactorily reproduced by xerographic means, photographic prints can be purchased at additional cost and inserted into your xerographic copy. These prints are available upon request from the Dissertations Customer Services Department.

5. Some pages in any document may have indistinct print. In all cases the best available copy has been filmed.

University
Microfilms
International
300 N. Zeeb Road
Ann Arbor, MI 48106

Downloaded from SHAREOK. Persistent Handle URL: https://hdl.handle.net/11244/5353

8524075

Siano, Joseph N.

AN ANALYSIS OF THE ATTITUDE OF CORRECTIONAL OFFICERS TOWARD INMATE EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS IN OKLAHOMA'S MINIMUM, MEDIUM, AND MAXIMUM SECURITY INSTITUTIONS

The University of Oklahoma PH.D. 1985

University
Microfilms
International 300 N. Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106

Copyright 1985

by

Siano, Joseph N.

All Rights Reserved

THE UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA

GRADUATE COLLEGE

AN ANALYSIS OF THE ATTITUDE OF CORRECTIONAL OFFICERS TOWARD INMATE EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS IN OKLAHOMA'S MINIMUM, MEDIUM, AND MAXIMUM SECURITY INSTITUTIONS

A DISSERTATION

SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE FACULTY

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

BY

JOSEPH N. SIANO

Norman, Oklahoma

1985

AN ANALYSIS OF THE ATTITUDE OF CORRECTIONAL OFFICERS TOWARD INMATE EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS IN OKLAHOMA'S MINIMUM, MEDIUM AND MAXIMUM SECURITY INSTITUTIONS

APPROVED BY:

Dr. Don S. Udell, Chair

Dr. Gary Green, Member

Dr. Andy Van Gundy, Member

Dr. Lloyd J. Korhonen, Member

Dr. Michael Langenbach, Member

DISSERTATION COMMITTEE

©

JOSEPH N. SIANO

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

As the researcher approached the conclusion of this study, his thoughts turned to those individuals who aided in his efforts to complete this degree. Their assistance, encouragement and support are deeply appreciated.

The researcher wishes to express gratitude to his chairman, Dr. Donald S. Udell, for his guidance, support and faith. The researcher would also like to thank his other four committee members: Dr. Gary Green, Dr. Lloyd Korhonen, Dr. Michael Langenbach and Dr. Andy VanGundy for their patience and diligence throughout the researcher's doctoral program. A further expression of appreciation is extended to the researcher's typist, Mrs. Norma Potts, for her encouragement and efforts.

Dr. Kathy Roberts, Dr. Steve Davis and Mr. Bud Clark are greatly appreciated for the great amount of time spent in the organization and data collection stages of this study. Without their efforts, this study could not have been completed. Also, appreciated are the on-site supervisors and correctional officers from the Oklahoma Department of Corrections who participated in this study.

This researcher is especially grateful to his parents, Mr. and Mrs. Louis Siano, for their continuous support and understanding and to his in-laws, Mr. and Mrs. Alfred Ferrieri, for their constant encouragement during the

researchers entire doctoral program.

Finally, the researcher wishes to express his love and gratitude to his wife, Barbara, and his daughter Andrea. It is having their love, understanding, and support that makes this project meaningful.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iv
LIST OF TABLES	ix
ABSTRACT	xi
CHAPTER I	
INTRODUCTION	1
The Changing Role of the American Correctional System	2
The Role of the Correctional Officer in Today's Correctional Institution	3
The Education of Inmates as a Part of the Rehabilitative Process	5
Theoretical Framework	8
Need for the Study	10
Statement of the Problem	12
Hypotheses	13
Definition of Terms	14
Limitations of the Study	16
Organization of the Study	16
CHAPTER II	
REVIEW OF SELECTED LITERATURE	18
CHAPTER III	
METHODOLOGY	31
Statement of the Problem	31

TABLE OF CONTENTS (cont'd.)

Page

Population of the Study 31

Instrumentation 34

Data Acquisition 35

Treatment of the Data 36

Summary of Methodology 38

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS 40

Introduction 40

Statment of the Problem 41

Tables of Demographic Factors 41

Hypotheses Tested 44

Additional Findings 50

Analysis of Four Evaluative Items Correctional Officer/Program Staff Relationship 61

Positive Statements 61

Negative Statements 63

Summary 65

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS 67

Statement of the Problem 67

Procedures 67

Summary of Results 68

Conclusions and Recommendations 70

TABLE OF CONTENTS (cont'd.)

Page

Recommendations 73

BIBLIOGRAPHY 77

APPENDIX A 82

APPENDIX B 95

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1	Ratio of Staff to Inmates	11
2	Number of Correctional Officers and Inmates by Institution	32
3	Correctional Institutions and Security Level ...	33
4	Percent of Response by Gender	41
5	Percent of Response by Institution Security Level	42
6	Number of Years Employed as a Correctional Officer	42
7	Educational Level Attained by Correctional Officer	43
8	Correctional Officers Age	44
9	Results of the T-Test for Correctional Officers Sex (COSEX)	44
10	ANOVA for Institution Security Level	45
11	Spearman Correlation for Attitude and Years Employed as a Correctional Officer (YRSCO) ...	47
12	Spearman Correlation for Attitude and Correctional Officers Attained Level of Education (EDLVL)	48
13	Spearman Rank Correlation Coefficient for Attitude and Correctional Officer Age (COAGE).	49
14	Frequencies and Percentages for Item #1	51
15	Frequencies and Percentages for Item #2	52
16	Frequencies and Percentages for Item #5	53
17	Frequencies and Percentages for Item #6	53

LIST OF TABLES (cont'd.)

Table		Page
18	Frequencies and Percentages for Item #9	54
19	Frequencies and Percentages for Item #13	55
20	Frequencies and Percentages for Item #3	56
21	Frequencies and Percentages for Item #4	57
22	Frequencies and Percentages for Item #7	58
23	Frequencies and Percentages for Item #8	59
24	Frequencies and Percentages for Item #12	60
25	Frequencies and Percentages for Item #14	61
26	Frequencies and Percentages for Item #10	62
27	Frequencies and Percentages for Item #16	62
28	Frequencies and Percentages for Item #11	64
29	Frequencies and Percentages for Item #15	65
30	Mean, Standard Deviation, and Median for all Opinionnaire Items	102

ABSTRACT

AN ANALYSIS OF THE ATTITUDE OF CORRECTIONAL OFFICERS TOWARD INMATE EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS IN OKLAHOMA'S MINIMUM, MEDIUM, AND MAXIMUM SECURITY INSTITUTIONS

BY: JOSEPH N. SIANO

MAJOR PROFESSOR: DON S. UDELL, Ph.D.

The problem of this study was to answer the question: What are the attitudes of correctional officers toward inmate educational programs in Oklahoma's maximum, medium, and minimum security prisons? Attitudes of correctional officers were studied in relation to their gender, educational level, number of years employed by the Oklahoma Department of Corrections, age, and the security level of the institution in which they are employed.

An extensive review of current literature pertaining to rehabilitative and treatment programs in correctional institutions was performed. Special attention was given to literature related to the role of the correctional officer in the rehabilitation and treatment of inmates. An opinionnaire was developed to collect demographic and attitudinal information from correctional officers employed by the Oklahoma Department of Corrections. The population for the study was limited to the 1,270 correctional officers employed by the Oklahoma Department of Corrections. A

sample of 20 percent (254) of the population was chosen to participate in the study. A total of 212 (85 percent) opinionnaires were returned and validated for statistical analysis.

Parametric and non-parametric tests of significance were used to test the hypotheses for significance. A t-test was used to test HO_0. An analysis of variance procedure was used in testing HO_1. The non-parametric Spearman rank order correlation coefficient was chosen to test HO_2, HO_3, and HO_4. The hypotheses were tested at the .05 level of significance. In each case, the results were statistically not significant. The researcher accepted the null hypotheses.

AN ANALYSIS OF THE ATTITUDE OF CORRECTIONAL OFFICERS TOWARD INMATE EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS IN OKLAHOMA'S MINIMUM, MEDIUM, AND MAXIMUM SECURITY INSTITUTIONS

CHAPTER I

Introduction

As the role of corrections shifts from principally punishment and retribution to treatment and rehabilitation we have seen a greater interest in the education of inmates in the correctional setting. Correctional education programs are but one aspect of the rehabilitative process. The success of such programs is dependent on the support and cooperation of administrative, custodial (security personnel) and program staff.

This introductory statement was divided into three sub-sections: (1) the changing role of the American correctional system (2) the role of the Correctional Officer in today's correctional institutions and, (3) the education of inmates as a part of the rehabilitation process. The understanding of each of these sub-sections and how they relate to each other is paramount to understanding the need for this study.

The Changing Role of the American Correctional System

The American correctional system has been charged with the duty of punishing, deterring and rehabilitating offenders. Early corrections was characterized primarily by punishment and retribution. In most cases crimes were dealt with by corporal punishment and the death penalty was freely utilized. Corporal punishment and execution were used as a means to exorcise evil spirits that were seen as the cause of a person's crime.

During the 18th and 19th centuries, criminals were seen as people who chose to violate laws for pleasure or profit. This led to the philosophy of punishing criminals with a penalty that would offset the pleasure or gain derived from the crime.

In the Manual of Correctional Standards (1977) the American Correctional Association stated, "The modern philosophy of rehabilitation is put to practical application by the development of the three related and continuous phases of the correctional process: probation, institutional training and treatment, and parole." This is not saying that the primary function of the penal systems as rehabilitation has been generally accepted by the public. Rather, the correctional system is considered by the public to be more of a punitive agency.

The American Correctional Association (1977) further stated that, "penologists in the United States today are

generally agreed that the prison serves most effectively for the protection of society against crime when its major emphasis is on rehabilitation."

Rehabilitation is the current philosophy of the American correctional system, many critics to these programs remain. Halleck and White (1977) in "Is Rehabilitation Dead?" attributed the attack on correctional rehabilitation to three major trends: (1) the rising crime rates, (2) the "streams of academic research" which have supported the effectiveness of punishment and challenged the efficacy of rehabilitation, and (3) the attacks of civil libertarians, particularly on the indeterminate sentence.

In a national survey conducted by Corrections Magazine, Sewell (1975) reported that 63 percent of prison officials surveyed said that some rehabilitation programs can change inmate behavior for the better. An additional 14 percent maintain that there is not enough evidence to justify scrapping the idea of rehabilitation.

The Role of the Correctional Officer in Today's Correctional Institutions

Prison reform movements in America have had a number of effects on the treatment of inmates and the organization of prisons. There has been no greater change than the role of the correctional officer. The role of the guard has

evolved from the duties of security and control alone to direct involvement in treatment and rehabilitative programs.

As rehabilitation became the primary focus of correctional institutions, expectations of guards began to shift from security to active participation in the rehabilitation of inmates. Craddick (1964) stated, "Some programs in the mid-60's urged guards to become 'Front-Line Therapists' and counsel inmates." Stanley Bradsky (1974) noted in his paper, "A Bill of Rights for the Correctional Officer:"

> This is a time at which the goals of correctional institutions are changing. Exclusively custodial institutions are adopting idealogies of reintegration into communities and prisons as agents of positive behavior change. As a result several messages may be given to employees as well as inmates. The officer is sometimes perceived as being a personal counselor to whom the inmates can turn in times of need. At the same time he must be a firm symbol of authority who will encourage by example and by punitive action appropriate to societal behavior.

The primary function of the correctional officer remains the prevention of escapes, riots, and all security matters (Brodsky, 1974). Inmate rehabilitation has been added to this function. As we assess the goals of security and rehabilitation, it becomes apparent that the methods needed to reach these goals are incompatible. Janowitz and Winter (1959) stated, "Under the role prescriptions dictated by the rehabilitative ideal, the guard is to relax and to act spontaneously. Inmates are to be 'understood,'

not blamed, and formal disciplining mechanisms should be triggered as infrequently as possible." From the viewpoint of the guards, to carry out their primary task (security) and to manage large numbers of inmates and materials, bureaucratic organization and impersonal treatment are necessary.

The dual role of custody-treatment causes much conflict for the correctional officer. The lack of administrative support and mistrust by inmates produce an environment filled with frustration. The consequence of this contradictory role is a high turnover rate of correctional officers. In a study done by Jacobs and Sear (1977) at the Statesville Correction Center in Illinois, the turnover rate was found to be over 100 percent and much higher among new guards.

It is apparent that role confusion among correctional officers affects both job performance and program success. State Departments of Corrections must define more clearly the role of the correctional officer. Hiring practices and training programs must be developed to meet the needs of the officers in today's prison system.

The Education of Inmates as a Part of the Rehabilitative Process

The goal of the rehabilitive process in the correctional system is the preparation of inmates to assume the

responsibilities accorded them by society upon release. Perlstein and Phelps in their book Alternatives to Prison, (1975) stated that 95 percent of all those incarcerated will be released. The authors go on to say that the national figure on recidivism ranges from 40 percent to 80 percent. These statistics clearly represent the need for strong rehabilitative programs and the obvious failure of the present methods being utilized.

The Task Force Report: Corrections, (1967) stated that education is as good a barometer as any of the likelihood of success in modern America. The report stated that 50 percent of adult felony inmates in 1960 had no high school education. Over the past twenty years there has been a dramatic rise in this statistic. S. D. Feldman (1974) stated that 90 percent of all inmates in our nation's prisons have not completed a high school education. The Federal Bureau of Prisons reported at least 50 percent of adults in federal and state facilities can neither read nor write (Regan, et al, 1975).

The National Prisoner Statistics Special Report (1976) on Oklahoma's correctional facilities stated, that 70 percent of the prisoners in Oklahoma have not completed high school. Within this 70 percent, one fourth had ended their formal education at the eighth grade.

The Task Force Report: Corrections, (1967) reported that many offenders come from urban slums. Members of

minority groups who suffer economic and social discrimination are present in disproportionate numbers. The report goes on to say that this pattern of cumulative failure has prevented many offenders from developing a sense of self-respect, thus creating another obstacle to rehabilitation.

In reference to correctional education, Kendall (1975) made the point that those who work in correctional education deal almost entirely with men and women who have formed antisocial habits, attitudes, and ways of thinking and behaving. Kendall goes on to say correctional education must be to substitute improved habits and attitude for negative characteristics.

The Oklahoma Corrections Master Plan, (1976) described educational goals for the Oklahoma Correctional System. Educational goals include remedial education through college degree programs. These programs should provide the attainment of basic skills and the stimulation of individual interests and continuation of academic training. Educational programs should provide offenders with knowledge, skills and attitudes for assuming economic, social, and civic responsibilities upon release. The plan emphasized that institutions must provide inmates with skills and personal resources, to encourage an early and successful return to the community.

If the goal of rehabilitation is to return inmates to a society which demands of its people the ability to read

and write, we must provide them with programs that will enable them to master basic skills. T. A. Ryan (1978) addressed the problems of inmates returning to society:

> In the face of ever-increasing acts of crime and violence, and in response to the widespread concern over the problem of crime in America, the development of effective programs to promote the protection of society and at the same time redirect the offender population into constructive roles must be accorded top priority. With an offender group largely lacking the basic skills of gaining and maintaining gainful employment, the need for adult basic education in the nation's correctional institutions is of paramount importance. Far too often released offenders revert to their previous patterns of criminal behavior when faced with the almost impossible task of finding and keeping employment in the free world. The offenders in the nation's correctional institutions for the most part lack basic skills necessary for functioning productively within the accepted norms of society. They have distorted value structures, are handicapped by deficits in communication and computation skills, usually lack interpersonal skills, and are without the educational credentials demanded by prospective employers (p. 1). Ryan also claimed that:
>
> To afford an equal chance for civic, economic, and social participation to the large segment of the adult illiterate population in correctional institutions or on parole and probation status, adult basic and career-based adult education programs must be implemented on an all-out basis in the nation's jails, reformatories, penitentiaries, and post-release settings (p. 3).

Theoretical Framework

In an effort to ascertain the data for this study, it was necessary to solicit the attitudes of correctional officers. It became relevant to review and discuss the

theoretical framework of attitudes and attitudinal studies.

Though there is great disagreement on the definition of attitude, attitudinal studies have expanded in recent years. Young (1951) suggested four criteria for measuring attitude: (1) it must have definite orientation in the world of objects, and in this respect differ from simple and conditional reflexes, (2) it must not be an altogether automatic and routine type of conduct, but must display some tension even when latent, (3) it varies in intensity, sometimes being urgent, sometimes relatively ineffective, (4) it is rooted in experience, and therefore is not simply a social instinct.

Attitudes may be developed as an adoptive function. Katz (1960) suggested, "Favorable attitudes are developed towards those social objects which fulfill an individual's needs, and unfavorable attitudes to objects which frustrate or block such fulfillment." Smith, Bruner and White (1956) spoke of the social adjustment function of attitude, by which they mean the function which attitudes can serve in facilitating identification with certain reference groups or significant others." Morris (1973) identified attitude as a state of mind or feeling with regard to some matter.

According to Thurstone's theory (1959) of attitudinal measurement, four types of descriptions can be used on an attitude scale: (1) a mean or average of a particular individual on a specific issue, (2) an opinion range can be

accepted or rejected, (3) the relative popularity of each attitude or issue, and (4) the homogeneity or heterogeneity of issues and attitudes.

Need for the Study

The introductory statement gives an overview of three important phases of the American correctional system. For any system to be successful, especially one as complex as our prison system, each branch must work with the other to attain a common goal.

The need for this study was based on the move toward rehabilitation as a primary goal of the Corrections Department and the influence the correctional officer has on the attainment of this goal. Wicks (1980) stated, "The correction officer is usually the person who is available for contact with the prisoner twenty-four hours per day, seven days per week. It becomes obvious what potential exists in each correctional officer to make a profound positive as well as negative impact on the confined offender."

In his book, Guard! A Society's Professional Prisoner, Wicks (1980) reported one study involving the ratio of staff to inmates for various professions. The results of this study are reported in Table 1.

TABLE 1

Position	Ratio of Staff to Inmates
Social Worker	1:866
Psychiatrist	1:2,436
Psychologist	1:9,282
Correctional Officer	1:9

As shown in Table 1, there is a significantly lower ratio of correctional officers to inmates than other professional prison personnel. The lower ratio suggests that correctional officers may have a great potential to influence the life of an inmate.

At the time of this writing, the Oklahoma State Department of Corrections reported the prisoner/guard ratio in the State of Oklahoma was 5:1. It would seem from this statistic that the attitudes of correctional officers toward rehabilitative programs would have a great bearing on their success. The potential influence of correctional officers on inmates participation in educational programs may affect the inmates rehabilitation/recidivism. Jesser (1963) proposed:

> Of all the personnel in the institution, the correctional officer is the closest to and in daily interaction with inmates. As with the transformation of the attendants role in the mental hospital, the role of the correctional officer must now come to be seen as control and critical, if not indispensible, to the

> reeducation of the inmate. Neither guard nor keeper, the correctional officer has now come to be seen as teacher and mediator of the process of education.

From the high national recidivism rate, it may be inferred that rehabilitative programs, of which education is a major portion are failing to meet prison needs. The National Prisoner Statistics Special Report (1976) on Oklahoma Correctional Facilities indicates that 70 percent of the prisoners in Oklahoma had not completed high school. The State, in recognition of this problem, appointed the State's first Department of Corrections Educational Coordinator.

The present study assessed correctional officers attitudes toward educational programs offered to institutionalized adults in Oklahoma's maximum, medium, and minimum security prisons. Through this assessment a data base was provided. Recommendations to the Oklahoma Department of Corrections may be provided based on the data collected.

Statement of the Problem

The problem of this study was to answer the question; What are the attitudes of correctional officers toward inmate educational programs in Oklahoma's maximum, medium, and minimum security prisons? Attitudes of correctional officers were studied in relation to their gender, educational level, number of years employed by the Oklahoma

Department of Corrections, age, and the security level of the institution in which they are employed.

Hypotheses

The following hypotheses were tested in this study:

HO_0 There is no significant difference between the mean attitudinal scores of male correctional officers and the attitudes of female correctional officers toward inmate educational programs.

HO_1 There is no significant difference in the mean attitudinal scores of correctional officers toward inmate educational programs at maximum, medium and minimum security institutions.

HO_2 There is no significant correlation between the number of years a person has served as a correctional officer in the Department of Corrections and his/her attitude toward inmate educational programs.

HO_3 There is no significant correlation between the level of education a correctional officer has attained and his/her attitude toward inmate educational programs.

HO_4 There is no significant correlation between the age of a correctional officer and

his/her attitude toward inmate educational programs.

Definition of Terms

Maximum Security Prison. Maximum security prison is frequently used to describe a correctional institution handling a high-risk inmate population. Typically, such an institution is enclosed by brick or stone walls, from 18 to 25 feet high and augmented by guard or gun towers.

The institutional process occurs in an atmosphere in which inmates are housed in interior cell blocks which, ideally, house no more than one inmate per cell. The majority of prisons built in the United States before World War I were of the maximum security type (Coffey, 1974, pp. 257-260).

Medium Security Prison. The medium security institution often uses the double fence enclosures and retains many of the characteristics of a maximum security prison. Sometimes it utilizes the "Pennsylvania Model," with up to 150 units of cell block buildings.

In most instances, the medium security facility houses a larger proportion of a given jurisdiction's prison population than the maximum security institutions (Coffey, 1974, p. 260).

Minimum Security Prison. The minimum security prison may or may not be fenced. As much as 70 percent of the

inmate population is housed in dormitories supervised on a minimal basis.

The minimum security prison is far less expensive than a maximum security institution not only in terms of construction, but in terms of personnel to direct institution programs.

Armed guards and other forms of restraint are usually considered unnecessary. Inmate supervision is conducted by unarmed officers and treatment personnel (Coffey, 1974, p. 260).

Correctional Officer. Correctional officers include persons working as supervisors or as line officers who have direct responsibility for custody, security, and safety of inmates in adult institutions, including state institutions and jails (Archambeault and Archambeault, 1982, p. 20).

Corrections. Corrections is a component of the American Criminal Justice System which has a dual mission of controlling offenders committed to it by the courts through in-community supervisors or incarceration and of attempting to rehabilitate and re-integrate adult or juvenile offenders back into society whenever possible (Fox, 1976).

COSEX. Correctional officers gender.

SECLUL. Institutional security level.

YRSCO. Years employed as a correctional officer.

Earned Credit. Credit time given to inmates off sentence time.

EDLUL. Correctional officers attained educational level.

COAGE. Correctional officers age.

Attitude. Denotes the sum total of an individual response of feelings, prejudices, biases, preconceived notions, ideas, fears, threats, and convictions about any specific topic or issue (Studbaker, 1978). "A Comparative Attitudinal Analysis of Students Participating in Condensed Programs Sponsored by the University of Oklahoma," Dissertation, 1978.

Limitations of the Study

The study is limited to:

1. The Oklahoma Penal System.

2. Those 1,270 correctional officers employed by the Oklahoma Department of Corrections.

3. The study is also limited to the maximum, medium, and minimum correctional institutions in the State Department of Corrections system.

4. A further limitation of this study involved the use of the Likert Type scale of measurement. This scale is ordinal in nature and does not provide a basis for saying how much favorable or unfavorable a response may be.

Organization of the Study

This study was presented in five chapters. Chapter I was an introduction which outlined the need for the study, statement of the problem, definition of terms and limitations of the study. Chapter II presented the review of selected literature related to this study. Chapter III presented methodological procedures, instrumentation, collection of data, and the treatment of the data. Chapter IV presented the findings of the study. Chapter V contained the summary, conclusions and recommendations.

CHAPTER II

Review of Selected Literature

The review of literature included the results of a survey of current periodicals, journals, and publications in the field of corrections. The literature search focused on the attitudes of correctional officers toward rehabilitative programs. Particular attention was given to inmate educational programs. The Current Index to Journals of Education (CIJE), has been surveyed as well as Psychological Abstracts, Dissertation Abstracts, and the Sociological Abstracts Index. Computerized literature searches of the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) and the National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS) have also been utilized.

Chang and Zastrow (1976) stated "with recidivism being estimated at over 50 percent it is obvious that some aspect of the rehabilitation process is failing. It may be that the rehabilitative process is not working because it fails to make significant changes in inmates perceptions and attitudes." The American Correctional Association (1977) stated, "It is recognized today correctional officers exert crucial influence, good or bad, on prisoners and should be given basic training at recruitment and in-service training

throughout their terms of service." Chang and Zastrow (1970) reported, "The nature of the relationship between residents and nonprofessional staff is increasingly becoming recognized for its significance in either maintaining deviant behavior patterns or for being an important intervention source for leading to the development of more constructive, effective behavior patterns."

In 1967 the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice reported:

> There is . . . need to modify and upgrade the role of custodial personnel in corrections, to bring them more actively into the task of rehabilitation. They may be the most influential persons in institutions simply by virtue of their numbers and their daily intimate contact with offenders. It is a mistake to define them as persons responsible only for control and maintenance. They can, by their attitude and understanding, reinforce or destroy the effectiveness of almost any correctional program. They can act as effective intermediaries or become insurmountable barriers between the inmates' world and the institution's administrative and treatment personnel.

In reference to the correctional officer, Duffee (1974) stated "to improve existing programs or to implement new programs which have more change potential, it is necessary to change the values of those who have the most direct impact on the inmate." If the correctional officer does have the most impact on the inmate, it would follow that he or she plays a significant role in determining the success or failure of treatment programs. Teske and

Williamson (1979) suggested: "the qualities of individual officers should be examined in an effort to determine which type of person possesses the desired qualities which produce a positive acceptance and promotion of the treatment programs."

In a study involving inmates and guards perceptions of themselves and each other, Chang and Zastrow (1976) reported that prison security officers assigned the lowest ranking to prison inmates. The low scores suggest security officers may view inmates as law violating, unpredictable, sneaky, untrustworthy, dishonest, undependable, and lazy. In regard to the influence this negative attitude toward inmates would have on the rehabilitation process Cooley (1980) claimed "that persons develop their self-concept in terms of how others relate to that person. In the case of inmates, if they are related to as if they are "law-violators" or as second-class citizens who are different, they may begin to perceive themselves in this fashion." In reference to rehabilitation, Cooley stated: "It has critical implications for the rehabilitation process because if people incarcerated come to perceive themselves as being "law-violators" they are likely to play such a role upon their release." An important conclusion from this study is that an atmosphere for rehabilitative change does not exist if inmates are perceived negatively by the group of people they will have the greatest amount of contact with during

their period of incarceration.

In a study conducted in the Texas Department of Corrections, Teske and Williamson (1979) reported 12 variables they considered significantly correlated with scores on a master scale used to measure correctional officers' attitudes toward selected treatment programs. Many of the variables reported have considerable impact on this study. Teske and Williamson's (1979) data revealed the following information:

> (1) lower ranking officers viewed treatment more positively than higher ranking officers; (2) the longer the number of years of service, the more negative the attitude toward treatment; (3) the higher the level of education completed, the more positive the attitude toward treatment; (4) officers with supplemental income were more positive toward treatment; (5) officers who viewed the primary function of the Texas Department of Corrections as punishment were more negative toward treatment and those who viewed the primary function as rehabilitation were more positive; (6) officers who were retired from military service were more positive toward treatment; (7) officers who attended church regularly were more positive toward treatment; (8) the longer the community of childhood residence, the more positive the attitude toward treatment; (9) inside picket officers were more positive toward treatment than outside picket officers; (10) officers that had selected corrections as a career were more positive towards treatment as opposed to those needing a job to facilitate college education; (11) officers who viewed work as more important in rehabilitation than treatment were axiomatically more negative toward treatment programs; and (12) older officers were more positive in their attitudes toward treatment than were younger officers.

The literature reviewed consistently suggested the

correctional officers have a tremendous impact on the inmate. In this sense they have the potential to support and enhance treatment programs or destroy their effectiveness through his attitude toward these programs and inmates. The study by Teske and Williamson suggested that correctional officers are aware of their key role and consider themselves to be the most important persons in relation to the rehabilitation of the inmate.

The attitudes of correctional officers toward treatment programs is directly related to what they perceive to be the major function of the prison system. In a study done at the Southern Nevada Correctional Center by Kensell and Shelden, (1981) the question was asked: "What in your opinion, is the main reason for putting an offender in prison?" Eighty nine percent chose the response "to protect society." A distant second was "to rehabilitate," with 57.1 percent selecting this response. Third, at 46 percent, was "to punish." Only a slight majority disagreed with the statement "the primary purpose of a correctional institution should be to punish convicted criminals." The researchers concluded that, while most respondents were not against rehabilitation, they believe prisons should be there to punish criminals and protect society.

A Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training (1968) found that 98 percent of correctional line workers felt that "rehabilitation" should have primary or

secondary emphasis in correctional agencies, while 48 percent believed "protection of society" should be emphasized. The Commission reported only 12 percent thought that "punishment" should be a primary or secondary goal. Jacobs (1978) reported in a study conducted in the Illinois prison system that 46 percent of the guards considered "rehabilitation" the purpose of imprisonment, while 54 percent considered either "the protection of society" or "punishment" as the main purpose of putting the offender in prison.

In reviewing the literature thus far, this study has discussed the attitudes of correctional officers toward inmates and treatment programs geared toward rehabilitation. The researcher has traced the philosophical progression of correctional institutions from punishment oriented to rehabilitation oriented agencies. As these changes have taken place, the role of the correctional officer has become ambiguous. The correctional officer is charged with the security and control of inmates. In recent years the role of the correctional officer has been expanded to also include a greater involvement in rehabilitative programs. The methods used to attain each of these goals are in many cases contradictory in nature. Brodsky (1974) stated, "It is important that officers have a clearly defined set of roles and priorities, and that in their dealings with inmates these loyalties, responsibilities, and roles be

explained. Thus, there would be no presenting of self under false guises." Wicks (1980) listed a number of tasks an officer might be required to fulfill at a given institution:

1. Security officer
2. Disciplinarian
3. Link between inmates and others (treatment staff, superior officers, public)
4. Behaviorial technician - "practical psychologist"
5. Educator
6. Administrative officer
7. Blue collar worker
8. Consultant

The ambiguity of these tasks and the fact that they frequently overlap is a constant source of frustration to the correctional officer. In his book, Guard!, (1980), Wicks wrote "adding to the conflict the C. O.'s may be put under when they are asked to fill combined custody, treatment roles are the administrations confusion and lack of total commitment to such a combination of images." In reference to inmates, Wicks stated: "There is also a mistrust on the part of the inmates towards the correctional officer, who they still view as "keepers." Dillion (1975) noted in a paper in the American Journal of Corrections:

> Many residents continue to behave like convicts. Even though guards are called correctional officers and wear blazers instead of military-

like uniforms, many are still called "hacks" and "pigs" and respond accordingly."

In his paper "Role Conflict in Organization: A Study of Camp Officials," Grusky (1959) discussed guard role conflict in terms of changing organizational goals. If an organization is assigned a new major goal, and if this goal is in conflict with what was the only primary goal of the system, then it would be expected that conflict between the goals would create new stresses for many members of the organization. In this light, Grusky noted a number of conflicts experienced by the correctional officer adapting to a treatment-oriented organization from one in which custody was the primary goal:

1. In a traditional custodial prison, the officials and inmates are characteristically hostile to one another and show a relatively low level of interaction. A treatment oriented environment encourages the guard to trust the inmate, interact with him often and in general to be emotionally supportive.
2. The assumption implicit in the custodial goal affirms that the function of the organization is to protect the community by keeping the prisoner in the organization. The inmate is correspondingly labeled as "dangerous," deserving of punishment, and unfit for the "outside world."

In contrast the function implicit in the treatment goal affirms the function of the organization is to protect the community by "rehabilitating" the prisoner.

3. The conventional prison, where the custodial goal is the primary objective, can be characterized as a formal bureaucracy which entails continuous enforcement of official regulations and results in a considerable amount of inmate resistance. On the other hand, the organization where the major goal is treatment creates a highly supportive staff-inmate relationship.

The goals of an institution probably play a major role in determining the behaviors and attitudes of correctional officers. The injustice to correctional officers appears to arise from correctional institutions not clarifying their primary goals. Correctional officers are expected to be involved in all aspects of the rehabilitation of inmates while being ultimately responsible for security and discipline.

The literature reviewed identified conflicts between treatment staff and custodial staff as a major factor in determining the attitudes of correctional officers toward treatment programs. Wicks (1980) claimed: "Conflict and unhealthy competition are the best way to describe the relationship between the uniformed forces and the group in

the prison most often referred to as the "program staff." Wicks listed the following reasons for this conflict:

1. Variance in philosophy over handling of inmates and lack of proof of effectiveness of treatment approaches.
2. Status differences between the two staffs.
3. Inmate agitation and exasperation of problems and differences between the two staffs.
4. Lack of opportunity for meaningful, non-threatening communication between staffs.
5. Tension and frustration felt by staff members in the correctional setting.

In his article, "The Correction Officer and the Educational Program," Henderson (1970) noted the practice in correctional institutions of assigning "positive" or "negative" functions to personnel. Positive functions, such as programs that are seen as useful in the management of inmates with an emphasis on rehabilitative value, are assigned to specialist personnel. Negative functions, having to do with the control of inmates, enforcing the standards or security precautions and the imposition of punishment to correct inmates, are the responsibility of the correctional officer. Henderson goes on to suggest four effects this continued practice may have on institutional goals.

1. Severe tensions can build up between staff identified with "Positive" and those charged with "Negative" functions. These are often exploited by inmates. Results can range from ineffectiveness of an institution's program to chaos.

2. Such a division among staff also reduces the prospects of personnel learning from one another. The people with various kinds of professional training have knowledge, ideas, and skills of potential value to the custodial staff. Correction Officers have a large store of information and know-how that would be useful for clinicians, teachers and other specialists. This is especially true in the very important areas of inmate peer-group relationships; of unstructured phases of institutional life; and (often) in the achievement of unobtrusive security and good order.

3. Correctional institutions can neither afford nor recruit enough well qualified professional personnel to provide the amount of control, attention, training and therapy needed by the inmate population to permit managing them strictly along so-called "Positive" lines and to provide for a maximum rehabilitative effort.

4. Correctional officers, in many instances, can be more effective models for, and can communicate more meaningfully with, inmates than professional specialists.

Irving Piliaven (1961) discussed the effect of staff conflict on the success of treatment programs: "Disunity among staff causes work slowdowns, fragmentation of planning, high turnover, and in service organizations such as correctional institutions, the reduction in effectiveness of treatment programs." In his book, The Therapeutic Community, Jones (1953) stated: "Today it is believed, more or less firmly, that each staff member within the in-

stitution has a potentially important role to play in the directed change of inmates. This view stresses first that cooperation and coordination of institutional workers are essential for successful programming."

In a study done by Jacobs (1978) in the Illinois prison system, the author stated: "The greatest organizational strain, however, becomes evident in the attitude of Illinois guards toward civilian counselors. Thirty-one percent of the guards strongly agreed and forty-nine percent agreed with the statement: 'In general, counselors and treatment personnel are more sympathetic to the problems of inmates than to the problems of correctional officers.'" Kensell and Shelden (1981) reported in a study done at the Southern Nevada Correctional Center that "most respondents felt there was some conflict between custody and treatment staff. Thus, only 16.1 percent responded "almost never" to the statement "Actions by program staff interfere with security efforts by custody." In a study done in the Oklahoma penal system, Udell, Longacre, and Colbert (1981) reported: "release time was cited as a cause of conflict between work supervisors and educators (treatment) by a majority; fifty-six percent of the teachers, while thirty-four percent reported that it created problems between security and educators."

The impact of the correctional officer on the progress of inmates toward rehabilitation is apparent in the literature reviewed for this study. There are many who believe that correctional institutions must clarify the role of correctional officers. The success of rehabilitative programs may be dependent on the ability of institutional staffs to work together toward a common goal.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Statement of the Problem

The problem of this study was to answer the question: What are the attitudes of correctional officers toward inmate educational programs in Oklahoma's maximum, medium, and minimum security prisons? Attitudes of correctional officers were studied in relation to their gender, educational level, number of years employed by the Oklahoma Department of Corrections, officer's age, and the security level of the inmates for which they are responsible.

Population and Sample of the Study

The population of this study included all 1,270 correctional officers presently employed by the Department of Corrections at its maximum, medium and minimum security institutions. Table 2 reports Department of Corrections data involving the number and gender of correctional officers employed at correctional institutions involved in this study. The table further reports the number of inmates incarcerated at the various institutions.

TABLE 2

Number of Correctional Officers and Inmates

	Number of Correctional Officers			Number of Inmates
	Total	M	F	
Oklahoma State Penitentiary	336	268	68	1,412
Crabtree Correction Center	37	29	8	198
Oklahoma State Reformatory	130	120	10	524
Lexington Correction Center	140	99	41	816
Joseph Harp Correction Center	138	97	41	768
McLeod Correction Center	57	54	3	420
Stringtown Correction Center	102	93	9	625
Quachita Correction Center	65	62	3	391
Conner Correction Center	115	84	31	288
Mabel Bassett Correction Center	50	32	18	268
Jess Dunn Correction Center	55	47	8	432
John Lilley Correction Center	45	32	13	95
TOTALS	1,270	1,017	253	6.237

A method of systematic sampling was used to select a sample of 20 percent of the total population to be surveyed (Van Dalen, 1979). The officers surveyed were chosen from a list of correctional officers currently employed by the Oklahoma Department of Corrections. Every fifth name on the list was added to the sample. A total of 254 correctional officers were selected as the sample population. A listing of each institution utilized in this study and its security level are shown in Table 3.

TABLE 3

Correctional Institutions and Security Level

Name of Institution	Security Level of Institution
Conner Correctional Center	Medium
Joseph Harp Correctional Center	Medium
Howard C. McLeod Correctional Center	Minimum
Jess Dunn Correctional Center	Minimum
Lexington Assessment and Reception Ctr.	Medium/Maximum
Mabel Bassett Correctional Center	Medium/Maximum
Oklahoma State Penitentiary	Maximum/Medium/ Minimum
Oklahoma State Reformatory (Granite)	Maximum/Medium
Quachita Correctional Center	Minimum
Stringtown Correctional Center	Medium
John Lilley Corrections Center	Minimum
Crabtree Correction Center	Medium

Instrumentation

An opinionnaire was developed to identify attitudes of correctional officers toward educational programs being implemented in Oklahoma's maximum, medium, and minimum correctional institutions. The opinionnaire was designed by reviewing the literature related to treatment programs in correctional institutions and discussions with members of the Oklahoma Department of Corrections. Statements were selected to provide information concerning the attitudes of correctional officers toward educational programs in relation to their gender, educational level, years of experience, age, and security level of the inmates for which they are responsible.

The Likert method of summated ratings was used in the construction of the opinionnaire. The validity of the instrument was established by a panel of experts associated with the Department of Corrections. Individuals participating on the panel were the Department of Corrections Director and Assistant Directors of Planning and Research, the Deputy Directors for Eastern and Western Institutions and the Deputy Director of Administrative Services. The selected items were critically reviewed and judged as to the appropriateness of their content. A preliminary survey was conducted utilizing ten correctional officers assigned to the Oklahoma City Community Treatment Center. The survey was administered to the participants as a group followed by

a discussion of the strengths and weaknesses of each item. The trial survey resulted in changes in wording and format of the instrument.

The final instrument consisted of three sections. Section one contained general information questions concerning the institutions. Section two involved personal information regarding the individual respondents. Section three consisted of 12 statements that assessed the attitudes of respondents toward inmate participation in educational programs. Four additional items (10, 11, 15, and 16) were designed to evaluate the professional relationships between correctional officers and correctional program staff.

Data Acquisition

The collection of data for this study consisted of three phases:

A. The first phase consisted of the procedures involved for submission and review of research proposals to the Oklahoma Department of Corrections. The procedures included:

1. The research proposal was submitted for review to the administrator of the Department of Corrections Planning and Research Unit.

2. The proposal was sent for review to the appropriate deputy directors, facilty heads and supervisors

of the divisions, facilities or units which were affected by the research project.

3. The proposal was recommended for approval by the above specified persons and was sent to the Director for final review and approval.

B. After acceptance of the research proposal, a letter was sent to each facility head to explain the purpose of the study and to coordinate the administration of the instrument.

C. The final phase of the data acquisition involved the dissemination of the instrument to correctional officers to be sampled at each of the institutions. A contact person at each facility was established by the Department of Corrections. It was the responsibilty of this individual to distribute the instrument to those correctional officers included in the sample and to be available to collect the completed instrument. Packets containing cover letters, directions for opinionnaire administration, the proper number of surveys, and return envelopes were sent to each institution through the Department of Corrections Planning and Research Unit. Exact directions for administration of the opinionnaire are given in Appendix A.

Treatment of the Data

Two hundred fifty-four opinionnaires were distributed, 212 or 85 percent were returned. The data collected were tabulated. The possible responses for each question asked were given codes which were transferred to data cards for statistical analysis (Appendix A).

Parametric and non-parametric tests of significance were used in testing the hypotheses. The t-test was used in testing differences in attitudes between male and female correctional officers (HO_0). The t-test is used to compare the means of two groups. If the two sample means are far enough apart, the t-test will yield a significant difference, (.05 level in this study) thus permitting the researcher to reject the null hypotheses at a given significance level (Huck, Cormier, Bounds, 1974). Differences among correctional officers from varying levels of security (HO_1) were tested using the analysis of variance (ANOVA) procedure. The analysis of variance is a statistical procedure used to compare groups in terms of the mean scores. The analysis of variance is appropriate when more than two groups are being compared (Huck, Cormier, Bounds, 1974). The procedure used in assessing the validity of the null hypotheses is as follows: (1) the original data are put into a formula in order to obtain a calculated value (F-value), (2) the resulting calculated value is compared against a critical F-value, and (3) the null hypotheses is

rejected if calculated value is larger than the tabled critical value. For the purpose of this study, the .05 level of significance was applied (Hock, Cormier, Bounds, 1974).

Spearman correlations were calculated between attitude score and the variables: years employed as a correctional officer (HO_2), correctional officers level of education (HO_3), and age of the correctional officer (HO_4). The correlation technique measures the nature and degree of relationships between variables. Spearman's rho is a non-parametric technique using data in the form of ranks. To compute the Spearman rank correlation coefficient, the researcher would rank the data from two variables. After ranking each set of data, the researcher would then use the two sets of ranks in a formula to determine the correlation coefficient. For the purpose of this study the .05 level of significance was applied.

Summary of Methodology

An opionnaire was developed to assess the attitudes of correctional officers in Oklahoma's minimum, medium, and maximum security institutions toward inmate participation in educational programs.

The t-test, analysis of variance, and Spearman Rank Correlation Coefficient were used in testing the statistical significance of the five null hypotheses. For the purpose of this study each hypothesis was tested at the .05 level of significance.

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS

Introduction

This study was designed to investigate the attitudes of correctional officers employed at Oklahoma's minimum, medium, and maximum security institutions toward inmate participation in educational programs. The study considered correctional officers age, gender, educational level, years of employment as a correctional officer and institution security level as factors which influence attitude.

This chapter is the presentation and analysis of the data collected concerning the five null hypotheses. The findings and statistical analysis reported in this chapter were based upon the data obtained from the administration of an opinionnaire designed to assess the attitudes of correctional officers toward the participation of inmates in Department of Corrections sponsored educational programs. Included in this study were 212 correctional officers currently employed by the Oklahoma State Department of Corrections. The chapter is organized as follows:

1. Statement of the Problem
2. Tables of Demographic Factors

3. Hypotheses Tested
4. Additional Findings
5. Summary

Statement of the Problem

The problem of this study was to answer the question: What are the attitudes of correctional officers toward educational programs in Oklahoma's maximum, medium, and minimum security prisons? Attitudes of correctional officers were studied in relation to their gender, educational level, number of years employed by the Oklahoma Department of Corrections, officer's age, and the security level of the inmates for which they were responsible.

Tables of Demographic Factors

Table 4 identifies demographic information gathered from 212 respondents in reference to correctional officers' gender for the purpose of testing HO_0.

TABLE 4

Percent of Response by Gender (COSEX)

COSEX	Frequency	Percent
Male	170	80.0
Female	42	20.0

Table 5 reports results concerning the security level of the institutions at which the respondents were employed. These results were used in testing HO_1.

TABLE 5

Percent of Response by Institution Security Level (SECLVL)

SECLVL	Frequency	Percent
Minimum	53	25.0
Medium	84	39.0
Maximum	47	22.0
Mixed	28	14.0

Table 6 reflects information gathered in relation to the number of years correctional officers have been employed by the Department of Corrections. The data from this table were used in testing HO_2.

TABLE 6

Number of Years Employed as a Correctional Officer (YRSCO)

YRSCO	Frequency	Percent
Less than 1 year	18	8.0
1 - 2 years	43	20.0
3 - 4 years	39	18.0
4 - 5 years	23	10.0
5 - 6 years	18	8.0

TABLE 6 (cont'd.)

Number of Years Employed as a Correctional Officer (YRSCO)

6 - 7 years	14	6.0
7 - 8 years	10	4.0
8 + years	47	26.0

Table 7 described the results from 212 respondents in answer to a question involving the educational level attained by the correctional officer. This information was used in the testing of HO_3.

TABLE 7

Educational Level Attained by Correctional Officer (EDLVL)

EDLVL	Frequency	Percent
Below 12th grade	10	5.0
12th grade	57	27.0
12th grade +	57	27.0
1 - 2 yr. college	60	28.0
Associate Arts	15	7.0
Bachelor Degree	7	3.0
Voc/Technical	4	2.0
Other	2	1.0

Table 8 presents data involving the age of correctional officers sampled. These data were used in the

evaluation of HO_4.

TABLE 8

Correctional Officers' Age (COAGE)

Variable	N	Mean	STD DEV	Median
COAGE	212	39.250	9.964	38.000

Hypotheses Tested

HO_0 There is no significant difference between the mean attitudinal scores of male correctional officers and the attitudes of female correctional officers toward inmate educational programs.

A t-test was used in testing HO_0. The results are shown in Table 9.

TABLE 9

Results of the T-Test for Correctional Officers' Sex (COSEX)

Variable	N	Mean	STD. DEV.	DF	t	p>t
COSEX:						
Male	169	38.4	6.1	208	0.21	0.82
Female	41	38.7	7.4			

A sample of 212 correctional officers' attitudes toward inmate participation in educational programs was

tested using a t-test at the .05 level of significance. Responses from 170 males (80 percent) and 42 females (19 percent) were statistically analyzed.

The researcher found no significant difference in attitudes of male correctional officers and female correctional officers in relation to inmate participation in educational programs. HO_0 is accepted.

HO_1 There is no significant difference in the mean attitudinal scores of correctional officers toward inmate educational programs at maximum, medium, and minimum security institutions.

The researcher chose the one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA)to test HO_1. The results of this test are presented in Table 10.

TABLE 10

ANOVA For Institution Security Level (SECLVL)

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F-Value	p>F
SECLVL	43.5	3	14.5	0.35	0.79
ERROR	8640.9	206	41.9		
Total	8684.4	209			

The researcher audited 212 opinionnaires from correctional officers employed at various security level institutions. Twenty-five percent of the respondents were

from minimum security units, 39 percent were assigned to medium security units, 22 percent of the officers responding were from maximum security units. Thirteen percent of the respondents were employed at units with mixed security populations.

A one-way analysis of variance indicated no significant difference at the .05 level of significance. The researcher accepts the null hypothesis.

> HO_2 There is no significant correlation between the number of years a person has served as a correctional officer in the Department of Corrections and his/her attitude toward inmate educational programs.

Two hundred twelve correctional officers answered the question: How many years have you been employed as a correctional officer? Of those responding, 8.5 percent had been employed at the Department of Corrections less than one year, 20.2 percent had worked 1 - 2 years, 18.4 percent had worked 3 - 4 years, 11 percent had been employed for 4 - 5 years, while 9 percent had worked for 5 - 6 years, 5.6 percent had worked for 6 - 7 years, 4.3 percent had been employed for 7 - 8 years, while 22.2 percent had been correctional officers for more than eight years.

The Spearman rank-order correlation coefficient was used to calculate correlations between the attitudes of correctional officers toward inmate participation in

educational programs and the years an individual has been employed as a correctional officer in the Department of Corrections. The results of this test are presented in Table 11.

TABLE 11

Spearman Correlation for Attitude and Years Employed as a Correctional Officer (YRSCO)

Variable	N	RHO (Correlation)	Probability
YRSCO	212	.001	0.985

The researcher computed a Spearman Rank Correlation Coefficient and a value of R_S = .001 was obtained. The correlation was not significant at the .05 level. Based on the results of this analysis the null hypothesis must be accepted.

HO_3 There is no significant correlation between the level of education a correctional officer has attained and his/her attitude toward inmate educational programs.

Two hundred twelve correctional officers were surveyed to determine attained educational level. The results are briefly summarized here: 4.7 percent responded below 12th grade, 26.9 percent completed the 12th grade, 26.9 percent tested 12th grade plus, 28.3 percent responded 1 - 2 years

college, 7 percent completed an Associate Arts degree, 3 percent responded a Bachelors Degree, 1 percent had been involved in Vocational/Technical Training and .945 percent had other as their response.

The Spearman Rank correlation coefficient was selected to calculate correlations between the level of education a correctional officer had attained and his/her attitude toward inmate participation in educational programs. The results of this test are shown in Table 12.

TABLE 12

Spearman Correlation for Attitude and Correctional Officers Attained Level of Education (EDLVL)

Variable	N	RHO (Correlation)	Probability
EDLVL	212	0.108	0.117

A Spearman Rank correlation coefficient was computed by the researcher. A value of $R_S = 0.108$ was obtained. The correlation is not significant at the .05 level. The null hypothesis must be accepted based on the results of this test.

HO_4 There is no significant correlation between the age of a correctional officer and his/her attitude toward inmate educational programs.

The demographic information needed for the testing of this hypothesis was tabulated based on responses from 212

correctional officers. The information provided a mean age score of 39.2 years of age. A median age score was calculated to be 38.0 years of age with a standard deviation of 9.96 years. The range in age of correctional officers was 22 - 69 years of age.

The Spearman Rank Correlation Coefficient was chosen to calculate correlations between the age of a correctional officer and his/her attitude toward inmate participation in educational programs. The results of this test are provided in Table 13.

TABLE 13

Spearman Rank Correlation Coefficient for Attitude and Correctional Officers Age (COAGE)

Variable	N	RHO (Correlation)	Probability
COAGE	212	0.054	0.435

The Spearman Rank Correlation Coefficient was applied to the data. The correlation of .054 was determined to be not significant at the .05 level. The null hypothesis was not accepted based upon the results of this test.

Additional Findings

Item Analysis of Twelve Attitudinal Items

The following data represent the frequency distributions and percentage of responses gathered from 212 individuals in answer to 12 items developed to identify attitudes of correctional officers toward inmate participation in educational programs. The Likert method of summated ratings was used in the development and scoring of the opinionnaire. In accordance with this method, the 12 statements were divided into 6 positive statements and 6 negative statements in regard to inmate educational programs. The data collected were presented in two sections. Positive statements and results were tabulated and reported first, followed by negative statements and results. A code used in the tabulation of the data proceeds each section.

Code Used in Tabulation of Positive Statements

5 = SA - Strongly Agree

4 = A - Agree

3 = N - I have no feeling

2 = D - Disagree

1 = SD - Strongly Disagree

Item #1: The Department of Corrections should provide inmates with educational opportunities up to the high school level.

TABLE 14

Frequencies and Percentages for Item #1

01	Frequency	Cum Frequency	Percent	Cum Percent
1	1	1	0.472	0.472
2	8	9	3.774	4.245
3	8	17	3.774	8.019
4	116	133	54.717	62.736
5	79	212	37.264	100.000

Table 14 reports the response of 212 correctional officers to the statement: The Department of Corrections should provide inmates with educational opportunities up to the high school level. The data provided show attitudes of officers in general agreement with this statement with 91.9 percent of officers answering Strongly Agree or Agree. A response of Strongly Disagree or Disagree was chosen by only 4.2 percent of the sample. Therefore, it can be said that correctional officers' attitudes toward educational programs through the high school level are generally positive.

Item #2: The Department of Corrections should be financially responsible to provide inmates with educational opportunities up to the high school level.

TABLE 15

Frequencies and Percentages for Item #2

02	Frequency	Cum Frequency	Percent	Cum Percent
1	23	23	10.849	10.849
2	49	72	23.113	33.962
3	20	92	9.434	43.396
4	85	177	40.094	83.491
5	35	212	16.509	100.000

Table 15 data, collected from 212 correctional officers, involve the Department of Corrections' financial responsibility to provide inmates with educational programs up to the high school level. The response to this statement was favorable with 56.6 percent responding Strongly Agree or Agree, and 33.9 percent of the respondents choosing Strongly Disagree or Disagree. Although this is considered a favorable response, there is a higher percentage of dissatisfaction when compared to Item #1 where financial responsibility was not a factor. Nine point nine (9.9) percent of the respondents chose neutral on this issue.

Item #5: The Department of Corrections should provide inmates with vocational training opportunities.

TABLE 16

Frequencies and Percentages for Item #5

05	Frequency	Cum Frequency	Percent	Cum Percent
1	5	5	2.358	2.358
2	11	16	5.189	7.547
3	18	34	8.491	16.038
4	121	155	57.075	73.113
5	57	212	26.887	100.000

Table 16 shows that 83.9 percent Strongly Agree or Agree with the statement that the Department of Corrections should provide inmates with vocational training opportunities. Only 7.7 percent of the respondents chose Disagree or Strongly Disagree; 8.5 percent chose the neutral choice.

Item #6: The Department of Corrections should be financially responsible to provide inmates with vocational training opportunities.

TABLE 17

Frequencies and Percentages for Item #6

06	Frequency	Cum Frequency	Percent	Cum Percent
1	27	27	12.736	12.736
2	55	82	25.943	38.679
3	29	111	13.679	52.358

TABLE 17 (cont'd.)

Frequencies and Percentages for Item #6

06	Frequency	Cum Frequency	Percent	Cum Percent
4	74	185	34.906	87.264
5	27	212	12.736	100.000

As presented in Table 17, 47.6 percent of the officers sampled believe the Department of Corrections should take financial responsibility to provide vocational training to inmates. While 38.6 percent chose to Disagree or Strongly Disagree with this statement, 13.6 percent were neutral. It is evident that correctional officers are strongly in favor of vocational training opportunities being offered to inmates, but the data also suggest a great deal of negative feeling toward the Department of Corrections being financially responsible for these programs.

Item #9: Correctional officers should have input into the inmate work/educational assignments.

TABLE 18

Frequencies and Percentages for Item #9

09	Frequency	Cum Frequency	Percent	Cum Percent
	1			
1	2	2	0.948	0.948
2	25	27	11.848	12.796

TABLE 18 (cont'd.)

Frequencies and Percentages for Item #9

09	Frequency	Cum Frequency	Percent	Cum Percent
3	35	62	16.588	29.384
4	78	140	36.967	66.351
5	71	211	33.649	100.000

Table 18 shows 70.6 percent of the sample chose Strongly Agree or Agree as a response to Item 9 pertaining to correctional officers input into inmate work/educational assignments. Only 12.7 percent chose to respond Strongly Disagree or Disagree, while 16.5 percent chose the neutral response. The data represent a strong feeling on the part of a majority of correctional officers involving the scheduling of inmate time.

Item #13: Educational programs are an aid in the management of inmates.

TABLE 19

Frequencies and Percentages for Item #13

013	Frequency	Cum Frequency	Percent	Cum Percent
1	6	6	2.830	2.830
2	18	24	8.491	11.321
3	29	53	13.679	25.000
4	119	172	56.132	81.132
5	40	212	18.868	100.000

Table 19 shows 75 percent of the sample responded Strongly Agree or Agree when asked if educational programs are an aid in the management of inmates; 11.3 percent responded Strongly Disagree or Disagree and 13.6 percent chose the neutral response.

Code Used in Tabulation of Negative Statements

1 = SA - Strongly Agree

2 = A - Agree

3 = N - I have no feeling

4 = D - Disagree

5 = SD - Strongly Disagree

Item # 3: The Department of Corrections should not provide inmates with educational opportunities at the college or university level.

TABLE 20

Frequencies and Percentages for Item #3

03	Frequency	Cum Frequency	Percent	Cum Percent
1	32	32	15.094	15.094
2	68	100	32.075	47.170
3	22	122	10.377	57.547
4	47	169	22.170	79.717
5	43	212	20.283	100.000

Of the sample, 47.1 percent chose the response

Strongly Agree or Agree for Item #3; 42.4 percent responded Strongly Disagree or Disagree, while 10.3 percent chose the neutral response as shown in Table 20. This represents a lower percentage of agreement than was found in Items #1 and #5 involving high school and vocational training opportunities.

Item #4: The Department of Corrections should not financially be responsible to provide inmates with educational opportunities at the college or university level.

TABLE 21

Frequencies and Percentages for Item #4

04	Frequency	Cum Frequency	Percent	Cum Percent
1	20	20	9.434	9.434
2	21	41	9.906	19.340
3	11	52	5.189	24.528
4	68	120	32.075	56.604
5	92	212	43.396	100.000

As shown in Table 21, 75.5 percent of the respondents answered Strongly Disagree or Disagree for Item #4. Only 19.3 percent responded Strongly Agree or Agree, while 5.1 percent chose the neutral response. It appears that although correctional officers are split in opinions related to university and college programs being offered to

inmates (Table 23), a majority feel if these programs are offered the DOC should be financially responsible.

Item #7: Inmates should be required to work at an institutional job assignment while enrolled in educational programs.

TABLE 22

Frequencies and Percentages for Item #7

07	Frequency	Cum Frequency	Percent	Cum Percent
1	7	7	3.302	3.302
2	15	22	7.075	10.377
3	26	48	12.264	22.642
4	72	120	33.962	56.604
5	92	212	43.396	100.000

In Table 22, 77.3 percent of those responding to Item #7 chose Strongly Disagree or Disagree; 10.3 percent responded Strongly Agree or Agree, while 12.2 percent chose the neutral response. A majority of correctional officers feel that educational programs are an acceptable substitution for time spent on institutional jobs.

Item #8: Inmates should <u>not</u> receive earned credit for full time educational work.

TABLE 23

Frequencies and Percentages for Item #8

08	Frequency	Cum Frequency	Percent	Cum Percent
1	24	24	11.321	11.321
2	73	97	34.434	45.755
3	28	125	13.208	58.962
4	55	180	25.943	84.906
5	32	212	15.094	100.000

Of the correctional officers responding, 41 percent chose the responses Strongly Disagree or Disagree when answering Item #8; 45.7 percent of those responding chose Strongly Agree or Agree, while 13.2 percent responded with the neutral position (Table 23). The data suggest that, although a majority of correctional officers see educational programs as an acceptable substitute for institutional jobs, they do not consider education as being acceptable in terms of earned credit in relation to sentence time served.

Item #12: Security needs are not taken into consideration when educational programs are being developed.

TABLE 24

Frequencies and Percentages for Item #12

012	Frequency	Cum Frequency	Percent	Cum Percent
1	26	26	12.264	12.264
2	84	110	39.623	51.887
3	36	146	16.981	68.868
4	42	188	19.811	88.679
5	24	212	11.321	100.000

Of the correctional officers responding, 51.8 percent chose Strongly Agree or Agree for Item #12; 31.1 percent responded Strongly Disagree or Disagree, while 16.9 percent chose the neutral response (Table 24). A majority of security personnel believe educational staff members do not take the needs of security into consideration when implementing educational programs.

Item #14: Educational programs are not a deterrent to behavioral problems.

TABLE 25

Frequencies and Percentage for Item #14

014	Frequency	Cum Frequency	Percent	Cum Percent
1	21	21	9.906	9.906
2	54	75	25.472	35.377
3	37	112	17.453	52.830
4	78	190	36.792	89.623
5	22	212	10.377	100.000

Table 25 shows 35.3 percent of the correctional officers in the sample responded Strongly Agree or Agree to Item #14; 47.1 percent responded Strongly Disagree or Disagree while a significant number (17.4 percent) chose the neutral response. The data indicate that a large number of security personnel believe that educational programs are a deterrent to behavioral problems. However, over one-third of those responding believe that educational programs do not act as a deterrent to inmate behavioral problems.

Additional Findings (cont'd.)

Analysis of Four Evaluative Items Correctional Officer/Program Staff Relationship

Positive Statements

Item #10: Security Staff and educational staff have a positive working relationship at your institution.

TABLE 26

Frequencies and Percentages for Item #10

010	Frequency	Cum Frequency	Percent	Cum Percent
1	14	14	6.604	6.604
2	21	35	9.906	16.509
3	36	71	16.981	33.491
4	100	171	47.170	80.660
5	41	212	19.340	100.000

Sixty six point five (66.5) percent of correctional officers felt there is a positive working relationship between themselves and the educational staff; 16.5 percent answered this item Strongly Disagree or Disagree, while 16.9 percent chose the neutral response.

Item #16: In general, counselors and treatment personnel are more sympathetic to the problems of correctional officers.

TABLE 27

Frequencies and Percentages for Item #16

016	Frequency	Cum Frequency	Percent	Cum Percent
1	46	46	21.698	21.698
2	73	119	34.434	56.132
3	50	169	23.585	79.717

TABLE 27 (cont'd.)

Frequencies and Percentages for Item #16

016	Frequency	Cum Frequency	Percent	Cum Percent
4	32	201	15.094	94.811
5	11	212	5.189	100.000

In Table 27, 56.1 percent of correctional officers sampled replied Strongly Disagree or Disagree in response to statement number 16. Twenty point two percent (20.2) responded Strongly Agree or Agree, while 23.5 percent gave the neutral response. It appears a significant number of correctional officers feel that treatment personnel do not take security matters into consideration in program planning.

Negative Statements

Item #11: The educational staff is not understanding of security needs at your institution.

TABLE 28

Frequencies and Percentages for Item #11

011	Frequency	Cum Frequency	Percent	Cum Percent
1	24	24	11.321	11.321
2	86	110	40.566	51.887
3	41	151	19.340	71.226
4	45	196	21.226	92.453
5	16	212	7.547	100.000

In Table 28, 51.8 percent of the respondents chose to Strongly Agree or Agree when responding to Item number 11. Those responding Strongly Disagree or Disagree were 28.7 percent, while 19.3 percent chose the neutral response. The data gathered indicate that a majority of correctional officers feel that educational staff members do not understand what is involved in matters of security.

Item #15: Actions by program staff interfere with security efforts by custody staff.

TABLE 29

Frequencies and Percentages for Item #15

015	Frequency	Cum Frequency	Percent	Cum Percent
1	19	19	8.962	8.962
2	77	96	36.321	45.283
3	56	152	26.415	71.698
4	43	195	20.283	91.981
5	17	212	8.019	100.000

Table 29 shows 45.2 percent of the correctional officers responding chose Strongly Agree or Agree for Item 15; 28.3 percent responded Strongly Disagree or Disagree, and a significant number (26.4 percent) chose the neutral response.

Summary

This chapter reported on data gathered from 212 opinionnaires concerning the attitudes of correctional officers toward inmate participation in educational programs in Oklahoma's minimum, medium, and maximum security prisons.

Five hypotheses were tested and the results analyzed. A t-test was used to test HO_0 involving attitudes of correctional officers based on gender. The results were considered not significant at the .05 level. The null hypothesis was accepted. An ANOVA was used to examine HO_1,

which involved attitudes of correctional officers in relation to the level of security at the institution to which they were assigned. The results were considered not significant at the .05 level. HO_1 was accepted.

The final three hypotheses were tested using the Spearman Rank Correlation Coefficient. The hypotheses concerned the attitudes of correctional officers in relation to the number of years employed as a correctional officer (HO_2), the level of education attained by the officer (HO_3), and the age of the officer (HO_4). Results of the tests in all three cases were found to be not significant at the .05 level. All three null hypotheses, therefore, were accepted based on the statistical results.

The researcher presented frequency and percentage of responses for each of 12 items developed to assess the attitudes of correctional officers toward inmate participation in educational programs. Further frequencies and percentages were reported on four items designed to evaluate the working relationship between correctional officers and program staff. Implications of this item analysis were reported in Chapter V as a part of the researchers conclusions and recommendations.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Statement of the Problem

The problem of this study was to answer the question: What are the attitudes of correctional officers toward inmate educational programs in Oklahoma's maximum, medium, and minimum security prisons? Attitudes of correctional officers were studied in relation to their gender, educational level, number of years employed by the Oklahoma Department of Corrections, age, and the security level of the institution in which they are employed.

Procedures

An extensive review of current literature pertaining to rehabilitative and treatment programs in correctional institutions was performed. Special attention was given to literature related to the role of the correctional officer in the rehabilitation and treatment of inmates. An opinionniare was developed to collect demographic and attitudinal information from correctional officers employed by the Oklahoma Department of Corrections. The population for the study was limited to the 1,270 correctional officers employed by the Oklahoma Department of Corrections. A sample of 20 percent (254) of the population was chosen to

participate in the study. A total of 212 (85 percent) opinionnaires were returned and validated for statistical analysis.

Summary of Results

Five null hypotheses were tested in this study. The hypotheses were stated as follows:

HO_0 There is no significant difference between the mean attitudinal scores of male correctional officers and the attitudes of female correctional officers toward inmate educational programs.

HO_1 There is no significant difference in the mean attitudinal scores of correctional officers toward inmate educational programs at maximum, medium, and minimum security institutions.

HO_2 There is no significant correlation between the number of years a person has served as a correctional officer in the Department of Corrections and his/her attitude toward inmate educational programs.

HO_3 There is no significant correlation between the level of education a correctional officer has attained and his/her attitude toward inmate educational programs.

HO_4 There is no significant correlation between the age of a correctional officer and his/her attitude toward inmate educational programs.

Parametric and non-parametric tests of significance were used to test the hypotheses for significance. A t-test was used to test HO_0. An analysis of variance procedure was used in testing HO_1. The non-parametric Spearman rank order correlation coefficient was chosen to test HO_2, HO_3, and HO_4. The hypotheses were tested at the .05 level of significance. In each case, the results were statistically not significant. The researcher accepted the null hypotheses.

The researcher analyzed the data collected from 12 items designed to assess the attitudes of correctional officers toward inmate educational programs. The 12 statements were discussed in two major categories:

1. Correctional officers' attitudes toward the level of education offered to inmates.

2. Correctional officers' attitudes toward the Department of Corrections being financially responsible to provide educational programs.

A third category comprised of four additional statements designed to evaluate the professional relationships between correctional officers/program staff was also analyzed.

Correctional officers/program staff professional relationships. The analysis of correctional officers/ responses within these categories was the basis for the researchers conclusions and recommendations.

Conclussions and Recommendations

It appears from the statistical analyses of the data that the variables gender, educational level, age, years employed, and institutional level do not have a significant impact on the attitudes of Oklahoma's correctional officers in regard to inmate participation in educational programs.

Twelve items concerning educational programs were responded to by 212 correctional officers. The responses were tabulated and analyzed. Conclusions and recommendations were drawn from this analysis. For the purpose of this discussion, the items were categorized as follows:

Category #1: Correctional officers attitude toward the level of education offered to inmates.

It can be concluded that correctional officers have a very positive attitude toward inmates receiving educational opportunities through the high school level with 91 percent of the officers in favor of these programs. Eighty three percent were in favor of vocational training programs. Officers were less in favor of offering college level programs with only 47 percent giving a positive response to that item. It is evident that correctional officers do support a major portion of educational opportunities offered. The level of education provided seems to be a factor in the support an educational program will receive.

Category #2: Correctional officers attitude toward the Department of Corrections being financially responsible

to provide educational programs.

For all levels of education offered, a majority of correctional officers believed that the Department of Corrections should be financially responsible to provide them. An interesting statistic in this category is that although only 47 percent of the correctional officers felt college and university programs should be provided, 75 percent agreed that it was the Department of Corrections responsibility to pay for these programs if they were offered.

In reviewing the literature for this study, a great deal of attention was given to the role professional/security staff relationships play in the implementation and success of treatment programs. Piliaven (1961) stated "Disunity among staff causes work slowdowns, fragmentation of planning, high turnover, and in service organizations such as correctional institutions, the reduction in effectiveness of treatment programs." In his book, The Therapeutic Community, Jones (1953) stated: "Today it is believed, more or less, firmly, that each staff member within the institution has a potentially important role to play in the direct change of inmates. This view stresses first that cooperation and coordination of institutional workers are essential for successful programming."

In an effort to address the issue of program/security

staff relationships, four items designed to evaluate this were included in the opinionniare developed for this study. The analyses of these four items were summarized in Category 1.

Category 1: Correctional officer/program staff relationships.

Sixty-six percent of the correctional officers responding felt they have a positive working relationship with educational personnel at their institutions. However, 51 percent of the respondents felt that the educational staff is not understanding of the needs of security. Fifty-one percent do not believe security needs are taken into consideration when educational programs are being developed. Forty-five percent of officers responding felt that actions of program staff interfere with security efforts. Finally, 56 percent disagreed with the statement, "In general, counselors and treatment personnel are more sympathetic to the problems of correctional officers."

It appears correctional officers have a positive and supportive attitude toward inmate participation in educational programs. The difficulties identified appear to be in the level of education provided to inmates by the Department of Corrections and the lack of attention given to security needs when educational programs are developed and implemented. Finally, security personnel feel

treatment staff interfere with the security function.

The following recommendations address these issues.

Recommendations

In view of the findings of this study, the researcher makes the following recommendations:

1. Effective communication methods must be established throughout all levels of institutions. Stress must be placed on communication between security and educational personnel. A suggestion would be weekly staff meetings. The purpose of these meetings could be to discuss educational program planning for individual inmates. These meetings should include educational and security personnel. This practice would provide an opportunity to voice difficulties or disagreements.

2. Educational personnel must have an understanding of all aspects of the institution. Continual in-service training in this area is recommended. As a part of this training the researcher suggests educational personnel involved in program development and implementation serve an apprenticeship in other areas of the institution. This could mean nothing more than spending time on the job with supervisors of other institution functions.

3. Security personnel must have an understanding of educational programs. Program goals and objectives should be understood. In-service training is recommended. It is

further recommended that security personnel become an actual part of the educational program. With funding always a problem, security personnel could serve as educational aides on a rotating basis. Program understanding can best be developed through participation.

4. Security personnel should become a part of the planning and development of educational program. It is recommended that each institution establish an on-going team to evaluate the quality and effectiveness of educational programs at that institution. The team should consist of institution administration, educational personnel and security personnel.

5. Educational staff must have a clear understanding of institutional goals. Programs should be developed that are compatable with those goals. Correctional educators must have a philosophy of education that identifies with the Department of Corrections.

6. Although on opinionniare items concerning educational programs a majority of correctional officers were in favor of education programs being provided (high school 91 percent, vocational training 83 percent, college 47 percent), a significant percentage of correctional officers responded either neutral or negatively to these items. It is recommended that the Department of Corrections investigate the possibility of establishing a security institution whose primary function is the

education of inmates. It is recommended that a screening procedure be developed to assure the participation of inmates that are most likely to gain from this experience. It is further recommended that security personnel who have demonstrated understanding and support of these programs be assigned to this facility.

7. It is recommended that all staff members be given the opportunity to participate in any of the educational programs being sponsored by the Department of Corrections. This involves staff in the educational process while encouraging support for these programs.

8. Training programs should be adopted that stress the importance of treatment programs and emphasize the role of the correctional officer in these programs. It is suggested as part of this training that security personnel should become familiar with some of the terminology and theory used by the educational staff. The correctional officer should understand the goals of educational programs as it relates to his/her job.

9. It is recommended that the Department of Corrections state clearly the role of the correctional officer in relation to treatment programs. This role should be addressed during the evaluation of current and potential employees.

Recommendations for Further Research

1. A follow-up study is recommended concerning inmates' attitudes toward the educational programs being provided to them by the Department of Corrections.

2. An in-depth study concerning the attitudes of security personnel toward treatment staff in the Oklahoma correctional system.

3. Conduct a study to determine what curriculum areas need particular emphasis in the Department of Corrections educational program.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

Archam Beault, W. G., Archam Beault, B. J. Correctional Supervisory Management, Principles of Organization, Policy, and Law. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1982.

Best, J. W. Research in Education. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1970.

Carny, L. P. Corrections, Treatment, and Philosophy. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1980.

Coffey, A. R. Administration of Criminal Justice. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1974.

Crouch, B. W. The Keepers, Prison Guard and Contempory Corrections. Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas Publisher, 1980.

Fox, V. Introduction to Corrections. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1972.

Hazelrigg L. Prison Within Society. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, Inc., 1968.

Huck, W. H., Cormier, W. H., & Bounds, W. G. Reading Statistics and Research. New York: Harper & Row, 1974.

Jones, M. The Therapeutic Community. New York: Basic Books, 1953.

Perlstein, G. R. & Phelps, T. R. Alternatives to Prison-Community Based Corrections. Pacific Palisades, CA: Goodyear Publishing Company, 1975.

Ryan, T. A. Education for Adults in Correctional Institutions: A Book of Readings. Education Research and Development Center, University of Hawaii, 1975.

Siegel, S. Non-Parametric Statistics. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1956.

Smith, M. B., Bruner, J. S. and White, R. S. Opinions and Personality. New York: Wiley, 1956.

Thurstone, L. L. The Measurement of Values. University of Chicago Press, 1959.

Vandalen, D. B. Understanding Educational Research: An Introduction. New York: McGraw Hill Co., 1979.

Wicks, R. J. Guard! Society's Professional Prisoner. Houston, TX: Gulf Publishing Co., 1980.

Young, K. Social Attitudes. New York: Holt, 1957.

Periodicals

Brodsky, S. L. (1974, June). A bill of rights for the correctional officer. Federal Probation. p. 39.

Chang, Zastrow & Blazicek. (1975). Inmates perception of significant others, and implications for the rehabilitation process. Journal of Criminology and Penology, 3, 85.

Craddick, R. A. (1964, July). An approach to short-term training of custodial officers and staff in prisoner-counseling. Canadian Journal of Corrections, 325-330.

Dillon, S. T. (1975, Jan-Feb). Examining the role of maximum security in the rehabilitation process. American Journal of Corrections, 27.

Duffee, D. (1974). The correction officers subculture and organizational change. Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 11, 155-179.

Gettmser, S. (1979, Dec). Look abroad for new ideas. Corrections Magazine, pp. 44-47.

Grusky, O. (1959, Mar). Role conflict in organization: A study of prison camp officials. Administrative Science Quarterly, 3, 452-472.

Henderson, R. L. (1970, May-Jun). The correction officer and the educational program. American Journal of Corrections, 18-21.

Jacobs, J. B. (1978, April). What prison force guards think: A profile of the Illinois force. Crime and Delinquency, pp. 40-50.

Jacobs, J. B. (1978, April). What prison guards think. Crime and Delinquency, pp. 185-196.

Jacobs, J. B. & Grear, M. P. (1977, Nov). Dropouts and rejects: An analysis of the prison guards revolving door. Criminal Justice Review, 2, 157.

Janowitz, W. & Winter, R. (1959, Jun). Effective institutions for juvenile delinquents: A research statement. Social Service Review, 33.

Kinsell, C. & Shelden, A. (1981, Jan-Feb). A survey of correctional officers at a medium security prison. Corrections Today, pp. 35-42.

Rackers, P. D. (1981, Feb). Officers and inmates: Dignity through dialogue. Corrections Today, pp. 52, 53.

Teske, R. H. C. & Williamson, H. E. (1979, Mar). Correctional officers attitudes toward selected treatment programs. Criminal Justice and Behavior, 6, 59-66.

Miscellaneous Citations

American Psychological Association (1983). Publications Manual, 3rd ed. Washington, D.C.

Benton, W. F. (1970). Oklahoma Corrections Master Plan. National Clearinghouse for Criminal Justice Planning and Architecture.

Census of Prisoners in State Correctional Facilities. National Prisoner Statistics Special Report. U. S. Department of Justice. No. SD-NPS-SR-3, Dec. 1976.

Feldman, S. D. (1974, Oct). Trends in Offender Vocational and Education Programs: A Literature Search. Washington, D. C.: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, Offender Education in Community Colleges Project.

Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, National Criminal Justice Information and Statistics Service. (1970). Expenditure and Employment Data from the Criminal Justice System. Washington, D. C.: SD-EE-No. 3.

Manual of Standards for Adult Correctional Institutions. (1977). Commission on Accreditation for Corrections. American Correctional Association.

Studbaker, P. (1978) " A comparative attitudinal analysis of students participating in condensed programs sponsored by the University of Oklahoma." (Doctoral dissertation).

Udell, D. S., Longacre, C. D., & Colbert, W. (1981, Jun). A survey of teacher training needs of adult basic education and general education program instructors in the Oklahoma penal system. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Oklahoma).

APPENDIX A

SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

Section I

General Information

1. Institution Name_____

2. Security Level of Institution

   Maximum _____

   Medium _____

   Minimum _____

3. Institution Houses

   Males _____

   Females _____

   Both _____

4. Does this institution serve any unique or specialized purpose?

   Diagnostic Center _____

   Pre-Release Center _____

   Young Offenders _____

   Strict Custody _____

   Behavioral/Emotional Problems _____

Section II

Personal Information

1. What is your age? _____

2. What is your sex? Male_____ Female_____

3. What is your present rank level? _____

4. How many years have you been employed as a correctional officer?

   Less than 1 year_____

   1 - 2 _____ 5 - 6 _____

   3 - 4 _____ 6 - 7 _____

   4 - 5 _____ 7 - 8 _____

   More than 8 years_____

5. How many years have you been employed at the institution where you are presently located?

   Less than 1 year_____

   1 - 2 _____ 5 - 6 _____

   3 - 4 _____ 6 - 7 _____

   4 - 5 _____ 7 - 8 _____

   More than 8 years _____

6. In how many different correctional institutions in the State of Oklahoma have you worked?_____

7. What is your present level of education?

   Below 12th Grade _____ 1-2 years college _____

   12th Grade _____ Associate of Arts _____

   12th Grade+_____ Bachelor Degree _____

   Vocational/Technical Training _____ Other _____

   (Please Specify) _____

Section III

The following statements represent opinions, and your agreement or disagreement will be determined on the basis of your convictions. Kindly check your position on the scale as the statement first impresses you. Indicate what you believe, rather than what you think you should believe.

SA - I strongly agree

A - I agree

N - I have no feeling

D - I disagree

SD - I strongly disagree

After reading each statement carefully, place a check mark beside the item under the appropriate symbol.

In general follow these definitions of response alternatives:

SA - I almost always agree with this statement; or in almost all instances, this statement is true.

A - I frequently am in agreement with this statement; or more often than not this statement is true.

N - This statement is neither true nor false, or, the evidence indicates that this statement is true about half the time.

D - I frequently am in disagreement with this statement, or more often than not, this statement is false.

SD - I almost always disagree with this statement; or in almost all instances this statement is false.

8. Are you presently involved in any training programs sponsored by the Department of Corrections?

Yes _____ No _____

If yes, please specify _____

9. What Department of Corrections sponsored training programs have you participated in the past five years?

_____

_____

_____

10. Are you presently involved in any training programs offered outside of the Department of Corrections? (Vo-Tech, College, Community, etc.)

Yes _____ No _____

If yes, please specify _____

_____

11. What is your marital status?

Married _____ Widowed _____

Single _____ Other _____
(Please Specify)

_____

12. What is the age and present educational levels of your children?

_____ _____

_____ _____

_____ _____

13. What percent of your time involves direct interaction with, or supervision of, inmates?

0 - 10% _____ 25 - 50% _____ 75 - 100% _____

10 - 25% _____ 50 - 75% _____

SA	A	N	D	SD	STATEMENT
					1. The Department of Corrections should provide inmates with educational opportunities up to the high school level.
					2. The Department of Corrections should be financially responsible to provide inmates with educational opportunities up to the high school level.
					3. The Department of Corrections should not provide inmates with educational opportunities at the college or university level.
					4. The Department of Corrections should not be financially responsible to provide inmates with educational opportunities at the college or university level.
					5. The Department of Corrections should provide inmates with vocational training opportunities.
					6. The Department of Corrections should be financially responsible to provide inmates with vocational training opportunities.
					7. Inmates should be required to work at an institutional job assignment while enrolled in educational programs.
					8. Inmates should not receive earned credit for full time educational work.
					9. Correctional officers should have input into the inmate work/educational assignments.

SA	A	N	D	SD	STATEMENT
					10. Security staff and educational staff have a positive working relationship at your institution.
					11. The educational staff is not understanding of security needs at your institution.
					12. Security needs are not taken into consideration when educational rograms are being developed.
					13. Educational programs are an aid in the management of inmates.
					14. Educational programs are not a deterrent to behavioral problems.
					15. Actions by program staff interfere with security efforts by custody staff.
					16. In general, counselors and treatment personnel are more sympathetic to the problems of correctional officers.

MEMORANDUM

August 28, 1984

TO: All Wardens

FROM: Cliff Sandel, Deputy Director of Administrative Services

THRU: Gary Maynard, Deputy Director of Western Institutions
Gary Parsons, Deputy Director of Eastern Institutions

SUBJ: Correctional Officer Questionnaire

Mr. Joe Siano, graduate student at the University of Oklahoma, has received approval to conduct his dissertation within the Oklahoma Department of Corrections. The study concerns correctional officers' attitudes toward education programs and the results from the study may be useful in planning training programs. In addition, participation in the study will assist facility with AGA Standards 64 and 65 concerning participation in research.

To complete participation in the study take the following steps:

1. Within the packet is a list of names of correctional officers at your facility that were randomly selected. This list should be given, with the packets, to the Chief of Security.

2. The Chief of security should give a questionnaire to each individual on the main list and place a check next to the individual's name.

3. If an individual on the list no longer works for the facility or is not at work, then a name should be taken from the alternate list.

4. It is essential that each facility have the total number of people on the main list participating in the study.

5. Once the correctional officer has completed the questionnaire, s/he should return it to the Chief of Security.

6. The Chief of Security should check on the list each individual's name as the forms are returned.

7. On or before September 7, 1984 the completed forms for the facility are to be placed in an envelope and mailed to Planning and Research.

Your cooperation in this study will be greatly appreciated. Upon completion of the report a copy will be mailed to each warden. If you have any questions about the study procedure, please contact Bud Clark or me at 405-427-6521.

CS/rs

Dear Correctional Officer:

The enclosed survey is part of a research study being conducted in partial fulfillment of a Doctor of Philosophy Degree at the University of Oklahoma. The study is being done in cooperation with the Oklahoma Department of Corrections, Department of Planning and Research.

Results of this survey will be reported as group scores only. The anonymity of your response is assured.

The successful completion of this study is dependent upon the response of this survey. Your immediate attention to this survey will be greatly appreciated.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Joseph N. Siano

JNS/cnj
Enclosure

December 5, 1984

Dear Dr. Davis:

I would like to thank you and the Department of Corrections for your participation in my research project concerning attitudes of correctional officers toward inmate educational programs. With the participation in this project of the wardens and correctional officers at each of the minimum, medium, and maximum security institutions, I feel the data collected will benefit the Department as it considers future in-service training for its' employees.

Once again thank you and all the members of the Department for your help and cooperation.

Sincerely,

Joseph Siano

DATA DICTIONARY FOR PURPOSE OF ANALYSIS

	VARIABLE	LENGTH	Description
Facility No	FACNO	2	DOC Code Number
Security Level	SECLEVLE	1	1=min., 2=med., 3=max., 4=mixed
Inmate Sex	INMSEX	1	1=male, 2=female, 3=both
Special Purpose of Institution	SPECPURP	1	1=Diagnostic Ctr. 2=Pre-Release, 3=Young Offenders 4=Strict Custody 5=Behavioral Problems 6=Multi-Purpose
Correctional Officers Age	COAGE	2	
Correctional Officers Rank	CORANk	1	1=Cadet, 2=COI, 3=COII, 4=COIII, 5=COIV, 6=COV
Correctional Officers Sex	COSEX	1	1=Male, 2=Female
Years Employed As a Correctional Officer	YRSCO	1	0=Less than 1, 1=1-2, 2=3-4, 3=4-5, 4=5-6, 5=6-7, 6=7-8, 7=8+
Years at Present Location	YRSLOC	1	Same as Above
No. of Institutions Employed at Co-Educational	NOINSTS	1	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 0=more than 9
Level	EDLVL	1	0=Below 12, 1=12, 2=12+, 3=1-2 college, 4=A.A., 5=B.D., 6=Voc/ Tech., 7=other

DOC Training Programs	DOCTRAN	1	1=yes, 2= no
Types of Programs	PROGRAMS	1	1=Academy, 2=management, 3=DOC Annual Training 4=E-Squad
Outside of DOC Training	OUTSDTRN	1	1=yes, 2=no
Marital Status	MARSTAT	1	1=mar., 2=single, 3=widowed, 4=divorced
Children's Age	CHLDAGE	2	
Child's Grade	CHLDGRD	1	1=grade school, 2=mid-school, 3=high school 4=college
Percent of Time with Inmates	PCTIME	1	1=0-10%, 2=10-25%, 3=25-50%, 4=50-75%, 5=75-100%
Questions 1-16		1	5=Strongly Agree 4=Agree 3=No Feeling 2=Disagree 1=Strongly Disagree

APPENDIX B

SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

Section I

General Information

1. Institution Name _____

2. Security Level of Institution

Maximum	25.0
Medium	39.6
Minimum	22.3

3. Institution Houses

Males	86.8
Females	3.8
Both	9.4

4. Does this institution serve any unique or specialized purpose?

Diagnostic Center	0
Pre-Release Center	8.9
Young Offenders	6.6
Strict Custody	65.5
Behavioral/Emotional Problems	9.4

Section II

Personal Information

1. What is your age? 43 (mean age)

2. What is your sex? Male 80.2 Female 19.3

3. What is your present rank level? _____

4. How many years have you been employed as a correctional officer?

   Less than 1 year 8.5

   1 - 2 20.2 5 - 6 8.5

   3 - 4 18.4 6 - 7 6.6

   4 - 5 11.0 7 - 8 4.7

   More than 8 years 22.2

5. How many years have you been employed at the institution where you are presently located?

   Less than 1 year 13.7

   1 - 2 21.7 5 - 6 9.0

   3 - 4 11.0 6 - 7 5.6

   4 - 5 8.5 7 - 8 4.3

   More than 8 years 21.2

6. In how many different correctional institutions in the State of Oklahoma have you worked? _____

7. What is your present level of education?

   Below 12th Grade 4.7 1-2 years college 28.3

   12th Grade 26.9 Associate of Arts 7.1

   12th Grade+ 26.9 Bachelor Degree 3.3

   Vocational/Technical Training 1.9 Other 1.0

   (Please Specify) _____

Section III

The following statements represent opinions, and your agreement or disagreement will be determined on the basis of your convictions. Kindly check your position on the scale as the statement first impresses you. Indicate what you believe, rather than what you think you should believe.

SA - I strongly agree

A - I agree

N - I have no feeling

D - I disagree

SD - I strongly disagree

After reading each statement carefully, place a check mark beside the item under the appropriate symbol.

In general follow these definitions of response alternatives:

SA - I almost always agree with this statement; or in almost all instances, this statement is true.

A - I frequently am in agreement with this statement; or more often than not this statement is true.

N - This statement is neither true nor false, or, the evidence indicates that this statement is true about half the time.

D - I frequently am in disagreement with this statement, or more often than not, this statement is false.

SD - I almost always disagree with this statement; or in almost all instances this statement is false.

8. Are you presently involved in any training programs sponsored by the Department of Corrections?

Yes 19.8 No 80.1

If yes, please specify _____

9. What Department of Corrections sponsored training programs have you participated in the past five years?

_____

_____

_____

10. Are you presently involved in any training programs offered outside of the Department of Corrections? (Vo-Tech, College, Community, etc.)

Yes 8.5 No 91.5

If yes, please specify _____

_____

11. What is your marital status?

Married 77.8 Widowed .9

Single 9.9 Other 10.8 (Divorced)
(Please Specify)

_____

12. What is the age and present educational levels of your children?

_____ _____

_____ _____

_____ _____

13. What percent of your time involves direct interaction with, or supervision of, inmates?

0 - 10% 7.0 25 - 50% 14.6 75 - 100% 59.4

10 - 25% 6.6 50 - 75% 12.2

SA	A	N	D	SD	STATEMENT
37.2	59.7	3.8	3.8	.47	1. The Department of Corrections should provide inmates with educational opportunities up to the high school level.
17.0	40.0	9.4	23.1	10.9	2. The Department of Corrections should be financially responsible to provide inmates with educational opportunities up to the high school level.
15.1	32.1	10.4	22.2	20.3	3. The Department of Corrections should not provide inmates with educational opportunities at the college or university level.
9.4	9.9	5.1	32.0	43.4	4. The Department of Corrections should not be financially responsible to provide inmates with educational opportunities at the college or university level.
26.9	57.1	8.5	5.2	2.4	5. The Department of Corrections should provide inmates with vocational training opportunities.
12.7	34.9	13.7	26.0	12.7	6. The Department of Corrections should be financially responsible to provide inmates with vocational training opportunities.
3.3	7.1	12.3	33.9	43.4	7. Inmates should be required to work at an institutional job assignment while enrolled in educational programs.
11.2	34.4	13.2	26.0	15.1	8. Inmates should not receive earned credit for full time educational work.
33.6	37.0	16.6	12.0	1.0	9. Correctional officers should have input into the inmate work/educational assignments.

SA	A	N	D	SD	STATEMENT
19.4	47.2	17.0	9.9	6.6	10. Security staff and educational staff have a positive working relationship at your institution.
11.3	40.6	19.3	21.2	7.5	11. The educational staff is <u>not</u> understanding of security needs at your institution.
12.3	39.6	17.0	19.9	11.3	12. Security needs are not taken into consideration when educational programs are being developed.
18.9	56.1	13.7	8.5	2.8	13. Educational programs are an aid in the management of inmates.
9.9	25.4	17.4	36.8	10.4	14. Educational programs are <u>not</u> a deterrent to behavioral problems.
9.0	36.3	26.4	20.3	8.0	15. Actions by program staff interfere with security efforts by custody staff.
5.2	15.0	23.6	34.4	21.7	16. In general, counselors and treatment personnel are more sympathetic to the problems of correctional officers.

TABLE 31

Mean, Standard Deviation, and Medium
For All Items

Variable	N	Mean	Std Dev	Medium
SECLVL	212	2.235849	0.9740898	2.000000
INMSEX	212	1.226415	0.6046113	1.000000
COAGE	212	39.250000	9.9643321	38.000000
COSEX	211	1.194313	0.3966117	1.000000
CORANK	212	2.778302	0.9096121	3.000000
YRSCO	212	3.400943	2.4387471	3.000000
YRSLOC	212	3.174528	2.5205717	2.000000
EDLVL	212	2.283019	1.3367196	2.000000
PCTTIME	212	4.103774	1.2800270	5.000000
Q1	212	4.245283	0.7390441	4.000000
Q2	212	3.283019	1.2861251	4.000000
Q3	212	2.995283	1.4024273	3.000000
Q4	212	2.099057	1.3150961	2.000000
Q5	212	4.009434	0.8815678	4.000000
Q6	212	3.089623	1.2755394	3.000000
Q7	212	1.929245	1.0663724	2.000000
Q8	212	3.009434	1.2915715	3.000000
Q9	211	3.905213	1.0284159	4.000000
Q10	212	3.627358	1.1048392	4.000000
Q11	212	3.268868	1.1430286	4.000000

TABLE 31 (cont'd.)

Mean, Standard Deviation, and Medium
For All Items

Variable	N	Mean	Std Dev	Median
Q12	212	3.216981	1.2238136	4.000000
Q13	212	3.797170	0.9395933	4.000000
Q14	212	2.877358	1.1940042	3.000000
Q15	212	3.179245	1.1040397	3.000000
Q16	212	2.476415	1.1413845	2.000000