

X

THE CONCERNS OF CORRECTIONAL INDUSTRY SUPERVISORS

by

Michael J. Irvine and Bonnie C. Craddock

Planning and Research Branch



Ontario

Ministry of
Correctional
Services

Honourable
Gordon Walker
Minister

Glenn R. Thompson
Deputy Minister

October, 1979

64889

MINISTRY OF CORRECTIONAL SERVICES

PROVINCE OF ONTARIO



PLANNING AND SUPPORT SERVICES DIVISION

M.J. Algar
Executive Director

PLANNING AND RESEARCH BRANCH

James J. Hug, Ph.D.
Director

A.C. Birkenmayer
Manager, Research Services

PROJECT STAFF

Principal Investigators Michael J. Irvine
and
Bonnie C. Craddock

October 1979

64889

Fold



Ontario

Ministry of
Correctional
Services

With the compliments of

Research Services
Planning and Research Branch
2001 Eglinton Avenue East
Scarborough, Ontario M1L 4P1
Phone (416) 750-3350

NCJRS

FEB 12 1980

ACQUISITIONS

Form No. 020-002 (11/77)

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Sincere appreciation is extended to the Ministry of Correctional Services staff whose cooperation was essential to the completion of this study. Mr. J. Pahapill, Manager, Industrial Programmes Branch, provided meaningful guidance and encouragement in the developmental phases. The following Superintendents also provided assistance in facilitating interviews with their staff: Mr. N. Bamford, Mr. H. Rowe, Mr. C. DeGrandis, Mr. G. Fisher, Mr. J. Moclair, Mr. J. Kundle and Mr. W. Taylor. Above all, the authors are indebted to the Industrial Programmes' staff who so willingly participated in the study.

NCJRS

FEB 12 1980

ACQUISITIONS

ADMINISTRATIVE ABSTRACT

Interviews were conducted with 115 industrial programme supervisors from seven Correctional Centres. The intention was to gather basic information regarding the staff and their programmes and to elicit observations and recommendations that would reflect their role in the Ministry.

The results were varied but generally yielded few surprises. The average officer was 48 years of age, had been with the Ministry 14 years and at his present position almost 9 years. A wide range of employment experience preceded Ministry employment but 27% had had no previous training or experience related to their current work. A large proportion had taken the staff training programme for correctional officers but there were indications of a need for a similar programme oriented to the specific needs of industry supervisors.

For the purposes of this study, the work programmes were grouped into five categories; training, maintenance, production for institutions, production for market use and community service. Generally, training programmes have the fewest inmates and tended to have only one staff supervisor/instructor per programme. By comparison, production programmes tended to have the most inmates. Within the wide range of types of programmes, the staff attached the highest priority to those which service or produce goods for institutional use. In general, despite the type of work being done, the staff tended to feel that they are accomplishing something with the inmates; either in skills or work habits.

Inmates were generally viewed as capable workers but lack real experience. The staff, in many cases, felt that they have more inmates than they need in their programmes and that the inmates can and should be expected to work at higher levels of performance.

Opinions concerning incentives varied. Some staff advocated no remuneration whatsoever, and still a couple recommended competitive wages. In general the majority supported either maintaining the present allowance scheme, or increasing the rate to a level approaching the minimum wage. Recommended increases were contingent upon the type of programme, the real quality of work performance and, in some cases, collecting room and board from the inmates. It was also suggested that incentive allowances be more closely aligned with actual work performed.

Although few of the officers had direct exposure to community work projects conducted outside the institution, responses to community programmes were favourable and more future projects were encouraged. The re-establishment of farming and agricultural programmes was also recommended. In general suggestions for future projects tended to centre on offsetting expenses or providing inmates with marketable skills.

Recommendations

- 1) Consider re-establishing agricultural/farming programmes.
- 2) Concentrate on selecting programmes which are cost-efficient in supporting institutional needs or which provide definite marketable skills.
- 3) Increase the number of programmes to match available labour force.
- 4) Provide staff training programmes for non-correctional staff.
- 5) Expand institutional based community service projects and permit non-correctional staff to supervise.
- 6) Investigate more fully the impact of community work by inmates.
- 7) Develop consistent staff classifications for all industrial programme supervisors.
- 8) Increase inmate incentive allowance, award incentives according to real work performance and investigate possibilities of collecting room and board.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	i
ADMINISTRATIVE ABSTRACT	ii
LIST OF TABLES	v
I INTRODUCTION	1
II METHODOLOGY	2
III RESULTS	3
A. Sample Description and Employment History	3
B. Education and Training	3
C. Description of Working Environment .	4
D. Incentives	5
E. Response to Change	7
F. Problems and Suggestions	8
IV DISCUSSION AND SUMMARY	12
V REFERENCES	16

LIST OF TABLES

<u>TABLE</u>		<u>Page</u>
1	Number of Staff in Work Programmes by Institution	4
2	Work Programme Priority by Work Programme Involvement	6
3	Suggested Pay Scales	6
4	Appropriate Pay by Programme Category .	7

I INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this survey was to gather information concerning the Ministry's Industrial/Work Programmes. In keeping with the Ministry's overall plan to conduct research among all levels of staff, the principal focus was on the concerns, attitudes and recommendations of the industrial staff.

In the past, many studies have been conducted and much data collected on prison-work in general (Evans 1970, Hickling-Johnson 1972, Singer 1973, West and Stratton 1971) and on special, innovative approaches to utilizing inmate labour (Crispino 1974, Jeffery and Woolpert 1974, Irvine 1978). In addition, staff surveys have been conducted with different groups of Ministry personnel (Correctional Officers - Wilkins 1975, Irvine 1977; Probation Officers - Crispino, Mulvihill and Rogers 1977). In one U.S. study (Glaser 1964), the importance of work supervisors was noted. In that survey, it was determined that interactions with industrial staff were rated most frequently by inmates as having been the most positive and influential during their institutional experience.

To date, within this Ministry, there has been no real attempt to determine the concerns and consensus of the Ministry's industrial staff. This orientation is particularly relevant and important because of past changes in the industrial programmes (i.e. new programmes, closures), recent procedural shifts (i.e. increased emphasis on earned remission) and future expected and on-going changes in work programmes.

For the present purposes, industrial staff are defined as including all Ministry personnel, who, in the course of their working duties teach, manage and/or supervise inmates who perform some working function. In the present context, they do not include correctional officers providing custodial supervision. Thus, the survey concerns the responses of trade instructors, production shop managers and work-party foremen.

In the discussion leading to the establishment of the research instruments, a number of primary issues emerged. There is a need for a description of the actual staff, including employment history, education and training, and a description of the Ministry's industrial working environments. It was also felt that by drawing on the direct experiences that the industrial staff have had, valuable insight could be gained into the operation of existing programmes including incentives, changes and problems, as well as into future recommendations for ongoing trends in prison work. Implicit in the present study therefore is the recognition that the Ministry's industrial staff via their unique role and experiences could provide meaningful insight which could be useful in the industrial planning processes.

II METHODOLOGY

A. Procedure

At the institutions that were visited each available industrial staff member was given a semi-structured voluntary interview that lasted 20-25 minutes. The questions focused on demographic characteristics, actual work situations, and staff attitudes concerning inmate labour, incentives and recent changes. Time was spent discussing problems that have occurred, recommended changes and suggestions for new work programmes.

In an effort to conduct the interviews as informally as possible, the sessions frequently occurred in the officers' working environments. The interviews were conducted by both of the authors and were given between the beginning of March and the middle of April, 1979.

B. Sample

A total of 115 industrial staff were interviewed at seven Correctional Centres. The numbers, by institution, were as follows: Guelph C.C. (38), Mimico C.C. (5), Millbrook C.C. (17), Burtch C.C. (19), Monteith C.C. (10), Rideau C.C. (17), and Thunder Bay C.C. (9). The decision to restrict the research to Correctional Centres was based on the fact that Jails and Detention Centres generally do not have industrial work programmes because their inmates tend not to be available for long periods of time. Adult Training Centre (A.T.C.'s), the other type of Ministry institution, have work programmes associated with trades training and education, and would ordinarily have been included in this study. They were excluded, however, because they are currently the subject of another extensive research evaluation. The lone correctional centre excluded from this study (Maplehurst C.C.) is also part of that A.T.C. research.

The 115 staff who were interviewed constituted approximately 80%-90% of the industrial staff at the institutions that were visited. For a variety of reasons, it was not possible to interview all staff. Some were ill or on vacation, and two were unwilling to participate. In addition, because some positions were vacant with only a possibility of being re-filled, it was not possible to determine the total number of potential interviews.

III RESULTS

A. Sample Description and Employment History

The 115 industrial staff members ranged in age from 22 to 65 years (average: 47.8 years). The staff had been with the Ministry of Correctional Services an average of 14.3 years, ranging from 1 to 35 years and had worked at their current Ministry position an average of 8.7 years, ranging from 1 to 27 years. Forty-five (39%) had always worked at the same position within the Ministry. Almost half were at one time employed as Correctional Officers or as Supervisors of Juveniles. Twelve had worked as Industrial Officers in other shops within the Ministry.

All but two of the officers had worked prior to joining the Ministry. Their experiences varied greatly. Fifty-five percent had worked in skilled trades or semi-skilled positions, 18% in factories and 15% in the armed forces. On the average, the staff members had 11.5 years of experience in non-governmental work relevant to the tasks that they now perform for the Ministry of Correctional Services. In total, however, 33 of the staff (27%) had no direct experience in the type of work that they currently do for the Ministry.

A variety of reasons were given for having joined the Ministry but were, for the most part of practical concern. Thirty-five (32%) were unemployed and needed work, 33 (30%) were motivated by financial and employment security, and 7 (6%) cited convenience. Eighteen (17%) chose the Ministry because it involved work related to their skills and former employment. Fifteen (14%) were primarily interested in working with people.

B. Education and Training

Information on educational achievement was obtained from 108 of the staff (94%). Of these officers, one-third had completed secondary school and only 16% had less than grade 9. Grade 10 was the overall average level attained. Seventy-eight (72%) reported having taken further training in addition to school. Thirty-eight of them had been involved in apprenticeship programmes encompassing a wide variety of trades.

Special courses offered or sponsored by the Ministry had been taken by 56 (49%) of the industrial staff, almost all of whom (86%) were satisfied that the training was of some use to them. The largest group (N = 44) were the staff who had participated in the staff training course that is offered for Correctional Officers (C.O's). Almost all of these industrial staff had been C.O's. and presumably had taken the course at that time.

Among the staff who have not received any Ministry training, a slight majority (N = 31) felt that some form of special training would be of benefit to them. Foremost among the suggestions was for training on how to deal with inmates, similar to training given to C.O's. A few suggested that they would appreciate access to staff training courses which would enable them to apply for other positions within the Ministry.

C. Description of the Working Environment

The industrial staff are involved in a wide variety of work programmes, the range and orientation of which vary with institutions. For research purposes, the various programmes have been categorized into five groups based on both the type of work and the ultimate recipient of the labour. The categories, including examples, are as follows:

- Training - Trades/vocational instruction, plumbing, welding, carpentry, etc.
- Maintenance - Repair, grounds crews, maintenance painters.
- Institutional Production - Laundry, kitchen, textiles, tailoring.
- Community Service - Construction, road clearing, bush clearing.
- Marketable Production - Picnic tables, licence plates.

The number of staff involved in the various categories of work programmes at each institution are provided in TABLE 1. As the data indicate, Guelph C.C., the largest institution, has the most industrial staff and also has the most diverse range of work programmes.

TABLE 1 - Number of Staff in Work Programmes by Institution.

<u>Institution</u>	<u>Training</u>	<u>Maintenance</u>	<u>Institution Production</u>	<u>Community Service</u>	<u>Market Production</u>	<u>Total</u>
Guelph C.C.	10	9	14	2	3	38
Mimico C.C.	1	4	-	-	-	5
Millbrook C.C.	3	4	2	-	8	17
Burtch C.C.	1	6	12	-	-	19
Monteith C.C.	4	2	4	-	-	10
Rideau C.C.	5	6	6	-	-	17
Thunder Bay C.C.	<u>2</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>9</u>
TOTAL	<u>26</u>	<u>35</u>	<u>41</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>115</u>

On the average, each industrial staff member supervises 11 inmates. The number of inmates in the programmes vary with the fewest in training programmes (average 7.2 inmates) and the greatest number in programmes producing institutional goods (average 13.7 inmates). As to labour requirements, 33% of the staff feel that they presently have the minimum number of inmates that they require in order to get their job done. Almost half of the staff (N = 55) however, figure that they could successfully manage with fewer inmates. These officers report that they have an average of 3.3 inmates per shop more than is necessary.

Only 30% (N = 35) of the staff work without colleagues sharing supervisory/management responsibilities. The majority (N = 80) do not work alone and have an average of three co-workers each. They tend to be in production programmes which also tend to have more inmates.

The majority of all of the staff (76%) seem to be content with the amount of staff assistance available to them. Those who were the least satisfied tended to be with programmes involving training or production of marketable goods. Their complaints focused primarily on security. The trades training staff who work alone were largely concerned about a lack of back-up support in the eventuality of a crisis.

The majority of the staff (59%) regard inmates as being capable workers in general. Although only 35% feel that inmates are presently expected to work at the same level of performance as civilians, 53% think that inmates should be expected to work at those levels. A number of critical problems inhibiting better work performance were cited. The most frequently given reason was a lack of real work experience (N = 41). Other comments centred on unwillingness to work and a lack of motivation (N = 37), negative attitudes and disciplinary problems (N = 28), a lack of financial incentives (N = 28), peer pressure and contraband (N = 18), and immaturity (N = 7).

In TABLE 2 are presented the ranked importance of the five work programme categories in relation to the category in which the respondents' programmes are included. Inspection of the data reveals an interesting pattern. In four out of five cases, the staff tended to rate their own type of shop as being either the highest or second highest in priority. Thus, for example, both maintenance and institutional production staff viewed their own work as most important. Similarly, training staff considered training to be second in priority. The only staff who did not fit the pattern were those involved in production of marketable goods. These staff, along with the majority of the others interviewed, tended to view the marketable production as being relatively low in priority.

TABLE 2 - Work Programme Priority by Work Programme Involvement

Own Programme	Programme Priority				
	Training	Maintenance	Institution Production	Community Service	Marketable Production
Training	2	1	3	4	5
Maintenance	3	1	2	5	4
Institution Production	2	3	1	5	4
Community Service	5	3	1	2	4
Marketable Production	3	2	1	4	5
OVERALL PRIORITY	3	2	1	4	5

As to the real accomplishments being achieved, some very encouraging comments were given. A large proportion (N = 46) felt that their programme teaches the inmates some useful skills; 26 felt that they teach good work habits and routine and that the inmates become motivated to seek past-release employment; 10 suggested that their programmes provide goods and services to the Ministry. By contrast only 16 contended that they merely keep inmates occupied and seven felt that no real accomplishments are being achieved.

D. Incentives

Staff attitudes concerning the appropriate pay for inmate labour were of interest. A range of possible pay rates was suggested, and as the data on TABLE 3 indicate, the present incentive allowance scheme (approximately \$7.75 per week-grade 4) was endorsed by the largest proportion.

TABLE 3 - Suggested Pay Scales

	N	Percent	Cumulative Percent
No payment	12	10	10
Present incentive allowance	47	41	51
Between allowance and minimum wage	28	24	75
Minimum wage	24	21	96
Competitive wage	2	2	98

Any form of financial incentive was viewed as excessive by 10% of the industrial staff. These officers generally commented that the inmates incur much public expense already, and, as "masters of their own destiny", should not also be paid for their work. This however, was only a minority opinion. By contrast, almost half of the staff (47%) felt that work production and performance would improve should the inmates be paid more than the presently given incentive allowance.

TABLE 4 - Appropriate Pay by Programme Category

Programme Category	Suggested Pay Rate				
	No Payment (%)	Present Incentive (%)	Incentive Minimum Wage (%)	Minimum Wage (%)	Competitive Wage (%)
Training	15	49	17	15	2
Maintenance Institution	11	41	24	20	2
Production	10	35	31	21	2
Community Service	11	41	25	19	2
Marketable Production	11	34	27	23	2

The recommended pay schemes for the various programme categories are presented in TABLE 4. As the data indicate, proportionately more staff prefer the current incentive allowance system for all types of work. There were no statistically significant differences among programmes within pay systems. Increases beyond the present rate were endorsed by slightly more staff for production work. Training programmes tended to receive the least support for increases in remuneration.

E. Response to Change

The recent introduction of community service projects has not had a negative impact as far as the majority of industrial staff are concerned. Despite the fact that these projects are designed to accommodate the better behaved and motivated inmates, 62% of the staff have not perceived a change in the type and quality of inmate that they receive in their shops. The bulk of the remainder (38%) however, argued that the newer programmes tend to take their best inmates and that as a result, the quality of work performed in their shops is reduced.

Another area of recent change concerned the increased emphasis on earned remission. Problems related to the change were minimal. Thirty-two percent, however, did complain that consequent increases in paper work were somewhat excessive. The majority were not affected, however,

and indeed, 20 staff members even claimed that the change has had a positive impact on their jobs, citing such factors as more control, better incentives and better co-operation.

F. Problems and Suggestions

Consistent with the obvious concern and consideration given by the staff, there were a number of astute observations made concerning problems as well as recommendations based on direct experience. Although some staff did not identify areas in need of improvement, a total of 191 separate, but in many cases similar, comments were made. Essentially the problems fell into four broad categories: programme difficulties, inmate discipline, administrative issues, and incentives.

Problems concerning actual programmes numbered 84 (44%) and are typified by such issues as the failure to teach inmates useful, marketable skills (N = 17) and the fact that often inmates are not in programmes long enough to learn anything constructive (N = 16).

A miscellany of additional programme problems is listed below. The list is a reflection of the concerns of the industrial staff but is neither exhaustive nor intended to imply any order of importance. Some of the issues were commented on by only a few officers and, often identified "problems" were expressed as recommended changes.

- Outside managed industries should be returned to being operated by the Ministry
- Agricultural land and facilities are not being used
- Various good programmes have been closed
- Outside work should be de-emphasized and important institutional work given priority
- Inmates working in kitchens are wasteful
- Not enough programmes for inmates
- There are too many activities and not enough inmates
- Working hours are too short for inmates to learn anything

- Lack of real production
- Need to identify and eliminate poor workers
- Machinery outdated, training not useful outside institution

Problems related to inmate discipline were less prevalent but, nevertheless, were of concern to many of the industrial staff. The more pressing issues revolved around inmate apathy and a lack of motivation toward any form of work as well as a lack of discipline and control that the staff have over the inmates. Some staff contended that inmates enjoy too much freedom and could, with some cunningness, spend all of their time in visits with professional staff. A few also complained that peer pressures affect work performance. In some cases, for example, pressure is brought to bear on good working inmates in efforts to reduce their performance.

Administrative problems also prevail. Among the issues of concern was a perceived lack of co-operation from management. In some instances, concern was registered over what was considered to be poor long-term programme planning. Criticism was also leveled at the closure of programmes which have since re-emerged in the vogue (i.e., farming). Other administrative problems included the following:

- Poor communication - trained staff not consulted in programme planning
- Need for improved selection process for placing inmates in work programmes
- Lack of support from management when misconducts are issued by work supervisors
- Lack of financial and material resources inhibit purchasing of supplies and establishment of new programmes

Issues regarding incentives for inmate work are not easily resolved and were the source of concern by some of the industrial staff. The majority of comments that were volunteered during discussions of suitable pay levels for inmates, suggested that inmates are underpaid for their work. By contrast, however, one staff member argued that inmates are overpaid. Many staff were critical of the failure of the present incentive system to adequately discriminate work performance. As an example of the

extreme, inmates who do not work, receive an allowance roughly equal to that given to inmates who do work. Consistent among those who advocate increased pay for inmates was the feeling that inmates should also be required to pay room and board at the same time.

The value placed on work programmes by the industrial staff is evident in the recommendations for new programmes. A large majority (71%) endorsed the establishment of new programmes or expansion of existing projects. More prevalent among the recommendations were the establishment of any new trades training programmes and the re-opening of some of the previously closed programmes. The consistent emphasis was on programmes which would give the inmates useful skills.

The industrial staff, generally, failed to come up with real specific suggestions for new programmes. Rather, they tended to generalize. The few 'specific' recommendations are listed below:

- Professional janitorial service training
- Lumbering
- Forestry
- Manufacture of solar energy collectors

The 'general' recommendations included the following:

- Restitution programmes
- Programmes which give marketable skills
- Work which generates revenue
- Profit making programmes
- Outside work (contracts) for government agencies
- Community service projects.

In the course of the interviews, additional comments were made which warrant inclusion because they reflect the unique perspective of this segment of the Ministry's staff. One contentious issue concerned the similarity of duties with C.O's despite a generally lesser salary. In addition, some were concerned that job

classifications among industrial staff were inconsistent. It was argued by some officers that similar roles were classified differently and in some cases, staff with the same classification have different roles. A few staff were also unsure as to why they are ineligible to supervise inmates outside the institution and yet do so routinely inside the institution.

IV DISCUSSION AND SUMMARY

During the interviews with the industrial staff, a number of consistent themes and trends were evident. Perhaps the most clear impression was that staff had put considerable thought into their jobs and their role within the Ministry. They were more than willing to discuss their work and it was clear that they appreciated being interviewed. Many saw the sessions as a genuine forum for their viewpoints and welcomed what they considered to be overdue recognition of their unique role in the Ministry. The information that was obtained therefore, reflects a spirit of co-operation with the research and is considered by the researchers to be a reasonable reflection of the attitudes and perceptions of this segment of the Ministry's staff.

Many of the staff revealed a deep concern for the needs of inmates and the majority recognized foremost, a need to improve the inmates' employability. One of the more consistent findings was that the majority feel that their programmes partially address this need for improved employability. They contended that the major real accomplishments were either in teaching the inmates new skills and habits or in giving them more motivation to seek post-release employment.

Not only did the staff strongly endorse the value of work for inmates but they were also consistent in their ranking of the importance of work programmes. In the event that there be insufficient inmates for all work programmes, the staff were practical as to which programmes should be filled first. Programmes oriented to servicing institutions, either in producing usable goods or in maintenance, tended to be given the highest priorities. Interestingly, however, biases crept into the ratings. The staff had a tendency to give their own programmes a high priority. Indeed, the relative priorities of the work programmes must be interpreted with caution. There were very few staff who were involved in marketable production or community projects. It would be unfair therefore, to label as relatively less important, programmes which are not well represented in the staff interviews, particularly since the staff tended to rank their own programmes highly. The staff may also have been misled by the terminology "marketable production" and viewed it as a form of exploitation of inmate labour. Furthermore, a different order of priority might have been evident had the context of the interview questions been shifted from that of the institution to the inmates. In this case, it is likely that the ranked importance would have been more closely aligned with the perceived needs of the inmates and would have been headed up by training programmes at the top of the list.

In the past, unfortunately, there has been little attempt to distinguish various forms of work programmes for inmates. The array of programmes and approaches vary with each institution to the extent that only a post hoc arbitrary,

although conceptually meaningful delineation was feasible. As a result, in this study the programmes have been grouped according to both the task and the recipient of the service. In forcing these distinctions, some categories were under-represented and thus afforded little information. As noted above, for example, marketable production and community service projects were not well represented by the interviews.

Community service projects, as programmes operated by the Ministry, have recently become the subject of much interest. The low representation of these programmes in this study, however, should not be interpreted as an indication that few such projects are in operation. In most institutions, work outside, including community service, require correctional staff (C.O's) for custodial supervision. Frequently no other staff are utilized. Even though some C.O's supervise inmates who are working, they were excluded from the study because firstly, the appropriate C.O's are difficult to identify and secondly the primary role is still security rather than worker supervision. However, there remains a need to explore more fully the impact of this type of programme. The overall response by the industrial staff to community work was favourable and further information regarding the impact on institutions would be useful.

Information on the backgrounds of the industrial staff yielded few real surprises. A wide variety of employment experiences preceeded Ministry employment and the majority brought to the Ministry many years of experience relevant to their current Ministry positions. It was perhaps unexpected, however, that as many as a quarter of the staff supervise or train inmates in work with which they themselves have had no previous experience.

For many staff, Ministry employment had had little mobility, that is, they have always been in the same position. Although almost half had at one time been correctional officers or supervisors of juveniles, not all of them became industrial staff through a job-change process. In the past, correction staff performed all industrial supervision. Thus, although the proportion is unknown, some had changed their classification but did not change their job role.

The predominant motive for having joined the Ministry was expediency. The majority were essentially motivated by practical concerns; be it, a need for employment or for convenience. Relatively few claimed to have been primarily interested in working with people or in re-channeling their skills.

A major aspect of the industrial staff role involves training or education and the education record of the staff themselves was both encouraging and impressive. The majority

had completed some or all of secondary school, but more significantly, two-thirds had additional training, either in trades or post-secondary courses. However, involvement in Ministry sponsored and/or operated courses was minimal. Although many of the staff had taken the staff training course for C.O's, presumably when they were C.O's themselves, there are no courses available for non-correctional staff. For many of the industrial staff interviewed, previous training was essentially insufficient or inappropriate for correctional work. Indeed, a large proportion recommended that courses be made available to industrial officers giving instructions on how to deal with inmates and on corrections in general.

All things considered, there is some evidence that inmates are underworked. The majority of staff felt that inmates are not expected to work at the same level of production as civilians. A large portion also indicated that they have available to them more inmates than they need. As a result, too many workers are engaged in too little work and are generally not expected to keep up to civilian standards.

The minimum provincial inmate labour requirements would have been a desirable feature to this survey, particularly for programme planning purposes; however, a number of factors prevented this from being obtained. For one reason, staff in similar positions had differing opinions as to how many inmates were necessary. In addition, it is suspected that many staff who claimed that the numbers that they presently have are the minimum necessary for their operation, did so because they did not really consider alternative approaches. The most critical difficulty involved in getting overall estimates stemmed from the qualifiers applied by the staff. It was not possible to satisfactorily get estimates when prevalent comments included "it depends on the type and motivation of the inmate", or "give me two good inmates and that's all I'll need". The management staff who were contacted also felt that it was difficult to project the necessary labour resources.

Increased remuneration for inmate labour was seen by a majority of the staff as being particularly important for production industries. In general the officers argued that work performance would improve if inmates were paid more. However, it was also argued that in order for maximum work performance to be achieved, the incentives should discriminate levels of work and that those who are not working should not receive the same incentive allowance. To offset the increased expense, the staff also recommended that in conjunction with increased pay for more work, room and board be collected from the inmates. This suggestion is not without precedent; the practice of charging room and board is in operation with some institutional programmes (i.e., Guelph Abattoir). The concept was also viewed by some staff as being more relevant to the needs of inmates. For example, the approach would be consistent with

attempts to give inmates realistic working-life experience. The whole issue (increased pay and collected room and board) was also favoured for its ability to enable the staff to have more remunerative control and be able to reward good work with more pay.

Recent changes within the Ministry, both in procedure and in orientation provoked mixed reactions from the industrial staff. As noted above response, to newer community oriented service projects were generally favourable despite the impact they have on the remaining quality of inmate labour. The changes that were the most heavily criticized concerned past trends away from agricultural programmes. The closure of farming operations in the past were judged by the industrial staff as having been counter-intuitive in the present period of constraint. The agricultural programmes were viewed as contributing to some level of self-sufficiency as well as the development of continually needed skilled farm labour. Indeed, one of the more prevalent suggestions for "new" programmes was for farming/agricultural projects, either in the form of new programmes or in the re-establishment of former facilities.

Often when employing a survey questionnaire technique, as was done in this study, there are opportunities to express and discuss problems and concerns which in the end can reveal consistent perceptions. In addition, however, there also can be isolated comments which are not expressed by many respondents but nevertheless reveal incisive observations. This survey was no exception. Generally speaking, problems which can be resolved by industrial programmes were at a minimum. Often problems were related to psychological issues concerning inmates; for example, lack of experience, poor motivation and immaturity. Some issues of concern to the programmes focused on reducing the number of inmates in each programme, concentrating on useful training with up-to-date machinery, improving selection for work parties and increasing the incentives to reflect work performance.

The list of programmes recommended for future expansion is not as extensive as might have been anticipated given the amount of experience of the staff sample. Those which were recommended are, however, consistent with the concerns expressed by the industrial staff throughout the interviews. Foremost among the proposals are those which focus on giving the inmates skills and experience useful for them upon return to the community. Coupled with this thrust is an orientation to programmes which offset institutional and/or community expense.

V REFERENCES

- Crispino, L. (1974), The Temporary Absence Programme for Employment: A Study of Benefits. Planning and Research Branch, Ministry of Correctional Services, Province of Ontario, 1974.
- Evans, R. (1970), Prison Industries in the Canadian Penitentiary Service. Report prepared for the Solicitor General of Canada, 1970.
- Glaser, D. (1964), The Effectiveness of a Prison & Parole System, Bobbs-Merrill, Indianapolis, 1964.
- Grutzner, W. (1971), Prison Guards Caught in the Conflict Between the Duty to Re-socialize and the Reality of the Prison Situation. z Strafvollzug, 1971, 20/1, 8-14.
- Hickling-Johnson Consultants, (1972), A Review of Industrial Activity. A Report to the Minister of Correctional Services, Province of Ontario, 1972.
- Jeffery, R. and Woolpert, S. (1974), Work Furlough as an Alternative to Incarceration: An examination of its effects on recidivism and social cost. The Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology, 1974, 65 (3), 405-415.
- Rudoff, A. and Esselstyn, T.C. (1973), Evaluating Work Furlough: A Follow-up, Federal Probation, June 1973, 52.
- Saipe, A.L. (1971), A survey of private management's attitudes to Prison Industries in the Canadian Penitentiary Service, a report to the Solicitor General of Canada, 1971.
- Saipe, A.L. (1973), Federal Prison Industries: a survey of private senior executives' attitudes. Canadian Journal of Criminology and Corrections.
- Singer, N.M. (1973), Incentives and the use of Prison Labour. Crime and Delinquency, April 1973, 200-211.
- West, J.P. and Stratton, J.R. (1971), The Role of Correctional Industries. Centre for Labour Management, College of Business Administration, University of Iowa, Iowa City, 1971.