

Federal Probation

The Evolution of Probation: Early Salaries,
Qualifications, and Hiring Practices *Charles Lindner*
Margaret R. Savarese

Focus for the Future: Accountability in
Sentencing *Thomas J. Quinn*

The Need for a New International-National Criminal
Justice Order *Manuel López-Rey*

Politically Appointed Administrators: An Empirical
Perspective *Salvatore Cerrato*

Nonintervention: The Myth of Doing No Harm *Lawrence F. Travis, III*
Francis T. Cullen

Prison Option: Supervised Intensive
Probation Program *Freddie V. Smith*

County Jail: A Professionally Managed Corrections
Program That Controls Its Population *Nicholas L. Demos*

Condition of Success: A Case Study in the Infiltration
of Organized Crime *Frederick T. Martens*

Sexual Aggression in Federal Prisons:
Prevalence and Employee Impact *Peter L. Nacci*
Thomas R. Kane

Probation That Worked For Us *David R. Busby*

93994-
94000

MARCH 1984

ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES COURTS

WILLIAM E. FOLEY
Director

JOSEPH F. SPANIOL, JR.
Deputy Director

DONALD L. CHAMLEE
Chief of Probation

EDITORIAL STAFF

MICHAEL J. KEENAN
Deputy Chief of Probation
Editor

WILLIAM A. MAIO, JR.
Managing Editor

MILLIE A. RABY
Editorial Secretary

ADVISORY COMMITTEE

WILLIAM E. AMOS, ED. D., Professor and Coordinator,
Criminal Justice Programs, North Texas State
University, Denton

BEN S. MEEKER, Chief Probation Officer (Retired), U.S.
District Court for the Northern District of Illinois

RICHARD A. CHAPPELL, Former Chairman, U.S. Board of
Parole, and Former Chief, Federal Probation System

LLOYD E. OHLIN, PH.D., Professor of Criminology, Harvard
University Law School

ALVIN W. COHN, D. CRIM, President, Administration of
Justice Services, Inc., Rockville, Md.

MILTON G. RECTOR, President Emeritus, National Council
on Crime and Delinquency, Hackensack, N.J.

JOHN P. CONRAD, Visiting Fellow, The National Institute of
Justice, Washington, D.C.

GEORGE J. REED, Commissioner (Retired), U.S. Parole
Commission

BENJAMIN FRANK, PH.D., Chief of Research and Statistics
(Retired), Federal Bureau of Prisons, and former
Professor, Southern Illinois University and The American
University

THORSTEN SELLIN, PH.D., Emeritus Professor of Sociology,
University of Pennsylvania

DANIEL GLASER, PH.D., Professor of Sociology, University of
Southern California

CHARLES E. SMITH, M.D., Professor of Psychiatry, The
School of Medicine, University of North Carolina, Chapel
Hill

PETER B. HOFFMAN, PH.D., Research Director, U.S. Parole
Commission

MERRILL A. SMITH, Chief of Probation (Retired),
Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts

ROBERTS J. WRIGHT, Commissioner of Corrections (Retired),
Westchester County, N.Y., and former Editor, American
Journal of Correction

Federal Probation is published by the Administrative Office of the United States Courts and is edited by the Probation Division of the Administrative Office.

All phases of preventive and correctional activities in delinquency and crime come within the fields of interest of FEDERAL PROBATION. The Quarterly wishes to share with its readers all constructively worthwhile points of view and welcomes the contributions of those engaged in the study of juvenile and adult offenders. Federal, state, and local organizations, institutions, and agencies—both public and private—are invited to submit any significant experience and findings related to the prevention and control of delinquency and crime.

Manuscripts (in duplicate), editorial matters, books, and communications should be addressed to FEDERAL PROBATION, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, Washington, D.C. 20544.

Subscriptions may be ordered from the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, at an annual rate of \$9.00 (domestic) and \$11.25 (foreign). Single copies are available at \$3.50 (domestic) and \$4.40 (foreign).

Permission to quote is granted on condition that appropriate credit is given to the author and the Quarterly. Information regarding the reprinting of articles may be obtained by writing to the Editors.

FEDERAL PROBATION QUARTERLY
Administrative Office of the United States Courts, Washington, D.C. 20544

SECOND-CLASS POSTAGE PAID AT WASHINGTON, D.C.
Publication Number: USPS 356-210

Federal Probation

A JOURNAL OF CORRECTIONAL PHILOSOPHY AND PRACTICE

Published by the Administrative Office of the United States Courts

VOLUME XXXXVIII

MARCH 1984

APR 30 1984

NUMBER 1

This Issue in Brief

The Evolution of Probation: Early Salaries, Qualifications, and Hiring Practices.—Charles Lindner and Margaret R. Savarese review probation practices at the turn of the century and find that many concerns facing probation today, such as high caseloads and inadequate salaries, also existed in the past. The authors further explore early conditions of employment, including qualifications, compensation, and hiring practices. A 1910 civil service examination is included to allow the reader to test himself against the probation officer of the past.

Focus for the Future: Accountability in Sentencing.—Author Thomas J. Quinn argues for a new dialogue, replacing the “in” versus “out” decision with assignment to 1 of 10 “Accountability Levels.” In this broad range of increasingly restrictive options offenders would be adequately monitored at whatever level they are placed, with logical progression down the scale toward freedom over time and retrogression further up the scale for noncompliance. The private sector can be used to help fill the gaps in the middle levels and policy structured to offer decisionmakers the desired mix of offender slots in a jurisdiction.

The Need for a New International-National Criminal Justice Order.—Crime is increasing everywhere, particularly under dictatorial regimes, and in democratic countries the penal systems are becoming more and more unable to cope with it, asserts Manuel López-Rey. The abuse of power plays a primordial role in the growth of contemporary crime, the main reason being that the penal systems are still, in spite of frequent reforms, rooted in the 19th century. The author stresses the need for a new international-national criminal justice order.

Politically Appointed Administrators: An Empirical Perspective.—In the wake of prison riots, serious doubts about the effectiveness of the correctional system have been raised by professionals and concerned citizens alike, according to Salvatore Cer-

rato. His article presents the position that unqualified administrators, by virtue of institutional inexperience and lack of correctional expertise, have become an unstabilizing force within the correctional milieu.

CONTENTS

The Evolution of Probation: Early Salaries, Qualifications, and Hiring Practices	Charles Lindner Margaret R. Savarese	3
Focus for the Future: Accountability in Sentencing	Thomas J. Quinn	10
The Need for a New International-National Criminal Justice Order	Manuel López-Rey	19
Politically Appointed Administrators: An Empirical Perspective	Salvatore Cerrato	22
Radical Nonintervention: The Myth of Doing No Harm	Lawrence F. Travis, III Francis T. Cullen	29
Alabama Prison Option: Supervised Intensive Restitution Program	Freddie V. Smith	32
The Future Jail: A Professionally Managed Corrections Center That Controls Its Population	Nicholas L. Demos	35
The Illusion of Success: A Case Study in the Infiltration of Legitimate Business	Frederick T. Martens	40
Sex and Sexual Aggression in Federal Prisons: Inmate Involvement and Employee Impact	Peter L. Nacci Thomas R. Kane	46
A Combination That Worked for Us	David R. Busby	53
Departments:		
News of the Future		58
Looking at the Law		61
Reviews of Professional Periodicals		63
Your Bookshelf on Review		67
It Has Come to Our Attention		73

Radical Nonintervention: The Myth of Doing No Harm.—Authors Travis and Cullen offer three reasons why the call for liberals to withdraw from the policymaking process in the criminal justice system will cause more harm than an interventionist strategy: First, reform efforts have been one of the few humanizing forces in our correctional past. Second, nonintervention by progressives only serves to facilitate the get tough movement now sweeping the Nation. And third, nonintervention is a philosophy of despair, not of hope, and thus risks attenuating the will of practitioners to continue to do good in the face of daily obstacles.

Alabama Prison Option: Supervised Intensive Restitution Program.—Alabama Commissioner of Corrections Freddie V. Smith discusses an innovative restitution program which uses close face-to-face supervision, enforced curfews, required workloads in public service or contracted employment, under family involvement, supervision fees, and other freedom restrictions. Incorporated provisions also require program officers to coordinate closely with law enforcement and judicial agencies.

The Future Jail: A Professionally Managed Corrections Center That Controls Its Population.—Antiquated methods of jail administration are no longer acceptable either to the criminal justice agencies they serve or the political officials responsible for their oversight. Nicholas Demos presents some basic principles for jail management, emphasizing a proactive role for social trial judges. He also summarizes the Washington State comprehensive strategy that transformed the jails of that State.

The Illusion of Success: A Case Study in the Infiltration of Legitimate Business.—Frederick

Martens examines and analyzes the systemic nature of organized crime with institutional structures within a lower socioeconomic community. Through the use of ethnographic collection and analysis techniques, the author delineates the structural arrangements between finance institutions, liquor wholesalers, vending companies and professionals (e.g., accountants and lawyers) and the "bar" or tavern. Employing a sophisticated pyramid scheme in which the tavern is the commodity, "unsuspecting" entrepreneurs are enlisted into this scam, only to be disillusioned by the ultimate death of their dream. The illusion of success is a classic case study in the convergence of organized crime with white-collar crime.

Sex and Sexual Aggression in Federal Prisons: Inmate Involvement and Employee Impact.—In the December 1983 issue of *Federal Probation*, Nacci and Kane focused on the incidence of homosexual activity and sexual aggression in Federal prisons. Analyses and discussions in the present report concern: profiles of inmates who have participated in consensual homosexual activity or have been targets of sex pressure; correctional officers' attitudes toward the protection of inmates, the prevention of homosexual activity, the danger of sexual assault in prisons, and job satisfaction; and factors that influence inmate participation in consensual homosexual activity.

A Combination That Worked for Us.—U.S. Probation Officer David R. Busby describes a drug after-care program which has proven successful in the Northern District of Alabama. The program combines intensive urine surveillance with intensive counseling, a wilderness experience (camping, rappelling, hiking), and a work detail experience.

All the articles appearing in this magazine are regarded as appropriate expressions of ideas worthy of thought but their publication is not to be taken as an endorsement by the editors or the Federal probation office of the views set forth. The editors may or may not agree with the articles appearing in the magazine, but believe them in any case to be deserving of consideration.

U.S. Department of Justice
National Institute of Justice

This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated in this document are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the National Institute of Justice.

Permission to reproduce this copyrighted material has been granted by
Federal Probation

to the National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS).

Further reproduction outside of the NCJRS system requires permission of the copyright owner.

Politically Appointed Administrators: An Empirical Perspective

BY SALVATORE CERRATO*
Correction Officer, Essex County Jail, Newark, N.J.

THE PROBLEM of effective corrections has been a major point of contention in social circles for a number of years. Debates focus primarily on the failure of correctional institutions to reform people who are considered social threats. The recent rash of prison riots,¹ coupled with severe job dissatisfaction among correctional personnel, illustrates the critical nature of this problem. The public's attitude towards correctional endeavors has become one of dubious faith in a system constantly revealed in a negative light.

In correctional institutions² where administrators are political appointees,³ serious questions have been raised concerning basic institutional control, as well as about the degree of responsiveness to the growing interests of the inmate population. Concerned personnel are expressing fears and question the competence of politically appointed administrators to formulate effective policy. Consequently, the general credibility of the correctional system is being shaken from within as institutional personnel accuse politically appointed administrators of deific pronouncements and authoritative waywardness.⁴

*The author wishes to thank Allan Durrant, assistant professor, serials librarian, Essex County College, Newark, N.J., for his assistance in the preparation of this article.

An administrator is accepted as the most valuable resource in the institution. The success of all efforts within that institution ultimately depends upon what the administrator thinks and how he behaves.⁵

A major problem confronting correctional institutions today is the system of appointing unqualified administrators through political patronage. Politically appointed administrators can become an

¹For a recent account of mass prison disturbances in a number of states, see *Corrections Digest*, Volume 12, Number 23, November 6, 1981, p. 1.

²This article is limited to county and state adult correctional institutions.

³Here and throughout the article, the term "political appointee" denotes an administrator (warden, superintendent or director) of an adult correctional institution; possessing political qualifications, but often lacking professional qualifications such as practical correctional experience, knowledge of institutional organization and correctional philosophy. Politically appointed administrators are generally not subject to civil service requirements and are appointed through political patronage. They serve at the pleasure of the elected chief executive for a specific time. At the state level, appointments are made by the governor, while at the county level they are made either by the board of chosen freeholders or the county executive. Politically appointed administrators owe allegiance to political figures concerned not with correctional improvement but with perpetuating their stay in office.

⁴This view is based upon my experience as a correction officer, along with a consensus of the expressions gathered from discussions with other correctional officers employed in various adult county and state correctional institutions.

⁵This article deals essentially with the administrators' role in internal management. It should be noted in passing that it ignores many of the dynamics of the prison experience itself, which set limits on what administrators can do, and the forces that impinge on the correctional institution from the outside. For example, reform and interest groups, and citizen advisory committees responsible for monitoring prison conditions.

unstabilizing force if they bring incompetence to the formulation and performance of institutional policy. Administrative incompetence results from the following deficiencies:⁶

- (1) The irrelevance of the administrator's previous background to the human needs of the institution.
- (2) The lack of administrative expertise and experience in corrections that results in a progression of institutional events, which goes beyond the demands of short term inmate conciliation.
- (3) A lack of administrative responsiveness to suggestions that would increase the effectiveness of correctional supervisors in dealing with the difficulties they encounter in daily interactions with correctional officers and inmate populations.

The Problem

How can a politically appointed correctional administrator be objectively acquainted with all the intricacies of superintending a correctional institution, if he or she has only limited prior knowledge of the problems prevailing within a correctional facility? Under what circumstances, if any, is the appointment of an unqualified administrator through political patronage to be encouraged and sustained?⁷

Although the questions are not new, they remain unanswered. Even though the danger inherent within political appointments are well understood by those employed with correctional facilities, politically based administrative appointments still plague our country's correctional institutions. In corrections today, both on the state and county level, there is a grow-

⁶The following are presented in descending order of importance, not necessarily in regard to chronology.

⁷The above tenet raises empirical questions which deserve attention in the correctional literature, primarily the relationship between unqualified correctional administrators and institutional instability.

⁸Methodologically, this article is based on an incompetence theorem. Inadequate human resources stem from lack of investment and/or judgment in administrative human capital. The term "human resources" is a broader concept of the economic concept of human capital. My interpretation of inadequate human resources is the lack of attributes pertaining to a qualified administrator, i.e., institutional experience.

⁹Richard A. McGee, *Prisons and Politics*, Lexington, Mass.: D. C. Heath and Company, 1981, p. 7.

¹⁰Ibid., p. 26.

¹¹New Jersey Association on Corrections *Report of the Task Force on the County Jail*, March 1979, p. 74.

¹²"Beleaguered Corrections Pros Face Increasing Job Insecurity as the Positions Become Hot Seats," *Corrections Digest*, Volume 6, Number 22 (sic), November 12, 1975, p. 1.

¹³Walter A. Lunden, *The Prison Warden and the Custodial Staff*, Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas, 1965, p. 36.

ing iconoclastic sentiment on the part of correctional officers which ridicules professionalism and the claim of administrative expertise.

The inadequacy of administrative talent in corrections is a result of insufficient human resources.⁸ Unqualified administrators create a condition in which inconsistent goals and objectives, lack of professional ideology, inmate unrest, and personnel dissatisfaction proliferate. This invariably results in a work environment which is increasingly chaotic.

Political Appointees: Source of Conflict

Conflict within correctional institutions has become increasingly associated with the political appointment of administrators. In 1953 the American Correctional Association stated that "Prison riots, mutinies, and disturbances are symptoms of faulty administration."⁹ This statement was true then, and intervening events during the last 30 years continue to provide evidence in support of the Association's findings. Who then, is responsible for this faulty administration? In state government, the fault lies within the office of the elected chief executive, the state's governor. McGee noted that the governor must recognize that his choice of administrator for the state's prison system will be one of the most crucial appointments he will make. "It should be done with extreme care, and if ever he should put aside secondary political considerations, this is the place."¹⁰

In county government, the fault lies with both the sheriff and the board of chosen freeholders, because of their political nature, the sheriff and freeholders may be insensitive to corrections, and may contribute to political patronage. In New Jersey, the report of the Task Force on the County Jails found that, "... county boards [freeholders] have often failed to appoint wardens who could even arguably qualify as professionals."¹¹ The political process of appointing administrators through political patronage appears to be inimical to our correctional system, an aberration that should not prevail.

On the state level, a survey revealed that nearly 80 percent of the 50 state correctional directors serve at the pleasure of the governor.¹² An equally striking observation comes from Walter Lunden, that the primary reason state prison wardens terminated their services from the years 1900 to 1955 was due to politics. He notes that 104, out of 294 state wardens claimed political patronage played a vital role in their termination.¹³ A 1978 survey conducted by the American Correctional Association discovered,

that only six of the 50 chief correctional administrators in the U.S. had been in their positions for more than three years. This extreme turnover inevitably causes instability in corrections. It

appears, however, that correctional appointments are becoming more political. Those in charge of appointing correctional officials should insure that they have a competent individual at the helm, then protect the administrator from needless political conflict. Change in corrections may be needed, but constant and precipitous changes are almost always detrimental to the stability of agencies and institutions.¹⁴

The erosion of professionalism in correctional facilities is accelerating because of the political appointments of unqualified correctional administrators. This is due to the low visibility of administrators and the generally "low" status of their "clientele." Low visibility tends to further erode the "professional" environment, generally undercutting pride which is one of the major sources of inducement to professionalism.

Criminologists (e.g., Regoli, Poole, Schrink) define professionalism in corrections as "... characterized by a concern for higher standards of education, selection, training, institutional performance, and a recognition of existing inadequacies."¹⁵ In the political appointment of administrators, little or no enforcement of minimum professional standards is adhered to. The President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice found that for the position of superintendent or warden, "53 percent of the institutions studied called for no specific minimum educational background; 39 percent required a high school education, and only 8 percent a college education. Of these positions, 56 percent were not under civil service or merit system coverage."¹⁶

Keeping the Peace

Due to lethargy and incompetence, politically appointed correctional administrators have been reticent in addressing themselves to conflicts that arise within their institutions.

Judging from discussions with numerous correctional personnel, there appear to be striking similarities in ways in which unqualified, politically appointed correctional administrators articulate perceptions of the conflicts they confront. These administrators attempt to explain crises in institutions by offering a mixture of pragmatic observations. Some administrators treat conflict as isolated in-

¹⁴American Correctional Association, *Riots and Disturbances in Correctional Institutions: A Discussion on Causes, Preventive Measures and Methods of Control*, 1981, p. 5.

¹⁵Robert M. Regoli, Eric D. Poole, and Jeffrey L. Schrink, "Occupational Socialization and Career Development: A Look at Cynicism Among Correctional Institution Workers," *Human Organization*, Volume 36, Number 2, Summer 1979, p. 184.

¹⁶President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice (National Crime Commission), *Task Force Report: Corrections*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1967, p. 165.

¹⁷Inmate placation is an optimistic ideology which attempts to bring about institutional tranquility. It is a practice—which has been overexercised and a much abused method—used by unqualified correctional administrators to temporarily arrest inmates' instability.

cidents, evidence of their inability to assimilate the implications of the conflict, often an outcome of their own irrelevant policies. Administrators seek to ameliorate inmate conflict rather than to meet it head on, treating symptoms, not causes as a means of defusing possible cumulative disorders. From the correction officer's perspective, administrators attempt to lessen immediate conflicts while neglecting to solve deep-seated difficulties.

Administrative ignorance concerning the main source of conflict within an institution creates a faulty foundation for the serious consideration of and response to further conflict. This subverts any reasonable measures to eliminate the source of the conflict itself. Unqualified administrators rely upon inmate placation as a practice in attempting to lessen conflict within their institution.¹⁷ They appear unwilling or unable to resolve institutional conflicts through more direct methods. A willingness to engage in dialogue with inmates and institutional staff has not been demonstrated — perhaps because careful scrutiny of administrative policies by inmates and staff will raise serious questions about administrative competence. And so, for reasons of administrative self-interest, inmate appeasement proliferates. In effect, the inmates are routinely appeased in order not to "rock the (institutional) boat."

Within a correctional institution an avoidable yet critical problem, often occurring on a daily basis, stems from inmate dissatisfaction with both food preparation and the menu itself. If the menu is considered unacceptable by the inmate population, a new menu is immediately proposed and prepared, in order to avoid conflict. The administration acquiesces to inmate demands involving the quality and content of their food, regardless of the legitimacy of the inmate discontent. Variations in patterns of inmate instability reflect their acceptance to the change in the new menu. Rather than examining the true source of dissatisfaction, a medium for inmate placation develops. Thus problems remain unsolved, the foundation for further discontent and subsequent demands remain intact.

The consequences of administrative incompetence and lethargy are dangerous, costly, and reach far beyond the denunciations of the inmate population, fomenting unrest and discontent among staff members as well. Institutional expenditures rise often becoming decidedly pyrrhic. Staff members express dissatisfaction, inmates rebel, administrators initiate new forms of placation to maintain some semblance of order, and inmate rehabilitation becomes less and less attainable.

Placating irate inmate populations poses a direct challenge to current penal doctrines. Inmate appease-

ment is now so deeply ingrained in many of our correctional systems that there are no painless ways to eradicate it. As a result, heterodox policies develop—policies that rely upon appeasement of inmate demands in order to maintain an orderly institutional environment.¹⁸ Inmate demands are met *not* because of an adherence to a basic penal philosophy, rather they are met to silence public outrage and inmate discontent. In absolute terms the inmate is treated as an object, something less than a human being. An apt analogy: the homeowner who must pacify his dog to avoid altercations with his neighbors!

Administrative concern to present a mask of order demands the practice of inmate appeasement, which directly contributes to the perpetuation of antagonism between both inmates and personnel and personnel and administration. Such antagonisms are created and reinforced by the policies of unqualified administrators, in a social structure that is fundamentally becoming more antagonistic.

Requisite Qualifications for Administrators

Correctional officers have an intimate view of the many inmate problems that prevail in a correctional institution. A correctional officer has the perspective and insight, gained from close interaction with inmates, to develop a professional understanding of the factors influencing inmate hostility. This idea is further reinforced since "the correctional officer knows inmates as people 24 hours a day. He knows them as does no other employee in the justice system."¹⁹ From these interactions, correctional officers feel competent to improve the correctional environment. They have the experience not only to

¹⁸Cloward points out that prison administrators accommodate to the prisoner society by permitting the creation of illegitimate opportunity structures. Through these arrangements, high status prisoners are permitted to dominate low status prisoners in return for the cooperation with the administration in preventing major prison disturbances and other events that might disturb the status quo of the institution. Richard A. Cloward, "Social Control in the Prison." In Richard A. Cloward: *Theoretical Studies in the Social Organization of the Prison*. New York: Social Science Research Council, 1970, pp. 20-48.

¹⁹Moreover, in referring to a state's policy of handling inmates, a New Jersey County Sheriff argues, "the state of New Jersey can't control them... they're afraid of them, and they have to buy them off." Carmine Boniello, "Sheriff J. Englehard Opposes State's Jail Policy," *New Jersey Police Officers Journal*, Volume 6, Number 2, Fall 1981, p. 1.

²⁰Robert Barrington, "Correction Officers Don't Do Time," *Corrections Today*, March/April, 1980 Volume 42, Number 2, p. 50. In colloquial terms a correction officer at Washington State Penitentiary expresses this sentiment: "We know them (inmates) better than the administration; we know them better than the parole board who sees them once a year, we know them better than the counselor who sees them once a month." Ethan Hoffman and John McCoy, *Concrete Mama: Prison Profiles from Walla Walla*. Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1981, p. 177.

²¹Ben M. Crouch, "The Guard in a Changing Prison World," in Ben M. Crouch (Ed.) *The Keepers: Prison Guards and Contemporary Corrections*. Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas, 1980, p. 21.

²²New Jersey County Penal System Study Commission, "Public Hearing on Essex County's Penal Institutions," 1974, p. 147.

recognize the objective structure of the correctional institution, but also to rationally adapt individual behavior patterns to coincide with the dictates of the correctional system.

By comparison, administrators who lack both experience and expertise in inmate interaction within a correctional environment rely on bureaucratic and/or impressionistic intuition in attempting to formulate institutionally sound policy and in offering practical solutions to current problems. There is little doubt that inmates are deeply concerned with every aspect of correctional policy. Inmate response to undesirable correctional policy is open hostility, too often resulting in violent rebellion, demonstrating the inmates' increasing sense of frustration. Ben Crouch writes, "many inmates have come to question the legitimacy of prison practices... how inmates define their situations is evident in the motivation of prison riots over the past twenty-five years."²⁰

An often asked question is: If correctional experience involving close inmate interactions is an important requisite for a warden of a correctional facility, why do problems still prevail since some administrators were formerly of the ranks? The answer is political manipulation. Many from the rank and file who were upgraded to administrative positions were selected not because of superior performance, but because of political patronage. The practice of dispensing political patronage has made substantial incursions at state and county levels. Since correctional operations are administered under the auspices of state and county governments, personnel within these institutions establish political ties. In many instances those who can obtain political means are able to maintain "plum jobs" within the facility. Their job function becomes nothing more than putting in time; they lose contact with any division in the facility where hostility and inmate/officer interactions are prevalent.

A former inmate's testimony to the New Jersey County Penal System Study Commission is illustrative.

... I witnessed a jail employee request of an officer a political contribution and I heard the officer refuse the political contribution. Now a correction officer in the pharmacy has a pretty nice job. It is not the same high-tension job as in the tiers. The solicitor said to him, "Do you like your job? ..." And the officer said, "Yes I do like my job, but I am not going to contribute." One week later the officer was transferred...²¹

Moreover, by maintaining a close relationship with their "hook" as it is sometimes referred to, these correctional personnel are able to advance within the institution regardless of civil service directives and in spite of questionable competence. Civil service examinations for promotion are competitive; by man-

date, those who score the highest are the first considered. But there have been incidents where individuals who failed such an exam have been appointed to more responsible positions, while those who passed have not.

The New Jersey County Penal System Study in 1974 of the Essex County Jail in Newark, found in questioning a correction officer, employed by the jail that: Jail employees who made donations to county officials received better positions, and in some instances gained rank without taking the required civil service examinations.²²

Lucian X. Lombardo, in his study of the Auburn Correctional Facility, revealed that "prior to 1970, job assignments within the institution were dispensed by supervisors. For the officer, this meant that his place with the institution was often subject to the whim of friendship and institutional politics."²³

In a survey of Illinois prison guards, James B. Jacobs found that 67 percent of the guards felt politics determine one's chance for promotion.²⁴

Within the correctional literature, it is not uncommon to find seemingly fallacious statements concerning administrative qualifications. It is ironic some of the more deceptive declarations come from noted correctional authorities. While their assertions seem innocuous to the lay reader, they have far reaching implications for correctional personnel. Basically, their comments are inapplicable to the reality of penal institutions. In referring to administrators, a former deputy director of the Federal Bureau of Prisons and staff member with the Joint Commission of Correctional Manpower and Training stated,

An effective chief executive of a large manufacturing firm might quickly learn to manage a corrections system. He would have to be fully committed to the purposes of corrections, however, and rely heavily on the professional judgment and practical knowledge of associates with correctional experience.²⁵

Carroll has indicated that a politically appointed correctional administrator, new to a particular in-

²²Ibid., p. 140 FF.

²³Lucien V. Lombardo, *Guards Imprisoned: Correctional Officers at Work*. New York: Elsevier North Holland, Inc., 1981, p. 30.

²⁴James B. Jacobs, "What Prison Guards Think: A Profile of the Illinois Force," *Crime and Delinquency*, April 1978, p. 190.

²⁵John J. Galvin, "Trained Correctional Manpower," *Manpower Administration*, U.S. Department of Labor, Volume 3, Number 1, January 1971, p. 16.

²⁶Leo Carroll, "The Frustrated Hacks" in Ben M. Crouch, (Ed.), *The Keepers: Prison Guards and Contemporary Corrections*. Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas, 1980, pp. 303-308.

²⁷Richard A. McGee, op. cit., p. 86.

²⁸Walter A. Lunden, op. cit., pp. 18-19.

stitution, will not necessarily rely upon "the professional judgment and practical knowledge" of established fellow associates. Such behavior encourages goal dissension and conflict. Ultimately affecting policy direction, institutional staff, as well as the inmate population.²⁶ Moreover, it is difficult to imagine anyone further removed and indifferent to the needs and interests of both workers and inmates, than the chief executive of a large manufacturing firm. Correctional administrators must be genuinely interested in seeing the correctional approach toward meeting inmate needs improve. They need to know the underlying principles of institutional cooperation, in order that they might act in the spirit of these principles. In light of such considerations, there is no reason to assume that business executives can adequately display or promote the level of cooperation required for institutional conformity.

Those high in the chain of command are most likely to make the decisions which give an institution its ethos. In practice, most business-oriented executives centralize high level decisionmaking. In corrections, both alienation from the job and alienation from fellow workers are a manifestation of an already highly centralized decisionmaking institution. As a result, antagonistic relations among institutional personnel exist, inhibiting the potential of internal cooperation. In corrections, we are dealing with people, as institutional conflicts insistently remind us. We should not be concerned with sales and profit margins; but with inmate needs and personnel safety.

To corroborate this point, a recognized authority in corrections has stated that,

The prison warden, above all, must be a proven administrator. Even if his administrative capacity has been established in other fields like hospitals, schools, or the military, a candidate will still need some direct experience in the prison environment at a lower level before being trusted with the command post. . . . Then one must ask why so many apparently able administrators from other fields have failed in the prison setting. It is probably that the prison provides so many opportunities to make disastrous mistakes. Unfortunately, a large share of what a successful warden must know is not what to do but what not to do. The alternative to bringing prison wardens in from other related fields is to develop them from within the system. This must be done on a long-term basis with a carefully planned strategy.²⁷

Moreover, we may take note of the fact that 69 wardens were asked to select the most important qualities that should be used in selecting a warden. Experience in the correctional field was listed as their highest priority.²⁸

Since the dynamics of administrative functions require institutional experience and expertise, a careful review of administrative credentials within many correctional facilities will expose a fundamental misplacement of personnel.

Discontent Causes Conflict

All activities within an institution must be integrated so that each contributes to the general efficiency of the whole. For an institution to function properly, and to be effective, there must be an integrated system of accountability. When accountability breaks down or does not exist at all, inefficiency increases, morale deteriorates, and the institution functions poorly as a whole.

Of vital importance is the relationship between politically appointed administrators and personnel, often characterized by a lack of accountability and poor communications. Institutional personnel necessarily rely upon the expertise of the administrator for guidance in policy matters and the professional administrator justifiably expects a certain amount of deference to his opinion. However, the administrator who fails to recognize the reciprocal relationship between administrative and correctional staff runs a great risk of alienating personnel.

There has been little interest at administrative levels in the needs of the correctional staff. Correctional staff are professionals, and as such have codes of professional behavior that foster norms of autonomy and expectation of involvement in shaping the goals and objectives of the institution. By virtue of their experience, professionals in corrections can make legitimate claims to involvement in setting goals and objectives as well as to demands for freedom from excessive constraint of rule. An administrator's disregard for staff concerns produces a frustrated and apathetic work force. The result for the correction staff is frustration over the inability to fulfill professional standards, as well as dissatisfaction with career and professional development. Without administrative reform which recognizes staff input, an effective relationship among personnel and administration seems unattainable.

To date there has been no organized pressure from institutional personnel to alter this situation. Action/protest from institutional personnel is scattered, confused and unlikely to be mobilized in any coherent way. In spite of the disorganization of opposition by institutional personnel, a rising, although scattered, wave of dissent exists, voicing despair and justified cynicism. Career risks in corrections are too high and the benefits too transient to make outright protest practical for the individual. The hostile and collective attitudes of correctional personnel are expressed in their ideologies, which often contradict and nullify the

ideology of the administration. Their vernacular is antiadministration, but adverse administration sanctions compel them to direct their hostilities into more subtle, less discernible channels. Their submerged hostilities find outlets in criticism and condemnation of the administration and in intensified intrigue against political appointees.

The correctional supervisor²⁹ is responsible for ensuring employee compliance with organizational rules and regulations. The dilemma that correctional supervisors face is that although they are in an optimum position to improve the correctional environment, barriers exist which limit their contribution. The most pressing of all problems confronting a correctional supervisor is the degree of insubordination among correctional officers. Due to questionable policy developed by unqualified administrators, the correctional officer is placed in grave danger, and the correctional supervisor finds himself caught between individual officer's need for safety and security, and dangerous directives handed down by the administration. Such a situation leads to indecision on the part of the supervisor, and insubordination on the part of the supervisor, and insubordination on the part of the correction officer.

Administrative policies that are inadequately structured often fail to provide proper supervision of inmate activity while directly affecting the ability of personnel to do their job effectively. For example, "Inmate freedom of movement policies" produce chaotic movement of inmate traffic within an institution, increase inmate opportunism and impede internal security in that inmate/staff ratios often exceed adequate levels of safety and supervision. These conditions increase the likelihood of disruption and result in offenses ranging from minor inmate transgressions to serious inmate/staff confrontation. Correctional personnel develop emotional strain and job dissatisfaction as a consequence of administrative policies they view as unnecessarily placing them in situations subject to inmate domination. Correction officers, often seeing the futility of the administration's ways rapidly losing morale, a direct consequence of the peripheral manifestations that result from improper administrative policies. Consequently, the correctional supervisor must confront correction officer apathy, lack of professionalism and various degrees of insubordination. Though increasingly alarmed, correctional supervisors remain largely inactive while correction officers become increasingly alienated from the correctional institution. Supervisors and officers cannot avoid being frustrated by events beyond their ability to control.

²⁹There are six main tasks performed by correctional supervisors. See, Law Enforcement Assistance Administration: *The National Manpower Survey of the Criminal Justice System*, Vol. 1, Summary Report, Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1978.

An Alternative Proposal

Partial solutions and stop-gap measures, ranging from inmate conciliation to increased freedom to constantly changing menus, have been proposed as means to halt inmate hostility within our correctional institutions. However, one fact has become clear: For genuine change to occur within the correctional system, new methods for administrative appointments must be developed.

There is an urgent need for qualified administrators, administrators who have unequivocally demonstrated their knowledge in dealing with "inmate problems" in a correction facility. Political patronage in corrections must cease. As Barrington argues, the political patronage system in this country heedlessly assigns carpetbag amateurs to assume correctional leadership roles within correctional institutions.³⁰ For instance, a former warden of Trenton State Prison, Mr. George W. Page, "... was a liquor dealer whose contributions to penology were a good deal less substantial than his contributions to the local Republican party."³¹ Moreover, the effects of political patronage are devastating. Ellis C. McDougall, former director of five correctional departments, states,

In 1971 when I went to Georgia as director, the deputy director of that major system had been a political appointee. He was a former disc jockey and a car salesman. Political patronage had reduced that system to a shambles.³²

Replacing unqualified administrators is a politically problematic procedure at best; reforms to this end are likely to be uncongenial—if not anathematical—to correctional officials to question. But anything short of replacing politically appointed, unqualified administrators would be ineffective, and would serve only to exacerbate the pressing problem currently faced by correctional facilities.

It is important at this juncture to ask what effect qualified administrators can have on an institution that will result in internal stability. Qualified administrators would be intimately involved in the planning and achievement of institutional goals and objectives and sensitive to policies that weaken identification between institutional personnel and inmate populations. Ineffective institutional policies and confusing or contradictory directives would be re-evaluated and substantially reduced. Because of prior experience, qualified administrators would be aware

that their policies affect the inmate population and institutional personnel and are therefore potential forces directing patterns leading to either institutional stability or instability. In addition, they would encourage an atmosphere more conducive for everyone to accept ruling authority as necessary and legitimate. This would improve the relationship between institutional personnel and inmate population and foster cooperation rather than competition. Social distance between inmates and personnel would sharply decrease. Correction officers, relied upon by inmates for interpretation of administrative directives, would be well informed and able to perform this function. The consequence of inmate dissatisfaction could be dealt with on an orderly basis through reason and mutual understanding; consensus and order would prevail, as opposed to dissent and conflict. In short, this would significantly ameliorate many anomalies in the prison community.

Conclusion

Conflict is frequently attributed to administrators who are less than competent, possessing inadequate expertise and experience to direct the complex functioning of a correctional institution. This view is predicated upon an analysis of the problems engendered by ill-qualified administrative appointments at county and state levels based essentially on political patronage. The statements and examples cited are suggestive of a misdirected system.

Shortsighted administrative policies and limited understanding of both inmate and staff needs have caused many administrators to flounder in undesirable, nonessential and costly undertakings. Self-serving efforts to maintain autonomy and authority are self-defeating, and contribute to institutional atrophy.

The absence of uniform policy interferes with the maintenance of orderly behavior and jeopardizes the safety of correctional staff. This is tantamount to abdication of responsibility on the part of administrators. Whether administrators can find solutions to problems that arise largely from their own incompetence is an open question. Administrators, by the nature of their alliance with the institution, have considerable latitude in their attempts to bring forth stability. Stability has not been achieved.

The distorted vision of correction administrators is traceable in large measure to a political myopia—inability of those who appoint administrators to focus on the facts. The cry for both administrators and policy reform grows, reinforced by the prominence of ill-qualified administrators and heightened by the growing concern of personnel about the institutional problems themselves.

³⁰Barrington, *op. cit.*, p. 50.

³¹Sanford Bates and Craig Thompson, "The Trouble With Prisons Is Politics," *Saturday Evening Post*, May 14, 1955. Quoted in American Correctional Association, *Riots and Disturbances in Correctional Institutions*, 1970, p. 67.

³²Ellis C. MacDougall, quoted in Clemens Bartollas, *Introduction to Corrections*. New York: Harper and Row, 1981, pp. 451-452.

END