

GROUP COUNSELING: A MODERN APPROACH TO  
REFORMING THE IMPRISONED INMATE

by 4529

JOHN BLAINE WILT

B. A., Kansas State University, 1968

---

A MASTER'S REPORT

submitted in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree

MASTER OF ARTS

Department of Sociology and Anthropology

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY  
Manhattan, Kansas

1970

Approved by:

  
Major Professor

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I owe a great deal of thanks to my advisor, Dr. George Peters and the Department Chairman, Dr. Eugene Friedmann for their kind advice and encouragement throughout the writing of this report. I would also like to express my sincere thanks to the members of my Report Committee, Professor Glenn Long and Dr. Sheldon Edelman who gave freely of their time in support of the ideas expressed herein.

The person who perservered with me in the early stages and final writing is my wife Jean. I thank her wholeheartedly for her confidence in me to present a finished product about one of the most unfinished areas of our society, the prison.

I will miss the friendship of my fellow graduate students in the department for this was one of the qualities that made graduate work at Kansas State University worthwhile.



LD  
2668  
R4  
1970  
W552  
C.2

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS . . . . .	11
PREFACE . . . . .	1
Chapter	
I. HISTORY OF PRISONS . . . . .	5
Humanitarian Reform Proposals . . . . .	5
Pennsylvania and Auburn Prison Systems . . . . .	8
Irish Prison System . . . . .	10
Declaration of Principles . . . . .	10
Does the Prison Reform? . . . . .	13
II. PRISON ORGANIZATION . . . . .	14
Introduction . . . . .	14
The Punitive-Custodial Prison . . . . .	16
Punitive Philosophy of Reform . . . . .	19
The Treatment-Oriented Prison . . . . .	22
Treatment Philosophy of Reform . . . . .	25
Reforming the Inmate . . . . .	27
III. ALLIANCES IN THE PRISON--INFLUENCE FROM RESEARCH IN UNDERSTANDING THE INMATE GROUP AND ITS POTENTIAL IN THE REHABILITATION PROCESS . . . . .	28
Introduction . . . . .	28
The Inmate Code . . . . .	30
Social Roles in the Prisoner Community . . . . .	31
Alliances Between the Official Social System and the Unofficial Social System . . . . .	35
Visibility of Attitudes, Values, and Opinions of Anti-Staff Oriented Inmates . . . . .	39
Implications from Prison Research . . . . .	41
Relationships Among Inmates . . . . .	41
Inmate-Staff Relationships . . . . .	44
Walter Reckless' "Impact" Studies . . . . .	49
Enhancing Communication in the Prison . . . . .	51
IV. THE EFFECTIVENESS OF THERAPIES IN PRISON . . . . .	54
Introduction . . . . .	54
Custody-Treatment Dilemma . . . . .	55
Individual Therapy . . . . .	56
Prison Group Therapy . . . . .	58
Effectiveness of Prison Group Therapy . . . . .	61

## Chapter

Status of Prison Group Therapy in 1950 and 1959 . . . . .	65
Principles of Group Treatment . . . . .	69
A Proposed Organization of Treatment	
Activities in the Prison . . . . .	70
Organizational Support for Group Counseling . . . . .	71
Group Counseling Personnel . . . . .	72
 V. GROUP COUNSELING IN THE CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS . . . . .	74
Introduction . . . . .	74
Significant Findings from Research . . . . .	74
The Group Counseling Movement in California's Prisons . . . . .	77
Goals and Values for Both Inmates and Staff . . . . .	79
What Group Counseling Does for the Inmate . . . . .	79
What Group Counseling Does for the Staff . . . . .	81
Evaluation of Correctional Effectiveness . . . . .	83
Pilot Studies in California's Department of Corrections Institutions . . . . .	89
Clue-Hunting About Group Counseling and Parole Outcome . . . . .	94
 VI. SUMMARY . . . . .	99
 REFERENCES . . . . .	102
 APPENDIX	
I. DECLARATION OF PRINCIPLES . . . . .	107
II. MODEL FOR GROUP COUNSELING . . . . .	114

## PREFACE

The following material is divided into five main chapters with a number of subdivisions contained in each chapter. Chapter I considers early jails and houses of correction in Europe and America and the evolution of several large prison systems based on different philosophies of handling or treating prisoners. Chapter I also describes early reform proposals and early advances in principles of criminal treatment. Many of those early pioneers concerned with penal reform were responsible for the correctional reform movement starting in the early part of this century. The ideals set forth by early prison congresses provided impetus for the progress made in the treatment of criminals and the clarification of important objectives of the modern prison.

The theme in Chapter II on prison organization is that there are both formal and informal aspects of prison organization which are important determinants of the types of behavior peculiar to the prison community. The second chapter considers the prison as a managing bureaucracy with responsibility for controlling inmates in accordance with certain policies and procedures regarding the rehabilitative potential of inmates. Administrators of the punitive-custodial prison enforce strict custody in order to maintain security and prevent riots and escapes. In the treatment-oriented prison, punitive conditions have been mitigated in favor of treatment and a relaxed-disciplined

approach is thought to be the best posture for custodians. This posture places the custodian in an awkward position of enforcing a treatment and control mandate with no logical approach to the treatment of inmates.

Chapter III discusses various findings from prison research that advances our knowledge of the functioning of the inmate group. A consistent finding is that the inmate group is not cohesive at all times and several alliances develop between the formal system of prison officials and the informal system of inmates. Authoritative prison policies tend to enhance the importance of the inmate code and the visibility of attitudes, values, and opinions of anti-staff oriented inmates. The third chapter concludes with the opinion that staff positions in the prison need to be altered in a favorable direction to allow interaction to become more personal and a longer time period made available during which staff members can develop variety and depth in their relationships to an inmate.

In the introduction to Chapter IV, two alternatives are presented to institution administrators in order to enhance the treatment potential of the prison. Either it will be necessary to increase the rewards to inmates or the standards of the inmate group will have to be changed. In view of the limitations of an inadequate therapist-inmate ratio that has plagued the individualized approach to treatment, it is proposed that greater success in reforming inmates might be achieved by

including those who have traditionally been excluded from the treatment process. For example, a change of status for custodial officers and enlarging the scope of the roles assigned to custodial and treatment workers are proposed in order to improve the present organization of treatment activities in prisons and include a treatment program that (1) supports group psychotherapy and group counseling, (2) enlarges the role of professional therapists who, at present, are limited in the amount of advice they can offer the non-professional worker in contact with inmates, (3) extends the role of custodians and others in contact with inmates, and finally, (4) includes large numbers of inmates who are to receive treatment.

Chapter V contains a discussion of group counseling in the California Department of Corrections. This discussion suggests that the group counseling movement in California's prisons is a direct outgrowth of the larger correctional reform movement that began taking root in this country in the early part of this century. California began taking steps to improve its prisons and improve its methods of handling prisoners by concentrating on developing therapeutic group treatment--group psychotherapy and group counseling. In 1960, 2,000 inmates were actively involved in group psychotherapy and 9,580 inmates were taking part in group counseling sessions. The total number of inmates involved in therapeutic group treatment in 1960 was, and still is, one-half the entire inmate population. Chapter V examines

group counseling as a program for correctional officers, vocational and academic teachers, job foremen and parole agents. As a result of extensive follow-up into the effects on inmates, prison personnel, and institutional environment, group counseling has demonstrated its worthiness as a treatment program alongside such traditional treatment approaches as individual and group psychotherapy.

Chapter VI provides a summary of this report dealing with the feasibility of a new order in the approach to treating imprisoned inmates: namely, utilizing custodial personnel as leaders of group counseling groups.

## CHAPTER I

### HISTORY OF PRISONS

#### Humanitarian Reform Proposals

The question, "Does the Prison Reform?" is a relatively new concern in the history of imprisonment. Imprisonment came about as a humane attempt to punish convicted criminals while lessening the importance of corporal and capital punishment. Assuming that it was a humanitarian spirit that resulted in initiating imprisonment as a form of treatment of criminals, it should be worthwhile to trace the path of modern humanitarian efforts in the form of prison reforms, starting with the early colonists and leading up to the current concern with the question, "Does the Prison Reform?"

The early colonists to the United States brought with them experiences with jails and workhouses as experiments in incarceration. Jails had been used on the European continent in the Middle Ages as places for the confinement of prisoners awaiting trial or punishment. Houses of correction established in England in 1500's grew in number on the European continent in the 1600's and 1700's. The Bridewell House of Correction for example, opened in London in 1557, was a congregate institution where vagrants, unemployed persons, orphans, and other individuals were exhorted to work at various kinds of labor as an improvement over the idle conditions found in many of the jails of the time. Houses of correction were in reality workhouses. One of

the more important of these was the workhouse at Ghent, Belgium, the Maison de Force, opened in 1773. It offered long-term confinement and featured "individual cells and certain other characteristics [which were] to become common in modern prisons" (Gibbons, 1968:437).

The Italian nobleman Cesare Beccaria of the classical school wrote in his book, An Essay on Crimes and Punishment, about widespread abuses and inequities in prevailing legal practices in Europe. "He was disturbed by the secret accusations, inadequate defense of accused persons, arbitrary and capricious exercise of powers by judges, and barbarous penalties commonplace in the Europe of his time" (ibid.:438). Accordingly,

his objective was to make punishment less arbitrary and severe than it had been. He contended that all persons who violated a specific law should receive identical punishments regardless of age, sanity, position, or circumstances (Sutherland and Cressey, 1966:55).

He argued for the development of an accurate calculation of pain and pleasures which would make the penalty just severe enough so that the pains would exceed the pleasures, regardless of individual differences. In this country Becarria's writing "marked the beginning of a wave of reform that spread over the Continent. Several governments adopted his views and they made a strong impression upon the American colonists" (American Correctional Association, 1962:5).

Quaker reforms began to take shape following publication of John Howard's book, The State of Prisons, in England in



1777. Howard's personal investigation of most of the prisons of England, and his advocacy of prison reform, were influential in America, especially in Pennsylvania. His attack on the punitive criminal code responsible for corporal and capital punishment was supplemented by the actions of a number of citizens of Philadelphia (most of them Quakers) organized under the name of the Society for Alleviating the Miseries of Public Prisons. This early reform group, which included Howard, William Penn, Benjamin Franklin, and others, brought forth the establishment of the first penitentiary in the history of man which featured the solitary cell, enforced meditation, and a situation almost entirely devoid of any type of work, organized recreation, or human interaction.

In 1790, following the Pennsylvania Reform Act, the Walnut Street Jail in Philadelphia became the Walnut Street Prison.

In this prison,

those convicted of more serious crimes were confined without labor in sixteen solitary cells, each six feet wide by eight feet long by nine feet high, with an inner iron door, an outer wooden door, and blinds and wire on the single cell window to prevent passing to contraband. The less hardened offenders were lodged together in eight rooms approximately eighteen by twenty feet (Johnson, 1964:336).

This cell-block became the penitentiary for the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, with prisoners being sent to it from several countries (American Correctional Association, 1962:10). Prior to the Walnut Street Prison, prisoners had been confined in common areas with no regard whatever for variations in age, sex, criminal history, or mental status (Cloward, 1960:25). This

separate system would, according to the religious beliefs held by the Quakers, "put a man in a position to meditate and be penitent over his sins and wrong-doing."

### Pennsylvania and Auburn Prison Systems

At the start of the 19th century there developed a bitter struggle over the relative merits of two systems of penology: the older Pennsylvania system of penology, which continued in the tradition of the Walnut Street Prison, and the newer congregate or Auburn system which permitted prisoners to mingle, but, advocated strict silence wherever and whenever they were assembled. Two reform associations were in the forefront in proposing modifications and in debating the virtues of the two systems. The members of the Philadelphia Society for Alleviating the Miseries of Public Prisons supported the former system where prisoners lived and worked in separate cells. The second prison reform association, the Boston Society for the Improvement of Prison Discipline, supported the Auburn system where prisoners lived in separate cells but worked in congregate shops.

Thick walls designed to prevent communication between cells created a problem for the Pennsylvania system when it needed to accomodate an increasing prison population. A great many other problems resulted from the physical isolation of the prisoners from each other. For example, it was recognized that overcrowding was causing moral contamination and disorder. Gershom

Powers described the results of an experiment in which character reformation was expected of a group of incorrigibles who were placed in solitary cells without labor.

A number of the prisoners had become insane. One lost an eye by beating his head against the wall. Another sprang through an open cell door and fell four galleries, an intervening stovepipe breaking his fall sufficiently to save his life. The health of many of the incorrigibles was seriously impaired. The hopes of achieving character reformation were not realized (Johnson, 1964:339).

Soon solitary confinement without labor was abandoned in favor of the newer Auburn system in which inmates were permitted to work in association in industrial shops, but confined in solitary cells at night. The Auburn system has also been called the "silent" system since a number of procedures were devised to prevent communication between inmates in any form.

In dining halls, for example, prisoners were seated with their backs toward the center so that each looked only at the backs of others; in movement, the 'lockstep' formation was exclusively employed. Conversation or even simulated communication between the convicts became the epitome of willful behavior and called for summary punishment (Cloward, 1960:26).

Thus it was strongly believed that the above procedures connected with this revised system would prevent the corruption of newer inmates by the older inmates, reduce the possibility of inmate plots, and suppress inter-inmate communication by imposing a rule of perpetual silence enforced by rigid discipline. However, the Auburn system had to face the same problem of overcrowding that confronted the early Walnut Street Prison and the Pennsylvania prisons. In at least partial response to overcrowded conditions, a new prison system migrated from Europe

and Australia.

### Irish Prison System

The new system was called the Irish system since it was widely adopted in Ireland after its practical use had been demonstrated in Australian convict camps. Its founder was Captain Maconochie, the originator of the "mark system." This was a new system of "humane" treatment whereby a prisoner's liberation was based on recognition of his conduct and character rather than on the nature of his original offense.

The Elmira Reformatory, the first reformatory for men in the United States which opened in New York in 1876, was notable for the emphasis placed on the mark system, the indeterminate sentence, and parole; as well as on physical training, military training, schooling, and training for a trade. These latter aspects of training and rehabilitation came about in 1888 after efforts to restrict prison labor were successful. One of the essential components of the Elmira rehabilitation program was a classificatory system of offenders into tractable and hardened groups. This system permitted younger, first offenders to be housed and treated separately from hardened offenders.

### Declaration of Principles

In addition to the reformatory idea, as exemplified by the Elmira Reformatory, an organization known as the National Prison Association, emerged in the 1870's to adopt certain fundamental principles of criminal treatment referred to as the "Declaration

of Principles". In response to surveys revealing prison practices supported by a punitive philosophy, there arose a desire among reform-oriented prison administrators to adopt an ideology consistent with "an era when humanist sentiment and an interest in a scientific approach to man were in ascendancy" (Eaton, 1962:10).

After an inspection of prisons and reformatories in eighteen eastern states, Enoch Cobb Wines and Theodore William Dwight strongly criticized the punitive policies found therein. Wines is credited with arousing nationwide interest in the development of a national congress of penologists. He felt that any organized approach to prison reform should be based on the principle that "the remaking of criminals, not the infliction of suffering, is the primary objective of incarceration" (ibid.:11).

Thus, the correctional reform movement was born. From the First National Prison Congress, held in Cincinnati in 1870, the following ideas were advocated:

1. The primary aim of public punishment is the protection of society against criminals through the reformation of the transgressor.
2. The principle of progressive classification should be applied to all.
3. The principle of reward and inducement to good conduct and reformation should be applied in prison administration, with indeterminate sentences to make punishment fit the criminal not only the crime.
4. Probation should be used in the place of imprisonment.
5. Religion and education should be utilized in prison programs.
6. Prisoners should be employed in useful labor.
7. Imprisonment should be continued until reformation is affected.
8. Political control of prisons should be eliminated.

9. Preventive institutions should be developed.
10. Prisons should be staffed with professionally qualified officers (ibid.:11-12).

These principles remain as the creed for penologists although the organizational title has changed from the Congress to National Prison Association in 1908, and to the American Correctional Association in 1955. These principles served as the ancestors of the "Declaration of Principles" as established in 1960 by the American Correctional Association [see Appendix I].

These ideals have had much to do with the progress made in the treatment of criminals and clarification of the more important objectives of the modern prison. Accomplishments that took place after the 1870's included policy that shaped the future of treatment in the modern prison. For example,

Extensive and widespread application of both the ideals and scientific aspirations of the correctional movement began in America in the 1920's with several important sociological and legal research studies and the organization in the 1930's of a unified Federal Bureau of Prisons. In the 1940's another ingredient was added to the correctional movement: long-range administrative planning. Fundamental reforms began to take organizational root in California and several other states, particularly Wisconsin, New Jersey, and Washington.

The administrative blueprints for correctional reform that were made living realities before and after World War II did not remain a matter of private know-how. They were compiled and published in 1954 by the American Correctional Association as a Manual of Correctional Standards. The Manual recommended in detail methods of translating correctional ideals into reality. Shortly after its publication, members of the American Correctional Association could think of enough suggestions for improvement to warrant undertaking a comprehensive revision, which was published in 1959. Included were chapters on research and program evaluation, advocating that they become a regular organizational function (ibid.:21-22).

Does the Prison Reform?

The question that is before us now is the one asked earlier, "Does the Prison Reform?" Some caution is warranted in answering this question. Although there is overwhelming sentiment among prison administrators that the prison "serves most effectively for the protection of society against crime when its major emphasis is on rehabilitation" (American Correctional Association, 1962:9), there are so many areas of conflict within the prison itself that a treatment rationale is usually of lesser importance than the rationale used in providing security measures and protection of society. The following analysis of the prison is for the purpose of providing some understanding about how the prison operates, the personnel involved in carrying out both treatment and custody mandates, and the role of the inmate who of necessity must accept this "mixed" goal policy designed for both treatment and control.



## CHAPTER II

### PRISON ORGANIZATION

#### Introduction

The prison functions as a rather unique type of managing bureaucracy which is administratively organized for the purpose of safeguarding other institutions of the society. There are both formal and informal aspects of prison organization which are important determinants of the types of behavior peculiar to the prison community. Unlike a business enterprise, prisons need not maintain competitive standards, adapt rapidly to technological progress, or respond to fluctuations of market conditions. Neither do prisons have to justify the legal mandate which says that prisons shall isolate those who have been defined as criminal and thus considered a threat to the normal social order. In other words,

the prison justifies its existence by fulfilling a legal mandate which, like most legal mandates, sets a floor below which achievement cannot fall but does not require the achievement of even high aims (Grosser, 1960:131).

Prisons seem to differ significantly from factories and similar organizations in other respects as well. For example, the administrative hierarchies of prisons are organized down to the lowest level. In factories there are separate hierarchies of management personnel and of workers. The lowest status employee in the prison, the guard, in contrast to a factory employee, is both a manager and a worker.



He is managed in a system of regulations and controls from above, but he also manages in a presumably concordant system the inmates who are in his charge. He is a low-status worker in interaction with management, but a higher-status foreman, 'officer,' or treatment agent in interaction with inmates (Cressey, 1960:79).

The guard in the totally punitive-oriented prison system has no counterpart in the business and industrial world.

Moreover, prisons differ significantly from factories and similar organizations as a result of the addition of new services and roles. Obtaining consensus among prison officials that a need exists for such services and roles in relation to the hierarchy of custodial ranks already present has been problematic. A later chapter notes the needs for non-line personnel (professional personnel performing treatment functions) to expand their advisory duties to guards, much like the advisory duties of technical experts in factory organizations or other bureaucracies. Thus, many prisons, not distinctively treatment-oriented, consist of a separate hierarchy of custodial ranks and non-line personnel (professional personnel and industrial foremen and superintendents) who have their own salary differentials and titles.

This chapter will be concerned with differences in two main types of prisons: the punitive-custodial prison and its counterpart, the treatment-oriented prison. Administrators of the former prison system concern themselves with problems of strict enforcement of custody in order to maintain security and prevent riots and escapes. In the treatment-oriented prison instead of

strict enforcement of custody, management is by top-level administrative officials who have been indoctrinated in modern treatment philosophy. This chapter also contains a description of the differences between patterns of authority and purpose, patterns of communication and decision-making, patterns of incentives and punishments and philosophy of reform in the prison oriented toward punishment and the prison oriented toward treatment.

### The Punitive-Custodial Prison

The majority of prisons in American society are of the punitive-custodial type. An understanding of the emphasis on (1) patterns of authority and purpose, (2) patterns of communication and decision-making and (3) patterns of incentives and punishments characteristic of the punitive-custodial prison will aid us in understanding this type of institution and how it differs from the treatment-oriented prison.

Patterns of authority and purpose in the punitive-custodial prison are based principally upon mere incumbency in office or "rank" authority. The principal goal of such authority is to teach offenders that they cannot get away with law and rule violation. Formal and severe sanctions, rules for behavior, order and stability, and compliance and obedience are the main procedures used in containing the incarcerated.

A bureaucratic chain of command is well developed in this type of prison. Because of the emphasis on rules "it is diffi-

cult to find an employee activity that is not regulated from above" (Cressey, 1965:1040). The guard has a dual role: he is a manager of the cellblock of inmates in his charge and a worker in interaction with management.

Each of the activities is regulated by an amount of status accorded the guard's position in interaction with the inmates or with his superiors. The situation between guard and inmate has been best described as a caste relationship, with varying degrees of reciprocity, friendship, or neglect of duty, depending on the objective sought by either the guard or inmate. This is the situation of accommodation that develops out of a condition of intense pressure on both guard and inmate.

In describing "Aspects of the Prison's Social Structure," S. Kirson Weinberg notes that the inmates and officials are two segregated strata and modes of deference and obedience are expected by the officials.

The officials, especially the guards, regard the convicts... as 'people who can't and shouldn't be trusted,' and as 'degenerates who must be put in their place at all times.'... There must be something wrong with every man here,' states another, 'else he wouldn't be here.' Convicts are considered 'born bad,' as mentally, emotionally, or morally deficient... In exceptional cases, only in cases where the inmates are 'not really convicts,' reform does occur... Because they are 'wild' and uncontrollable, they require the sternest measures of discipline... 'to act like an inmate' denotes derogatory behavior. 'To look like an inmate' indicates disagreeable appearance (Weinberg, 1953: 571-2).

Where there is this great a degree of difference between officials of the prison community, especially the guard, and

inmates, a measureable gap or social distance exists to protect their authority, as well as their virtue. This gap is bridged at several points, however, by a process of subtle attempts on the part of skillful members of the prisoner community who seek various ways around rules and regulations and who seek status and prestige as elite members and leaders of other prisoners. Realizing these demands, guards exhort new members to the prison to "go it alone," "do your own time," and "stay away from the other men."

Strict enforcement of custody is emphasized even further by limiting the amount of communication and decision-making between guards and their fellow workers, especially those identified as treatment staff; between guards and inmates, and among inmates, security is regarded as the dominant goal, and custodial staff are the primary agents in maintaining this policy. Mass handling, extreme deprivation, strict discipline, and punishment are the measures used to keep the offender confined, isolated, and in his place.

Rules stressing custodial control result in special forms of 'etiquette' for maintaining distance between staff and inmates. Staff are discouraged from, or even suspended or dismissed for, calling inmates 'mister'; they must address prisoners only by first name, last name, or nickname. But prisoners are required to address staff members as 'mister,' 'officer,' 'lieutenant' or some other title, together with their surname. Staff are not to 'fraternize' with prisoners; they must deal with them in an authoritative and impersonal manner, while inmates may not 'act familiar' with staff. If differences of opinion occur, particularly as to how an inmate behaved, the staff version is always to be regarded as correct (The President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, 1967:46).

As a result, inmates are typically and understandably hostile toward administrative personnel and any attempt on the part of treatment staff to change the inmates attitudes and values are futile efforts.

Because custody has traditionally been considered the first function of prison management and because custodial staff are more numerous and have more firsthand knowledge of inmates than do treatment staff, they make most of the day-to-day decisions in inmate management (ibid.:47).

That is,

wardens who are directed both to treat and to punish employ treatment specialists and set up treatment programs on paper, administer so-called treatment activities as measures to help insure security, or define as treatment the distribution of 'amenities' or 'privileges.' (Such programs may make prison life more comfortable but not necessarily any more conducive to reformation) (Cressey, 1960:86-7).

The punitive-custodial prison maintains a clear-cut policy regarding patterns of incentive and punishments. For example:

In the punitive-custodial prison, the first system for specifying management's expectations regarding the behavior of subordinates is used in reference to both inmates and employees, misconduct is viewed as intentional, and coercion is the principal method used to stimulate compliance. Rewards for valued service are used as inducements to satisfactory performance of duties, but the nature of prisoners' and employees' obligations is such that rewards for outstanding or extraordinary performance can rarely be distributed (ibid.: 1046).

### Punitive Philosophy of Reform

The punitive-custodial prison manifests rank-authority and here the situation is one of constant conflict between inmates and all types of staff personnel. As Lloyd Ohlin notes,

in many maximum security institutions it is the policy of the administration to enforce as great a degree of social distance as possible between the guards and the inmates. The manifest function of such a policy is to ensure the security of the institution. The authorities recognize that 'fraternizing' of guards and inmates may lead to serious security violations through the smuggling of contraband in and out of the institution, and by promoting lax custodial practices (Ohlin, 1956:20).

Amitai Etzioni makes some interesting comments about organizations, such as prisons, which tend to use coercion (interpreted as raw authority of force to gain compliance) extensively. With the type of control already described, based on rank authority, certain important activities of an expressive or instrumental nature are exclusively controlled by inmate leaders and not the guard force. As Etzioni points out, "The inmate leaders, for instance, determine if and when it is proper to speak to a guard, which crimes are more or less prestigious (murderers rank higher than rapists), and so on" (Etzioni, 1964:62). Similarly,

the allocation of work in the prison is affected by pressures the inmates' leaders exert on the officials. Responding to such pressures is often the only way an official can maintain the inmate leaders' cooperation, which in turn is often required to maintain efficient organizational control (ibid.:16).

Gresham M. Syke's study of guard-inmate interaction in the New Jersey State Maximum Security Prison in the city of Trenton, New Jersey, revealed the degree to which the power and force of the guard was effective as a means for securing obedience. In short,

the ability of the officials to physically coerce their captives into the paths of compliance is something of an illusion as far as the day-to-day activities of the prison



are concerned and may be of doubtful value in moments of crisis. In the first place, the punishments which the officials can inflict--for theft, assaults, escape attempts, gambling, insolence, homosexuality, and all the other deviations from the pattern of behavior called for by the regime of the custodians--do not represent a profound difference from the prisoner's usual status. In the second place, the system of rewards and punishments in the prison is defective because the reward side of the picture has been largely stripped away (Sykes, 1958:49-51).

This system of rewards and punishments is defective since it cannot be used as a means of motivating the inmates to conform. Moreover, the whole system of power is defective for the guard is "frequently reluctant to enforce the full range of the institution's regulations" (*ibid.*:54). The guard fails to enforce the full range of the institution's regulations for the following reasons:

(1) the guard is in close and intimate association with his prisoners throughout the course of the working day. He can remain aloof only with great difficulty, for he possesses few of those devices which normally serve to maintain social distance between the rulers and the ruled; (2) the guard is constantly exposed to a sort of moral blackmail in which the first signs of condemnation, estrangement, or rigid adherence to the rules is countered by the inmates with the threat of ridicule or hostility. And in this complex interplay, the guard does not always start from a position of determined opposition to 'being friendly.' He holds an intermediate post in a bureaucratic structure between top prison officials--his captains, lieutenants, and sergeants--and the prisoners in his charge. Like many such figures, the guard is caught in a conflict of loyalties; (3) the guard's position as a strict enforcer of the rules is undermined by the fact that he finds it almost impossible to avoid the claims of reciprocity. Thus the guard--backed by all the power of the State, close to armed men who will run to his aid, and aware that any prisoner who disobeys him can be punished if he presses charges against him--often discovers that his best path of action is to make 'deals' or 'trades' with the captives in his power. In effect, the guard buys compliance or obedience in certain areas at the cost of tolerating dis-

obedience elsewhere; (4) the theoretical dominance of the guard is undermined in actuality by the innocuous encroachment of the prisoner on the guard's duties. Making out reports, checking cells at the periodic count, locking and unlocking doors--in short, all the minor chores which the guard is called on to perform--may gradually be transferred into the hands of inmates whom the guard has come to trust. For reasons of indifference, laziness, or naivete, the guard may find that much of the power which he is supposed to exercise has slipped from his grasp (ibid.:54-57).

What Sykes has shown are the unanticipated effects of punishment in a maximum security prison run on the basis of a punitive philosophy of reform. The effects are the opposite of those expected when the punishment was imposed. This is partly because there is no distinction between rewards and punishments.

#### The Treatment-Oriented Prison

In the last ten or fifteen years prisons have become more oriented toward rehabilitation, apparently in response to modern rehabilitation theory. Only about a dozen American prisons now qualify as treatment-oriented. As Cressey points out,

In these relatively rare treatment-oriented institutions, administrators are committed to alter custodial roles so that they are at least in part treatment roles; e.g., a guard is to contribute to treatment of inmates as well as to custody (Cressey, 1960:87).

In this type of institution where punitive conditions have been mitigated in favor of treatment, treatment specialists are a part of the administrative organization, "and treatment functions have been assigned a priority that has marked consequences for the custodial and production organizations" (ibid.:87). Captains in charge of the guard force and industrial superintendents in charge of foremen (nonprofessional supervisors in



the treatment-oriented prison) have the dual responsibility of insuring the achievement of the goals of the custodial and industrial organizations and of diffusing treatment values to guards and foremen. Their authority is bureaucratic in nature on the basis of their rank in the prison hierarchy and from an understanding that their power is for the purpose of enforcing rules that specify the obligations of the guards and foremen in performance of their tasks.

It is significant to point out that the nonprofessional supervisory authority of captains and industrial superintendents in the modern treatment-oriented prison is neutralized for the following reasons:

they can scarcely judge an employee either unable or unwilling to 'do his job'; they have neither the ability to evaluate his 'professional' conduct nor a set of enforceable rules with which to regiment his custodial or work relations with inmates (ibid.:104).

The pattern of authority and purpose in the prison oriented toward treatment is based on technical competencies.

Professional treatment specialists are technical experts who stand above other employees, not because of salary differentials, descriptive titles, or the power to punish deviants, but because of professional competence (Cressey, 1965:1041).

With this outlook, at least two assumptions are made. The first deals with the offender, and the second is an assumption of the proper approach to the offender. It has to be assumed by all staff members responsible for the handling of inmates that all, or nearly all, of the inmates are in need of treatment. Any approach to treatment that involves purposive inflic-

tion of pain or suffering is not treatment. Thus, "the pattern of authority must be one in which the client is not expected to conform to a set of rank-enforced rules" (ibid.:1042); inmates must be permitted to be at least somewhat self-governing, and where treatment specialists are not administrators, counseling and treatment remain professional matters. Where treatment specialists are administrators, nonprofessional personnel should more directly participate in treatment.

With regard to patterns of communication and decision-making in the treatment prison, (1) restrictions on communication are minimal, and (2) decision-making is decentralized. "Extensive communication between offenders and employees, and among the two groups, is highly desirable and extensive, in direct contrast to the situation in the punitive-custodial prison" (ibid.: 1047).

The arrangement of positions into some sort of hierarchy is not nearly so important as the pattern of relationships achieved between employees and client. In this manner, communication among offenders follows a program of relaxed discipline, instead of the program of strict discipline that relies on individual inmates "doing their own time." In other words:

The pattern of communication and decision-making among employees in the treatment prison is consistent with the pattern found among clients and between employees and clients. First, extensive communications and decision-making about clients are necessary and desirable. Second, management must communicate extensively with employees about duties, policy, and program. A professional ethic and standard shared by all employees is relied upon to stimulate the degree of conformity and loyalty necessary

for efficient operation. Third, the special knowledge which employees have about the particular offenders in their charge makes each worker a technical specialist, at least with reference to the procedures to be used in handling those cases (ibid.:1048).

One of the most frequently found arguments in penological literature having to do with the rehabilitation of criminal offenders centers around discussion of custody versus treatment. This argument is directly related to discussion of the types of incentives available to prison administrators as inducements to inmates to reorient their behavior and attitudes along conventional lines, and punishments as negative sanctions for not complying with custodial rules or the official directives of prison administrators. Since treatment can only be one of the recognized functions of any prison, incorporating only a portion of the time of those assigned the direct task of rehabilitating inmates, it should be recognized at the outset that any theory of rehabilitation has to understand the reactions of the inmate as a group member reacting to two functions: the control function and the treatment function.

#### Treatment Philosophy of Reform

One of the main differences between the two types of prisons is the emphasis on strict discipline in the case of the punitive-custodial prison and the relaxed disciplined approach in the case of the treatment-oriented prison. Another difference centers around the philosophy of reform. The treatment-oriented prison makes a different assumption regarding recalcitrance on

the part of the prisoners than does the punitive-oriented prison. Recalcitrance on the part of prisoners is regarded as unintentional and the relaxed-disciplined approach is thought to be the best posture for custodians in an institution dedicated to the goal of treatment. This assumption forms the foundation on which non-punitive individualized treatment is based and this approach to treatment has two principal views of what guards should do:

(1) They should act as referral agents for the professionally trained staff-discussinmates' problems with them, in a broad sense diagnose surface problems of adjustment, and on the basis of amateur diagnoses refer each inmate to the proper professional personnel. This plan is favored by treatment personnel when they are acting in professional rather than administrative roles. Counseling and treatment are professional tasks for qualified personnel. (2) As administrators, the treatment specialists are likely to take the position that the guards should participate more in treatment; under professional direction they should deal with inmates' minor emotional problems, advise and encourage them to 'talk out' their difficulties with the law and with institutionalization, and inspire them by personal example to lead law-abiding lives (ibid.:94).

Both the first and second views, regardless of their treatment orientation, place the guard in a subordinate position to the technical authority of the professional treatment person. The first view sees counseling as a professional task and the second view offers no logical program of action other than the understanding that at some time and place the guard is to appear receptive, passive, and relaxed, and the inmate is to be able to talk out his difficulties with the guard.

Guards thus are expected to behave like those 'ideal' psychiatrists, social workers, and experienced mental hospital workers who without personal tension can listen to bizarre language, witness 'indecent' behavior, watch patients attempt to escape, or withstand violent verbal and physical attacks (ibid.:95).

### Reforming the Inmate

A possible alternative to reforming imprisoned inmates is a discovery of the number of alliances between the informal system of inmates and the formal system of prison personnel. Many penologists and criminologists have expressed disgust at the impulse to help by alleviating or mitigating the conditions of imprisonment or adding programs and services in the name of treatment without determining in advance the value of these aids to the inmates. As McCorkle and Korn emphasize,

It is the tragedy of modern correction that the impulse to help has become confused with treatment and seems to require defense as treatment. What if humane treatment fails to rehabilitate--shall it then be abandoned? The isolated survivals of flogging and other 'tough' techniques which still disgrace American penology remain to remind us that this is no mere academic question (1954:54-55).

The next chapter demonstrates that both social systems in the prison--the formal system of prison personnel and the informal system of inmates--are far less autonomous than officials or inmates would like to believe.

### CHAPTER III

#### ALLIANCES IN THE PRISON--INFLUENCE FROM RESEARCH IN UNDERSTANDING THE INMATE GROUP AND ITS POTENTIAL IN THE REHABILITATION PROCESS

##### Introduction

The first part of this chapter will describe various relations among inmates. The second part deals with a number of alliances in the prison between the official social system and the unofficial social system.

The formal authority of the inmate in relation to that of the staff members in the administrative hierarchy or even the authority of the guard is by definition negligible. Prison guards have a greater frequency of contact with inmates and thus mediate policy, rules for behavior, and the overall power of prison administrators.

In a reasonably sure manner, inmates achieve a quite clear understanding of the authority of prison guards. Consensus in satisfying inmate needs is typically based on the authority of guards who are expected to perform both custodial and treatment functions. As one writer points out, consensus is necessary to avoid situations where the inmate is hurt and not helped.

It may be the religious authority of a minister passing his verdict about an inmate's religious status or it may be the scientific authority of a physician who makes a statement about somatic health. The external paraphernalia of this authority--ritual, aloofness, and expert statements that are at least partially incomprehensible to laymen--are important, for the moment the characteristics of prisons

defined by such authority lose their awe-inspiring qualities, discussion may begin, and the likely result is a dissensus highly dysfunctional for the system (Galtung, 1961:134).

One problem in the prison community, it seems, is an overconcern with order and stability in a situation where traditional prison policies expect compliance and obedience despite the expected opposition of the inmates. This description holds true since the majority of prisons in the United States are of the punitive-custodial type. The multiple functions of retribution, suffering, protection, and reformation produce policies of strict surveillance and punitive actions designed to show the prisoner that society is stronger than he is. As a result, the prison may be viewed as a relatively isolated social system, composed of a ruling caste and a subordinate caste. "The ruling group, save for the fact that its authority is almost total and not based on any contractual relationship with the governed, might be likened to a managing bureaucracy" (Grosser, 1960:130). In the prison world prisoners are less likely to impute legitimacy to bases of social control, which is unlike the behavior of persons in other spheres of society. Moreover, a sense of worth and dignity is gained by being in the upper echelons of the inmate world--a world occupied by those whose past behavior best symbolizes that which society rejects and "who have most fully repudiated institutional norms" (Cloward, 1960:21). Researchers have been able to show that not all positions in the inmate world carry the same identical



status, are valued the same, or are of the same importance in influencing other inmates for or against administrative policy.

### The Inmate Code

Gresham Sykes and Sheldon Messinger point out that the social relations among inmates is regulated by a pervasive value system.

This value system of prisoners commonly takes the form of an explicit code in which brief normative imperatives are held forth as guides for the behavior of the inmate in his relations with fellow prisoners and custodians. The maxims are usually asserted with great vehemence by the inmate population, and violations call forth a diversity of sanctions ranging from ostracism to physical violence (Sykes and Messinger, 1960:5).

Sykes and Messinger classify the chief tenets of the inmate code into five major groups:

(1) There are those maxims that caution: Don't interfere with inmate interests, which center of course in serving the least possible number of pleasures and privileges while in prison. The most inflexible directive in this category is concerned with betrayal of a fellow captive to the institutional officials: Never rat on a con. In general, no qualification or mitigating circumstance is recognized; and no grievance against another inmate--even though it is justified in the eyes of the inmate population--is to be taken to officials for settlement. Other specifics include: Don't be nosey; don't have a loose lip; keep off a man's back; don't put a guy on the spot. In brief and positively put: Be loyal to your class--the cons. Prisoners must present a unified front against their guards no matter how much this may cost in terms of personal sacrifice. (2) There are explicit injunctions to refrain from quarrels or arguments with fellow prisoners: Don't lose your head. Emphasis is placed on the curtailment of affect; emotional frictions are to be minimized and the irritants of daily life ignored. Maxims often heard include: Play it cool and do your own time. (3) Prisoners assert that inmates should not take advantage of one another by means of force, fraud, or chicanery: Don't exploit inmates. This sums up several directives: Don't



break your word; don't steal from the cons; don't sell favors; don't be a racketeer; don't welsh on debts. More positively, it is argued that inmates should share scarce goods in a balanced reciprocity of 'gifts' or 'favors,' rather than sell to the highest bidder or selfishly monopolize any amenities; Be right. (4) There are rules that have as their central theme the maintenance of self: Don't weaken. Dignity and the ability to withstand frustration or threatening situations without complaining or resorting to subservience are widely acclaimed. The prisoner should be able to 'take it' and to maintain his integrity in the face of privation. When confronted with wrongfully aggressive behavior, whether of inmates or officials, the prisoner should show courage. Although starting a fight runs counter to the inmate code, retreating from a fight started by someone else is equally reprehensible. Some of these maxims are: Don't whine; don't cop out (cry guilty); don't suck around. Prescriptively put: Be tough; be a man. (5) Prisoners express a variety of maxims that forbid according prestige or respect to the custodians or the world for which they stand: Don't be a sucker. Guards are hacks or screws and are to be treated with constant suspicion and distrust. In any situation of conflict between officials and prisoners, the former are automatically to be considered in the wrong. Furthermore, inmates should not allow themselves to become committed to the values of hard work and submission to duly constituted authority--values prescribed (if not followed) by screws--for thus an inmate would become a sucker in a world where the law-abiding are usually hypocrites and the true path to success lies in forming a 'connection.' The positive maxim is: Be sharp (ibid.:69).

By pointing to the various social roles in the prisoner community, contacts with other inmates and with custodians, and communication of information and knowledge, certain inmate positions in the social structure of the organization and certain attitudes, opinions, and values are revealed, as well as various patterns in support of the maxims of the inmate code of behavior.

#### Social Roles in the Prisoner Community

In one of the earliest sociological analyses of prisons as

social organizations, Donald Clemmer developed and emphasized the process of "prisonization,"

but he also characterized the prison as 'atomized' because few inmates were intensively or extensively involved in primary group relations. His further claim that little structuring occurred within the prison was based on this same observation (Garritty, 1961:372).

Prisonization, defined as the process of assimilation of the prison culture by inmates as they become acquainted with the prison world, was seen by Clemmer to affect new inmates differently. He found

prisoners who went through the entire period of their incarceration with relatively little contact with the principal underlying themes of the prison culture. Some were persons whose previous social experience and isolation in their prison jobs protected them from intimate or prolonged exposure to the prison code and its criminal orientations. Others were prisoners who retained close contacts with the outside world through constant visits and letters from relatives and friends and failed to become completely immersed in the prison culture and social life. The most prisonized inmates were those who had a relatively well-developed and mature set of criminal value orientations on their admission to prison. They were persons relatively isolated from conventional contacts in the outside world and motivated to seek status and prestige within the informal groupings of the prison community (Ohlin, 1956:37-38).

Conditions which tend to maximize prisonization are

1. A sentence of many years, thus a long subjection to the universal factors of prisonization.
2. A somewhat unstable personality made unstable by an inadequacy of "socialized" relations before commitment, but possessing, nonetheless, a capacity for strong convictions and a particular kind of loyalty.
3. A dearth of positive relations with persons outside the walls.
4. Readiness and a capacity for integration into a prison primary group.
5. A blind, or almost blind, acceptance of the dogmas and mores of the primary groups and the general penal population.
6. A chance of placement with other

persons of a similar orientation. 7. A readiness to participate in gambling and abnormal sex behavior. The conditions which allow for minimum prisonization are the reverse of these (Garritty, 1961:362).

Clemmer's research in a state penitentiary in the early 1930's was one of the first attempts to classify prisoners into the following groups of categories:

(1) The 'Complete Clique Man' is described as one of a group of three or more men who are very close friends, share each other's luxuries and secrets, and accept punishment for each other. Eighteen percent of the inmates were reported to be in such primary groups. (2) The 'Group Man' is one who is friendly with a small group of inmates, but does not subject himself as completely as the 'clique man' to the wishes and acts of the group-as-a-whole, nor so completely shares confidences and restricts his association with one group. Thirty-six percent of the inmates were classified by Clemmer as 'group men.' (3) The 'Semi-solitary Man' was described as one who is civil with other inmates, but never becomes really intimate with them. Thirty-four percent of the prisoners were placed in this category. (4) The 'Complete Solitary Man' designated only three and one-half percent of the men. As the name suggests, these were men who kept completely to themselves and shared nothing with other inmates (Glaser, 1964:90).

Two later studies that paid particular attention to inmate roles and types are the study of argot roles by Gresham Sykes and Clarence Schrag's typology of inmate social types. Sykes

reports from his research that a systematic structure of roles can be observed in the prison community and can be used to describe the general behavior patterns of inmates. He found that prison argot labeled and described the position and role behavior of the inmates, and he described eleven roles which he believes form the basic social structure of the prison community (Garritty, 1961:360).

According to Sykes

An inmate who violates the norm proscribing the betrayal of a fellow prisoner is labeled a rat or a squealer in the vocabulary of the inmate world, and his deviance elicits universal scorn and hatred. Prisoners who exhibit

highly aggressive behavior, who quarrel easily and fight without cause, are often referred to as toughs. The individual who uses violence deliberately as a means to gain his ends is called a gorilla; a prisoner so designated is one who has established a satrapy based on coercion in clear contravention of the rule against exploitation by force. The term merchant, or peddler, is applied to the inmate who exploits his fellow captives not by force but by manipulation and trickery, and who typically sells or trades goods that are in short supply. If a prisoner shows himself unable to withstand the general rigors of existence in the custodial institution, he may be referred to as a weakling or a weak sister. If, more specifically, an inmate is unable to endure prolonged deprivation of heterosexual relationships and consequently enters into a homosexual liaison, he will be labeled a wolf or a fag, depending on whether his role is an active or a passive one. If he continues to plead his case, he may soon be sarcastically known as a rapo (from 'bum rap') or innocent. And if an inmate makes the mistake of allying himself with officialdom by taking on and expressing the values of conformity, he may be called a square John and ridiculed accordingly (Sykes, 1960:9-10).

Of all of the inmates, however, who most nearly fulfills the norms of the society of prisoners and upholds and supports the inmate code, the right guy, the real con, the real man

is the hero of the inmate social system, and his existence gives meaning to the villains, the deviants such as the rat, the tough, the gorilla, and the merchant.

A right guy is always loyal to his fellow prisoners. The right guy never interferes with other inmates who are conniving against the officials. Anybody who starts a fight with a right guy has to be ready to go all the way.

In his dealings with the prison officials, the right guy is unmistakably against them, but he doesn't act foolishly. When he talks about the officials with other inmates, he's sure to say that even the hacks with the best intentions are stupid, incompetent, and not be trusted; that the worst thing a con can do is give the hacks information--they'll only use it against you when the chips are down. A right guy sticks up for his rights, but he doesn't ask for pity; he can take all the lousy screws can hand out and more. Even if the right guy doesn't look for trouble with the officials, he'll go to the limit if they push him too far. He realizes that there are just two kinds of

people in the world, those in the know and the suckers or squares. Those who are in the know skim it off the top; suckers work (ibid.:10-11).

Whereas Sykes was concerned with the argot and vocabulary of the inmate world in describing the rat, toughs, gorilla, merchant, weakling, wolf, capo, square John, and right guy as a systematic structure of roles, Clarence Schrag developed a typological system or set of configurations "that deals primarily with issues involving social relations among inmates, contacts with staff members, and access to the civilian world" (Schrag, 1961:347). Schrag shifted from using argot labels such as square John or right guy to using a more neutral terminology. The terms prosocial, antisocial, pseudosocial, and asocial were called, collectively, social types. An explanation of each of Schrag's social types reveals differences in their relationships to officials in the prison. This explanation will provide an appropriate foundation for a discussion of alliances between the two social systems.

#### Alliances Between the Official Social System and the Unofficial Social System

With Schrag's essay we get one of the broadest interpretations of the alliances that develop in the prison situation between the official social system and the unofficial social system. This is primarily because both systems are far less autonomous than officials or inmates would like to believe.

Despite the clear logic of its structure, there may be significant defects in the system of unilateral authority relations. First, the system assumes that officers are fully committed to the objectives and policies announced



by the chief administrator. Secondly, it assumes that the power and authority of the broader community in dealing with the inmates. Thirdly, it assumes that inmates occupy a caste-like status that deprives them of any influence in the determination of policy. None of these assumptions is very realistic if judged in terms of social activities that are normally observed in the prison community (ibid.: 336).

Low-ranking officers play the smallest part in policy formation. They are expected to carry out orders, not evaluate them. In institutions where no official procedure for feedback (criticism) concerning official directives is available, unofficial channels for the diffusion of messages are used in turn to carry unofficial interpretations of inmate behavior.

Allegiance to the official administration may be less important to the subordinate officer than are his many involvements in the unofficial conventions of the prison community. His knowledge of the official program is sometimes limited to the specific rules and regulations that are his immediate concern. His information about prison affairs comes primarily from sources other than those that are officially prescribed. For example, over half of the subordinate officers in a state prison were unaware of the existence of a certain group therapy program that had been in operation for more than nine months. And the majority of those officers who knew about the program stated that they had learned of it from inmates or fellow officers rather than from their superiors (ibid.: 338).

Schrag was able to show that there were significant differences between prosocial, pseudosocial, antisocial, and asocial inmates in terms of social status, patterns of friendship, and positions of leadership in the prison community. The first important difference existed as a result of preinstitutional career. "Generally, antisocial offenders are reared in an environment consistently oriented toward illegitimate social

norms" (ibid.:350). In the prison, Schrag found that antisocial offenders are fairly consistent in following the choice-pattern dictated by the illegitimate normative system. Antisocial offenders maintain extensive contacts among the inmates, but minimal relations with the staff. They are next to the lowest of the four social types in participating in staff sponsored activities and treatment programs, and are identified as "rebels who have a cause, namely, the subversion of established authority" (ibid.:356).

Two other social types, the asocial and the pseudosocial offenders "exhibit defective normative perceptions growing out of early parental rejection and patterns of inconsistent discipline, respectively. They suffer severe personal frustrations at an early age and acquire distinctive adaptation techniques" (ibid.:350). "Pseudosocial offenders choose solutions representative of both conventional and deviant prescriptions while asocial offenders make the greatest number of irregular choices" (ibid.:353). Schrag determined that the irregular choice-pattern of the asocial offender, that is, his choice between conventional and deviant prescriptions, is directly related to his being restricted to fewer relations with staff and with inmates.

The preinstitutional career of the fourth category of offenders, prosocial offenders, "although utilizing legitimate normative standards, seem unable to cope with intense social pressures or unique personal problems" (ibid.:350). Prosocial



offender continue to select legitimate norms as solutions to their problems, maintain extensive contacts with staff members while restricting their contacts with inmates to other inmates of the prosocial type, and participate the most in staff-sponsored activities and treatment programs. "In consequence, the prosocial offender, for example, has a relatively clear path to conventional or legitimate behavior" (ibid.:355).

The second important difference that Schrag developed from his study was the orientation of some offenders toward the official social system with its official rewards and punishments, and an orientation away from the inmate social system. This fact lessens the autonomy of the inmate social system, makes it less cohesive, and, more important, opens the way for official intervention. Prosocial offenders and, to a lesser extent, pseudosocial offenders whose "exploitative interests, varied resources, and affective neutrality, make them the natural catalysts of social invention and change" (ibid.:356), are able to achieve their goals and interests as a result of their access to the legitimate means, their staff-centered orientation, and patterns of contact and participation with other in the prisoner community.

Most striking among the findings is the high frequency with which asocial inmates are identified as leaders. Evidently the fears and suspicions aroused by members of the other social types result in leadership status for inmates who are incapable of any high degree of mutual effort. Presumably, then, the higher the tensions and anxieties within the prisoner community, the greater the leadership potential of the asocial type (ibid.:354).

In analyzing the phenomenon of "Leadership Among Prison Inmates," and the determinants of the leadership trait in a prison community, Schrag found that

most important among the determinants of leadership are criminal maturity (leaders have served more years in prison, have longer sentences remaining to be served, are more frequently charged with crimes of violence, and are more likely to be repeated offenders), comparatively permanent tenure in the institution, and habits of aggressiveness and violence (significantly more leaders than other inmates are officially diagnosed as homosexual, psychoneurotic, or psychopathic and the institutional adjustments of leaders are marked by a significantly greater number of serious rule infractions, including escape, attempted escape, fighting, and assault). It is probable, therefore, that the group identifications of the inmates are generally organized around the activities and interests of the least improvable offenders, and that the values of the prison culture encourage rebellion and non-conformity (Schrag, 1964:540).

The purpose here was to dispute the belief that the inmate group always maintains its cohesiveness. Some inmates maintain a staff-centered orientation while others participate less in staff-sponsored activities and treatment programs. Likewise, it was shown that the formal structure of prison officials is far less autonomous than is commonly believed.

Visibility of Attitudes, Values, and Opinions  
of Anti-staff Oriented Inmates

Stanton Wheeler adds validity to the above findings by focusing his study of "Role Conflict in Correctional Communities," on the inmates' positions in the social structure of the organization, and the resulting visibility (or lack of it) of their attitudes, opinions, and values. Wheeler found earlier

that since both inmates and staff

tended to perceive inmate norms to be further removed from those of staff than the inmates actually indicated, we should find that the organization of the prison operates in such a way as to place antisocial inmates in highly visible positions; the norms and attitudes held by them should serve disproportionately as a source for the perception of general inmate standards (Wheeler, 1961:251).

Consistent with Schrag's findings of leadership in the prison community, Wheeler and his researchers suggested the following conclusion:

that much of the strength of the inmate culture may reside in the ability of anti-staff oriented inmates to attain positions of high visibility within the inmate system, thereby generating and reinforcing the image of a culture in marked conflict with the values of the administration. Although there is latent support for conventional orientations among many inmates, their actions may more closely model the opinions of the highly visible minority, thus creating conflict over and above that called for by the actual differences in values of inmates and staff (ibid.: 255).

The question that presents itself is how to go about changing the patterns of communication and decision-making among inmates and between staff and inmates, of the type suggested first by Clemmer, then Sykes, Schrag, and now Wheeler. In the prison inmate's social world, part of the influence on him comes from the various services and activities, such as psychological services and recreational activities. But what is the major influence on a prisoner during his confinement? Are inmates cohesive all the time? Is the strong code of loyalty always intact? Or is it a war of all against all? Some answers to these questions follow, as well as some

practical implications for prison management.

### Implications from Prison Research

The following discussion is divided into two sections of findings from a research investigation by Daniel Glaser in five prisons and correctional institutions. The prisons and correctional institutions (all federal) are (1) Leavenworth, a high security penitentiary housing about 2500 inmates who are believed to be tractable but require secure custody; (2) Terre Haute, a medium-security penitentiary, houses somewhat over 1300 inmates serving diverse sentences, with the average sentence being about five years; (3) Milan, a correctional institution with an inmate population around 700, includes industrial, educational and vocational training as its major program for inmate rehabilitation; (4) Chillicothe, built in 1925, holds about 1300 inmates, of whom the average age is about twenty, with over 90 percent under twenty-five serving an average sentence of three and one-half years; (5) Ashland, a correctional institution opened in 1940, houses about 500 inmates, having an average age of eighteen with none over twenty-one and four-fifths under twenty.

### Relationships Among Inmates

This first section of findings has to do with "Relationships Among Inmates," that is, friendship versus isolation, advice exchanged by inmates, inmate perception of variation in inter-inmate relations in different parts of the prison,

interests influencing inmate affiliations, and inmate interests and perceptions of the interests of other inmates. Numerous interviews were conducted by Glaser in each of the five prisons and correctional institutions.

In determining friendship versus isolation, it was necessary for Glaser and his researchers to look at variations on the basis of age and inmate relationships, length of imprisonment and relationships, and prison heterogeneity and inmate relationships. The following tentative conclusions were set forth from his interviews with the inmates:

1. Prisoners, as a whole, are more oriented to maintain voluntary isolation from other prisoners than to achieve solidarity with other prisoners.
2. Voluntary isolation of prisoners from each other is correlated directly with age of the prisoners; at low ages, the inverse of the first proposition above may occur.
3. Voluntary isolation of prisoners from each other is correlated with the amount of prior correctional confinement that they have experienced.
4. Voluntary isolation of prisoners from each other is correlated directly with the degree of heterogeneity of prisoners in an institution. This heterogeneity may be measured in terms of: (a) race, (b) length of sentence, (c) social class, or (d) prior correctional confinement.
5. Voluntary isolation of prisoners from each other varies in a U-shaped curve, being high at the beginning of confinement, decreasing towards the middle, and increasing near release.
  - a. The amplitude of this curve varies inversely with age or prior confinement of the prisoners.
  - b. The shape of this curve will be modified somewhat by the linear relationships with age, heterogeneity, and other variables indicated in the previous propositions (Glaser, 1964:98).

Responses to inquiries concerning advice exchanged by inmates provided support for this proposition: "6. The flow of inter-inmate advice is predominantly from older to younger inmates" (*ibid.*:100).

The following pair of related clusters of hypotheses are the result of inquiries into inmate perception of variation in inter-inmate relations in different parts of the prison.

Inmates will get along best with other inmates at jobs where they find: (1) a small number of other inmates; (2) low contact with the rest of the inmate population; (3) a trade training program; (4) limited access to contraband services or supplies; (5) careful selection of assignees. Or, stated conversely: 7b. Inmates are most likely to have trouble with other inmates at jobs with: (1) a high concentration of men rejected for assignment elsewhere; (2) a large number of prisoners assigned; (3) much contact with the rest of the inmate population; (4) access to services or supplies highly valued by most prisoners (ibid.:105).

Glaser's fourth area of inquiry had to do with interests influencing inmate affiliations.

The topics of concern in conversation and in learning from other inmates, and the reasons for avoiding other inmates suggest: 8. A predominant interest of prison inmates is to adjust to the expectations of their keepers in order to stay 'out of trouble' while confined. 9. Most prison inmates maintain strong noncriminal interests, including vocational aspirations of a legitimate nature (ibid.:111).

Glaser's last finding in this section on "Relationships Among Inmates" is very similar to the discovery by Wheeler that once the sources of bias, such as highly visible and highly mobile inmates, were pinpointed, the actual difference is not as great as the perceived difference in values between inmates and staff. In learning about inmate interests and perceptions of the interests of other inmates, Glaser and his researchers concluded that: "10. Prisoners perceive other prisoners as having less commitment to staff-supported values than is, in fact, the case" (ibid.:116).



One of the most important findings from the several different types of inquiry, and a finding that is of particular importance in the light of the conclusions reached by Clemmer, Sykes, Schrag, and Wheeler, is summarized by Glaser:

Inmates have a predominant interest in adjusting to the demands of the institution in that they have strong non-criminal aspirations. However, evidence and deductive reasoning supported the notion that inmates and others generally overestimate the extent of inmate opposition to staff-supported standards, because inmates who oppose these standards are most articulate (ibid.:118).

Glaser's explanation for the visibility of those articulate in opposing staff-supported standards has to do with the probability

that in some prisons, or sections of prisons, inmate leaders who identify with staff and promote conventional moral values are so clearly dominant that the conventional values are the most commonly articulated and non-conforming values are not extensively expressed (ibid.:118).

### Inmate-staff Relationships

Of particular importance are the findings by Glaser in this second section dealing with "Inmate-staff Relationships." It has already been indicated that in the authoritarian, traditional, or punitive-custodial prison that some situations are such that the communication is set up so that inmate leaders have their greatest influence upon the lives of the other inmates. This feeling is expressed by Ohlin who states that

it appears that the organizational arrangements of the institution and the administrative policies and practices markedly affect the degree to which inmate leaders can enforce widespread solidarity of opposition on the part of the part of the inmate body as a whole to the administration (Ohlin, 1956:20).



Glaser and his researchers surveyed the organizational arrangements of the five prisons and correctional institutions mentioned earlier, for pertinent situations which enhance inmate-staff communication. Under the headings of "Inmate Reports on Their Staff Preferences and Prejudices," and "The Personal Influence of Staff Members," the following areas were utilized in determining the types of communication between inmates and staff: (1) variations among prisons, (2) corrupt activity among inmates, (3) inmate-staff isolation, (4) personality attributes of staff, (5) functions of staff, and (6) nature of problems taken to staff. Tentative conclusions were gathered for the first five categories above, but not for the sixth. Rapport and trust was not established soon enough with either inmates or staff to come to even tentative conclusions regarding this sensitive category.

In regard to the first category, inmate-inmate pressure was studied sufficiently in the different prisons to come up with the following statement: "1. Inmate pressure on other inmates to avoid communication with officers varies directly with the extent to which there is an impersonal and authoritarian orientation of staff to inmates" (Glaser, 1964:128).

Observations of corrupt activity among inmates made it safe to assume that "2. The value in the inmate community of any inmate's presumed unusual access to staff, or to prison files and records, varies directly with restriction of personal

communication or friendship between staff and inmates" (ibid.: 129). In connection with this category, Glaser observed that:

Restriction of communication between staff and inmates maintains the formal authority of the staff and is presumed to reduce the possibility of their being corrupted by inmates. However, it increases the possibility of inmates corrupting other inmates. I suspect that authoritarian staff policies may not actually reduce the incorruptibility of staff, because: (1) staff always has to rely on some inmate clerks, technicians, and other assistants; (2) by virtue of their advantageous position for communication and friendship, these are the inmates most likely to achieve any corrupting of staff; (3) authoritarian policy promotes confidence-game orientations of these inmates to other inmates, since it enhances the apparent value of the position of these inmates in inmate society; (4) these confidence-game orientations thereby become more habitual behavior of such inmates, making them more likely to use them in dealing with staff as well as with inmates, and perhaps with outsiders also, before and after their release from prison (ibid.:129-30).

Many observers of the prison situation have pointed out that the amount of hostility and opposition to staff policies is reflected as a movement toward inmate solidarity. Likewise, this above movement may be a general isolation of prisoners from each other and from staff. It was shown that the increasing isolation of inmates from other inmates in Milan correctional institution, "appears to be a generalized pattern of avoiding others which also extends to the inmate relationships with officers" (ibid.:130). However, in the Ashland Correctional Institution, a relatively easy socializing atmosphere was particularly influential in the formation of relationships among inmates and between inmates and staff.

All this suggests that, despite some cohesion of small groups of inmates when in conflict with staff, on the

whole: 3. Voluntary isolation of inmates from each other varies directly with their isolation from officers. (This implies that staff attitudes toward inmates are the most independent variables and that if they are changed, there will be a change not only in inmate attitudes to staff but in inmate attitudes to each other) (ibid.:130).

The remainder of the findings deal generally with the personalities of various staff members and their impact on the inmates as a function, to some extent, of the staff member's position and duties, independently of his personality. It was assumed that being somewhat liked by inmates assisted staff in influencing inmates.

4. Staff influence on inmates varies directly with staff manifestation to inmates of the same types of personal behavior that cause a man to be liked in nonprison relationships. a. Inmates are most influenced by staff who act towards them in a friendly and considerate--rather than hostile--tone and manner. b. Inmates are most influenced by staff who treat them with fairness and predictability (ibid.:133).

The personality of the staff member did not account for the differences in liking one officer more than another. Senior officials (warden, assistant warden, captain, lieutenant), custodial officers (cell, unit, or gate officer), work supervisors (foreman, shop or detail officer, steward), educators (teachers, vocational training instructor), chaplains, doctors (clinical, psychologist, psychiatrist), and others (record clerk, clothing room, placement, or recreation officer) were all given an inmate personality rating, but they were also grouped into functional categories of staff position and rated according to the least and best-liked positions. On the basis of greatest total impact, that is, impact as the sum of most

liked and most disliked selections, in four out of the five prisons custodial officers were first in the number of designations to their positions marked "liked" or "disliked", putting them first in greatest total impact on inmates. Treatment personnel rated the least number of "liked" or "disliked" designations suggesting that they have less influence than other staff on the prison experience of most inmates. Caseworkers were the most disliked while work supervisors were the most liked, with the exception of Ashland where custodial officers were somewhat more often the best liked.

Glaser feels that much of the ineffectiveness in treating inmates in the five federal prisons has to do with the degree of specialization of the different officers in the prisons. This of course is related to the types, and specificity, of tasks of custodial officers places them in close contact with the inmates. Consequently, custodial officers have an opportunity, more so than any of the treatment personnel, to be liked or disliked depending on such factors as fairness, predictability, and manner of expression.

The treatment staff is less called upon to give orders to inmates or to initiate disciplinary action, so they are less frequently evaluated for their fairness than persons in other major staff categories. On the other hand, the associate wardens and the treatment staff are most often the persons to whom special requests are directed, so their response to these greatly affects the reactions they arouse in the inmate population. Custodial officers are very frequently the most liked, in addition to being more often than others the most disliked staff members. This suggests that inmate reaction to them is not as much a function of their staff position as may be the case with

inmate reaction to the treatment personnel and the work-supervision employees. Rather, these data suggest that, despite the demands of their position, many custodial officials and some other staff members could greatly alter the type of reaction they arouse (Glaser, 1964:137).

#### Walter Reckless' "Impact" Studies

Similar conclusions were arrived at after a series of correctional "impact" studies, conducted at Ohio State University under the direction of Professor Walter Reckless. Three studies in the series, Edward J. Galway's 1947 study at the U. S. Reformatory, Chillicothe, Ohio, David E. Bright's 1950 study of inmate groups in the Ohio Penitentiary, Columbus, Ohio, and Mark R. Moran's study at the U. S. Reformatory at Chillicothe, Ohio, in the summer of 1953, are of particular importance in connection with those findings just reported by Glaser. The findings which follow are from Galway and Bright's studies concerning inmate's telling which staff member knows them the best, understands them or has helped them the most.

Galway asked 275 departing inmates to indicate which staff member knew them best.

The 275 inmates nominated 125 different staff members, some, of course, more than one time. These 125 constituted 40 percent of the staff on the pay roll at the time. The 275 nominations of staff members who knew the inmate best (in the inmate's judgment) were distributed by branch of the service as follows: custody, 108; trade training, 39; farm, 32; industry, 18; maintenance, 18; culinary, 17; classification and parole (social workers), 14; clerical, 13; educational, 9; medical, 5; chaplain, 2 (Reckless, 1955:139-40).

Galway concluded that "professional staff could be wheeled in

line to have more positive impact and that their influence could extend to custodial and supervisory and other staff, in terms of developing understanding and awareness of behavior problems" (ibid.:140).

Six years after the original study, Galway again covered certain impact items in terminal interview with 250 inmates consecutively released from the U. S. Reformatory at Chillicothe, Ohio. The first terminal interview question was related to professed favorable or unfavorable feelings toward staff members. These were the results:

Sixty-eight percent professed to have got a good deal out of their stay; 23 percent, something; 9 percent, not much. This suggests that inmates will feel that they have obtained some benefit from the programme of an institution, if at the same time they feel favourably disposed toward staff (ibid.:142).

Inmates in another interview question were asked to name the staff member that helped them the most and to put what branch of service the staff member represented. The nominations were distributed as follows:

37.6 percent fell into the custodial branch (housing, maintenance, supervisory); 19.2, non-custodial maintenance; 12.8, industry foremen; 11.6, trade training supervisors; 17.6, professional (social workers, academic teachers, doctors, etc.); 1.2 percent, no answer. This distribution still conforms pretty much to the finding of the previous studies of the earlier Galway study (1947), although there is a greater proportion selection of professional staff members in the more recent Chillicothe sounding (ibid.:143).

David E. Bright administered a carefully-constructed questionnaire to five small samples (fifty each), representing



five different groups of inmates in the Ohio Penitentiary at Columbus, and found good evidence to support the following three propositions:

(1) The longer the time served in prison, the more adverse will be the attitudes of the inmates, as indicated by the responses of the inmates to questions concerning the personnel, the programme, and the physical facilities of the prison; (2) the lower-paid, non-professional staff members create more impact than do the higher paid, professional staff members, as indicated by the inmates' nominations of staff members they like best and of staff members who have done something for them; and (3) better prison programme and facilities lead to better attitudes, as indicated by the responses of inmates to questions concerning the programme and the physical facilities (ibid.:140).

Bright concluded that

by getting better personnel at the guard and the work supervision level, better programme, and better physical facilities and by decreasing the time of incarceration, prison administrators can increase the constructive impact of the institution on a large inmate population (ibid.:140).

Suggestions are made in the remainder of this chapter regarding a treatment approach that allows for more personal interaction to occur between inmates and officials in the prison. These suggestions are made in the light of Glaser's and Reckless' finding that custodial as well as treatment staff need to increase the frequency of their contact with inmates.

#### Enhancing Communication in the Prison

Our original question was concerned with changing the patterns of communication and decision-making inmates and between staff and inmates. It has been suggested by Clemmer, Sykes, Schrag, Wheeler, and Glaser that authoritarian staff



policies affect the cohesiveness of the inmate group and that generally, the more authoritarian the prison staff act toward inmates, the greater the cohesiveness and hostility of the inmates toward staff. Thus, staff positions in the prison need to be altered in a favorable direction to allow interaction to become more personal and a longer time period made available during which staff members can develop variety and depth in their relationships to an inmate. This situation can come about at the suggestion of the following hypotheses:

Focusing on particularistic diffuse, primary, or community relationships, one can assert: The more comprehensive and nonritualized the duties of any employee become in dealing with inmates, the more he is inclined to treat them on the basis of their personal attributes as individuals rather than on the basis of attitudes toward inmates as a class or social status, and the more inmates are inclined to reciprocate this treatment (Glaser, 1964:138).

The converse of this formulation states that:

The more ritualistic and routinized the duties of an employee become in dealing with inmates, the more he is inclined to become authoritarian and punitive toward them (regardless of official policies and directives), and the more he is inclined to rationalize punitiveness be stereotyped unfavorable conceptions of inmates, which they are inclined to reciprocate (ibid.:138-39).

Secondly,

The prison employee who has the greatest reformative influence on an offender is the one who is able to demonstrate sincere and sustained concern for and confidence in the offender's rehabilitation (ibid.:146).

Thirdly,

The prison employee's concern is most effectively manifested by gestures of interest and acts of assistance for the offender which exceed the minimal requirements of the employee's job in the prison (ibid.:146).

And finally,

The advancement of treatment goals requires centralization of more authority in the officials who are spokesmen for treatment interests, but decentralization of treatment activity, so as to increase the extent to which all staff in contact with inmates have a strong interest in treatment (ibid.:212).

These principles are embodied more in the types of inmate-staff relationships found in the treatment-oriented prison in contrast to more restricted patterns of communication in the punitive-custodial institution. The last principle underlies the extensive group counseling program in California's prisons. Chapter five of this report contains discussion of California's prison group counseling as the type of treatment program that includes both professional and non-professional prison personnel. The following chapter discusses two main types of therapies in the prison: individual and group therapy. A proposed organization of treatment activities gives support to the expansion of group treatment, under the heading of group counseling, enlisting the aid of custodial officers as group leaders.

## CHAPTER IV

### THE EFFECTIVENESS OF THERAPIES IN PRISON

#### Introduction

By realizing the number of common problems of adjustment or the pains of imprisonment which accompany the loss of freedom, it is clear that the prison must make accommodations and the officials must make certain concessions to the more influential and aggressive members from the inmate social system. In this situation, characteristic of the punitive-custodial prison, the majority of inmates are exhorted to go it alone.

As Mark Richmond points out:

To Institution administrators, then, there are two alternatives...either it will be necessary to increase the rewards, if they are to have any value, or the standards of the group will have to be changed in the direction of what is considered to be acceptable behavior (Richmond, 1965:104).

The criminal value system, vital to inmate society, the system of stratification with statuses and roles, and the "system of social controls independent of the official controls maintained by the administrative hierarchy" (Grosser, 1960:132), will not be significantly modified by programs of the kind which try to reduce inmate idleness, decrease inmate isolation through increased visiting privileges or attempts to improve the physical appearance of the prison. Gibbons identifies such attempts as adjuncts to treatment:

These are examples of humanitarian reform, of changes in correctional routines and practices designed to reduce some of the physical and psychological 'pains of imprisonment.' They operate to make the matter of 'doing time' more tolerable for the individual inmate (Gibbons, 1965:6).

Similarly,

this vagueness of aim has been matched by arguments over means, but there appears to be a growing area of agreement: imprisonment's effectiveness in reformation depends on a profound change in the criminal's personality structure, and this change is not to be won by exhortation; rather, conformity with the norms of society is to be secured by making the individual responsive to the reaction of others, in the sense that the social approval or disapproval of law-abiding groups becomes effective in channelling the individual's motives, drives, needs, or impulses (Sykes, 1956:257-58).

#### Custody-Treatment Dilemma

One of the main obstacles to effective treatment in the prison is the requirement expected from society for custodial security. Since most all prisons accept treatment as one of their goals, the requirement from society for custodial security creates a certain amount of conflict in the attempt to reach both objectives at once. This problem facing prison administrators has been described by several writers as the custody-treatment dilemma. In attempting to control large numbers of inmates, consistent with the policy of custodial security, a certain degree of punishment becomes necessary in achieving this end. Punishment interferes with treatment, therefore:

You cannot at the same time: (1) have punishment orientation; and have treatment orientation; (2) have an ideology concerning prison and prisoners such that external, exculpatory causes are only necessary causes, not sufficient causes of criminal acts by reason of the fact that individual

free will and auto-causation are assumed; and have an ideology concerning prison and prisoners such that external exculpatory causes (social, mental, biological, and physical determinants) are seen as both necessary and sufficient causes of crime; (3) portray the prison to society in negative sanctions; and portray the prison to society in terms such that it stands as a neutral or positive symbol); (4) put the inmate into the institution against his own wishes; and expect the inmate to adopt an attitude of willingness to undergo therapy; (5) intentionally (and with the inmate knowing that the action is intentional) inflict evils on the inmate or deprive him of positive values during his stay in prison; and expect the inmate to believe what is done is done for his own good, and to cooperate in his own treatment and therapy; (6) institutionalize secondary relations between inmates and personnel in an effort to assure equality in treatment and to prevent formation of personal ties that may endanger operative efficiency in emergencies; and institutionalize primary relations between inmates and personnel in an effort to assure or facilitate a transfer of values to inmates; (7) train personnel to orient themselves only to simple, consensual and highly visible variables like age, crime committed, criminal career and sentence; and train personnel to orient themselves to subtle, dissensual and latent characteristics of the inmates; (8) release the inmates after time periods which are mainly a function of their behavior before they were institutionalized; and release inmates after time periods which are mainly a function of their behavior after they were institutionalized (Galtung, 1961:122-23).

### Individual Therapy

Treatment in the prison is further limited by continued support for only those treatment approaches, usually a form of individual or group therapy, based on general psychiatric theory. As Cressey points out:

groups pressuring for 'treatment' of criminals have left invention of the processes for administering 'treatment' up to the correctional workers themselves, and correctional workers have not been innovative. Rather than experimenting with techniques based on rehabilitation or treatment principles specifically related to correction, they have used processes vaguely based on general psychiatric theory. Instead of precise descriptions of techniques for changing

attitudes, the correctional literature contains statements indicating that rehabilitation is to be induced 'through friendly admonition and encouragement', 'by relieving emotional tension', 'by stimulating the probationer's (prisoner's) self-respect' and 'by encouraging him to have insight into the basis of his maladjustment,' etc. (Cressey, 1968:38).

In all situations involving individual therapy, often called individual depth psychotherapy, the treatment goal is to uncover individual problems, lead the patient, client, or inmate to insight into his emotional problems, and develop new patterns of behavior as a result of this treatment. What limits the effectiveness of this approach to treatment is that prisons are limited in the number of professional therapists--psychiatrists, clinical psychologists, and psychiatric social workers--who must conduct themselves in a one-to-one relationship with the inmate. Sutherland and Cressey report that in 1954

only 29 full-time psychiatrists were employed to aid in diagnosing and treating all inmates in state prisons and reformatories for adults. Twelve of these men were located in California, seven in New York. Eighteen states had no psychiatric services at all, and only nine had the services of a full-time psychologists were employed to work with about 162,000 inmates in the United States (Sutherland and Cressey, 1966:523).

Another problem of individual therapy in the prison is the individual offender's contact with a value system or code that is usually hostile to attempts to help or treat individual members of this informal group association.

Much as he protests bad prison conditions, the adaptive inmate requires them, because his system of adaptation creates in him a need to protest. By finding reasonable



pretexts for aggressive protest, he is able to accomplish at least three essential psychological objectives: 1. The cathecting of hostilities originally generated by his failures in human relations generally and his resentment at confinement in particular. 2. Reinforcement of his self-picture in the role of a martyred victim of superior force, with attendant justifications of his 'heroic counterattack.' 3. Absolution of any personal sense of guilt or responsibility for his offense against society by emphasizing and concentrating on society's real or fancied offenses against him. The implications of this widespread psychological orientation for any treatment based chiefly on permissiveness and helping will become painfully obvious for any professional staff member who enters the prison with a missionary zeal and a determination to undo, by openhanded giving, the 'evils of generations of prison corruption' (McCorkle and Korn, 1954:95-96).

And finally, individual therapy is conducted on the principle that the primary difficulty lies within the individual offender, without reference to the offender's groups: "Since it cannot be effectively provided to all, partly because it promises no success in some cases, partly for economic reasons, it cannot be expected to change group values (Grosser, 1968:303).

### Prison Group Therapy

Group therapy, has as its treatment goals the discovery of group pressures to problem behavior and the development of new norms as a result of the group experience. Initially, some person takes on the role of therapist, but ultimately, offenders are encouraged to exert pressure upon each other to reform themselves. According to Sutherland and Cressey, group therapy is most effective in the prison if it utilizes the following principles:

- (a) Criminals who are to be reformed and the persons who are to exert influence or change must have a strong sense of belonging to the same group. The two general processes



in reformation are the alienation of the criminal from groups which support values conducive to criminality and, concurrently, the assimilation of the criminal into groups supporting values conducive to law-abiding behavior. The latter process can be accomplished only when the social distance between the criminals and the reformers is small enough to permit a genuine 'we' feeling. Consequently, the reformers and the reformees should be similar in social status and ethnic backgrounds; ideally, they would be similar in all respects except attitudes toward law-violation. (b) The more attractive the group to the criminal, the greater is the influence that the group can exert on the criminal. The group must be so constituted that the criminal desires and can achieve status in it. He must be given recognition for anti-criminal and non-criminal behavior. (c) The more relevant the basis of attraction of the group to the reformation of criminals, the greater will be the influence that the group can exert on the criminal's attitudes and values. This means that groups organized largely for the purpose of occupying the criminal's time--such as hobby and recreational groups--will not have the influence of a group organized for the explicit purpose of changing criminals. If the basis of attraction of the group is some tangential interest which the criminal might have (e.g., an interest in music), the criminal's values regarding criminality are likely to remain unchanged, while his values regarding the tangential interest are changed. (d) The greater the prestige of a group member in the eyes of those who are to be reformed, the greater the influence he can exert. The prestige assigned to a group member may spring from the member's social position outside the group, or it may spring from some attribute or trait which the member seems to possess. In assigning prestige, reformers may use criteria different from those used by other reformers. (e) Strong resistance will be encountered when the efforts to change individual criminals or the criminal members of a group would, if successful, have the result of making them deviate from the norms of the group. The group must be, first of all, a strongly anti-criminal group, so that deviation from group norms will be deviation in the direction of criminality. If the reformers are in such a minority--in numbers, influence, or prestige--that exhibition of essentially 'anti-reform' attitudes is the real basis of group cohesion, any reformation of individuals will be extremely unlikely. Sometimes an understanding of the situation can be secured only if the offender's rationalizations, by which he justifies and defends himself, are broken down. Such an understanding can be promoted only by persons who themselves have some understanding of the psychology and

sociology of crime. (f) The source of pressure on the criminal whose change is sought must lie within the group. The group must not rely upon the criminal to change himself. Perhaps the most effective group for reformation of criminals would be one in which status is achieved by exhibition of 'pro-reform' attitudes. That is, those persons who show the most marked tendency toward anti-criminal values, attitudes, and behavior would become leaders. Criminality is learned in intimate, personal groups, and non-criminality and anti-criminality are learned in similar groups (Sutherland and Cressey, 1966: 677-79).

The above principles stress: (1) that there must be more than an integration of the prisoner into a clinical group; (2) more than the mere reduction of isolation and belligerence among prisoners; (3) the importance of positive contacts with groups which will directly or indirectly implant in the prisoner the anti-criminal values of the larger society.

Because the individualization principle has great popularity, one would expect prison group therapy programs to emphasize simultaneous individual therapy, in the form of lectures, music, athletics, crafts, collective psychoanalysis, or other activities in which the therapy is administered to a collection of individuals. For the same reason, one would expect that where the therapy group was actually considered a medium of change it would be used as it is in most clinical therapy. That is, it would be based upon the individualization principle and would be used merely to reduce individual isolation and to provide a permissive setting in which belligerent inmates could 'ventilate' suppressed hostilities toward the police, court personnel, prison officials, and others (Cressey, 1954:22).

Ohlin notes that:

Most of the group therapy programs have been sponsored by psychologists or psychiatrists whose interests center on the individual case. These therapy programs seek to employ the group support of other inmates to create a permissive atmosphere and to release personal hostilities and aggression in order to formulate new personality orientations. Because of the tendency of therapists to fix their attention on the personal interactions and effects that are

achieved within the group therapy sessions, little thought is directed to the effects of participation on the inmate's position in the larger social structure of the prison system (Ohlin, 1956:34-35).

The trend has been to select participants for therapy sessions on the basis of some trait or characteristic such as offense, and to define the group sessions as something distinct and different from ordinary prison life.

Group therapy sessions rarely deal with 'natural' groups in the prison, i.e., groups of men united by common interests and attitudes. Consequently, attitudes and values acquired from taking the role of law-abiding person in the group sessions may receive little support in the general prison community. The inmate's friends receive him as a fellow criminal and may ridicule his newly acquired 'Square John' attitudes; the guards and other officials force him to assume the role of a lawbreaker and may distrust his 'reformed' demeanor. According to the group relations principle, if the experience in the role of a law-abiding person is to have a lasting reformative effect, it must be supported by the social organization in which the reformee lives (Cressey, 1954:24-25).

#### Effectiveness of Prison Group Therapy

There are several points to be made with regard to the program known as group therapy in prisons. Several of these points should be helpful in clearing up some of the controversies regarding treatment of inmates in prisons and the conflict that results in any attempt to carry out therapy in the prison institution. Most of the conflict derives from the relatively new idea of rehabilitation as a goal for prisons:

That rehabilitation is not a prime goal for many prison administrators is no accident. It is the result of a tradition demanding that the prison exact retribution and punishment from convicts. Only within the last thirty or forty years has rehabilitation been considered an important part of the functions of prisons (Seliger, 1969:48).

Previously it was brought out that certain personnel assigned the specific function of treatment in the prison, namely, psychiatrists and psychiatric social workers, view almost all crime as evidence of character disorder; a one-to-one inmate-to-therapist relationship should lead to the discovery of the causes of character disorder or maladjustment through this type of therapeutic relationship.

However, as seen before, because of the shortage of clinically trained personnel who are the only ones capable of conducting individual psychotherapy, a more feasible program would be some sort of group therapy or discussion sessions. Besides this inadequate therapist-inmate ratio, there are the various reactions the psychologist must face in dealing with confined inmates. The following few paragraphs give adequate description of the futility psychologists face in attempting to administer treatment without the aid of other staff personnel:

The psychologist will also find that the inmate, who probably has a background of psychological difficulties, will be harder to deal with during his stay in prison. The inmate will have reacted to a social climate with intensive deprivation of positive stimuli once available to him on the outside. The inmate loses all reactive face-saving devices to uncomfortable experiences since he has nowhere to escape from the conditions and the personalities in the prison. He is denied the protective distance and self-action he had in his associations with other people. He must get permission to do even the simplest of things and is often teased and tormented by his cellmates. The penitentiary experience, then, creates unbearable stress on an individual already proven incapable to deal effectively with strain.

Most of the inmate's time is spent in idleness. In a majority of prisons, there is only a half-hearted effort

to provide constructive work for the prisoner. There is no incentive in the prison. Even when available, the work tends to be monotonous. With nothing meaningful to do, the prisoner finds that time takes on grotesque proportions to him (ibid.:51-52).

The Manual of Correctional Standards issued by the American Correctional Association assesses the problem of idleness in prisons as follows:

Our state prisons, as a whole, face today the prospect of sinking deeper and deeper into the status of 'idle houses.' Thousands of prisoners now have no work at all, other thousands have nothing to do except dawdle through years of semi-idleness on overmanned maintenance details. In some of our most prosperous states only a small percentage of the prisoners are employed in industries, and they move at a pace which unfits them for future employment in an outside industry (American Correctional Association, 1962:16).

Group therapy, as a rehabilitative program for inmates, has certain limitations for several reasons. First there is a shortage of professionally trained therapists who can handle enough groups to make this type of treatment worthwhile. Second, as will be shown later, group therapy relies on psychoanalytic principles which excludes the prison guard from participation in a group therapy program and third, there are at least three different types of group therapy available in prisons; this tends to confuse other staff personnel, especially custodial, as to the actual differences between individual and group therapy.

While an extensive body of literature has developed in the area of group therapy, no technique has yet been standardized. This literature is largely in the form of descriptive, clinical reports of personal experiences with group therapy in specific situations and reveals the



varying orientation of practitioners. Several writers, in an effort to deal systematically with this impressionistic literature, arrange it under three basic approaches--repressive-inspirational, didactic, and analytic (McCorkle, 1952: 22).

The above approaches are based upon the depth of the therapist's reach. For example, the therapist who utilizes the repressive-inspirational approach hopes that emotional appeal will be sufficient in urging the participant to control himself "by suppressing asocial or worrisome thoughts or wishes and, at the same time, find an inspiration in life--work, religion, etc. (ibid.:22). The didactic approach is a second type of directive approach employing a class method "in the belief that intellectual insight and verbal knowledge of psychodynamics constitute treatment (ibid.:22). Analytically-oriented group therapy is more often than not referred to as group psychotherapy. The psychotherapist's role in interpretation of the psychic phenomena is non-directive with the main requirement that the therapist show sympathetic acceptance toward participants as soon as their emotional and social problems are revealed. This third approach involves depth analysis, transference, free association, and "intuitive interpretation of material" presented by group members and urges the loosening of repression and the conscious recognition and analysis of unconscious asocial wishes (ibid.:22).

Paul Tappan notes that:

Because of the differences in process involved, these clinical forms of group psychotherapy vary greatly in

the extent to which aggressions, anxieties, and defenses are stimulated in group sessions. Obviously, the personality, training and competence of the psychotherapist are important in group therapy, particularly where analytic methods are used (Tappan, 1960:520).

Group therapy offers several advantages over individual psychotherapy since potential therapists may be drawn from psychiatry, psychology, sociology, social case work, counseling, and guidance. A shortage of more specialized personnel, psychiatrists and psychologists, has resulted in inclusion of all types and categories of staff personnel in the therapeutic effort to rehabilitate prison inmates. Group therapy itself is a relatively new type of treatment technique and experimental form of psychotherapy evolving out of various procedures in dealing with military offenders at Army rehabilitation centers during the war:

While group methods were applied to inmates of correctional institutions prior to World War II, the use of group therapy in programs designed to restore delinquent soldiers to full duty status at Army rehabilitation centers, stimulated the interest of civilian correctional administrators in the application of specialized group methods to the civilian correctional population. Since World War II there has been a steady growth in the use of group methods in correctional treatment programs (McCorkle and Elias, 1960:57).

#### Status of Prison Group Therapy in 1950 and 1959

Two different questionnaire surveys, one in 1950 and one in 1959, of 312 correctional institutions attempted to determine the status of group therapy in their programs. Responses were sent in on the 1950 survey from 109, or 35 percent, of 312 correctional institutions. Data are also available based on



the 1959 survey of 220 United States correctional institutions. Survey questionnaires and results were administered and compiled by F. Lovell Bixby, Lloyd W. McCorkle, and Albert Elias, men associated with New Jersey's Department of Institutions and Agencies. The following findings from the 1950 survey are summarized here regarding the status of group therapy in American correctional institutions in 1950:

It was found that 35 percent of the institutions are currently using some form of group therapy and another 9 percent are planning to start this kind of program soon. (2) Group therapy programs are a relatively recent addition to the treatment programs of our penal and correctional institutions. This observation is borne out by the fact that almost half of them, 41 percent, have been in operation for one year or less. (3) There appears to be some tendency to redesignate existing activities with names currently in vogue. Evidence to support this contention rests on the fact that 75 percent of the institutions incorporated group therapy into established, existing programs such as occupational therapy and activity programs and orientation programs. Only 25 percent of the institutions reported that group therapy was considered as exclusively a part of the general psychotherapy program. (4) Although largely administered by professionally trained personnel, psychiatrists were responsible for operating group therapy programs in only 10 percent of institutions. Other therapists included psychologists (23 percent), psychiatric social workers (9 percent), and others such as teachers, occupational therapists, counselors and educational directors (58 percent). (5) The level of therapy varied somewhat: 53 percent of the institutions used the lecture-discussion method, 9 percent used the psychoanalytic approach, 9 percent used the repressive-inspirational technique, and 29 percent used other types of group therapy such as music, athletic and analytic-oriented programs. (6) The number of sessions per month varied from 12 to 72 and the number of participants in each group from 8 to 20 inmates. There was some fluctuation in the number of inmates reached by the group therapy program. The range was from 53 to 102. (7) The majority of institutions relied on voluntary participation and on recommendations by the members of the staff. However, there was no standardized procedure for selecting

persons for the therapy groups. Also, it seems that group therapy helped 'neurotic offenders,' 'normal inmates,' and 'minor behavior disorders,' and that it was of little value to the feeble-minded or psychopathic inmate. (8) When asked whether they would be interested in receiving assistance in establishing a group therapy program, 27 percent expressed a desire for aid. Of these institutions, 15 percent sought training for their own personnel and 12 percent preferred to employ qualified personnel. (9) As might be expected, group therapy is more frequently used in training schools and reformatories where a greater emphasis is placed on treatment and less frequently in prisons where the primary concern is custody. The replies indicate that almost half of the training schools and reformatories, 21 or 48 percent and 13 or 42 percent respectively, employ this type of program while only 5 or 14 percent of the prisons do so (McCorkle, 1953:85-86).

A second look at the current status of the group therapy approach in correctional facilities indicates that the use of group therapy is spreading in this country.

(1) In 1950, 35 percent of the facilities which replied to the questionnaire, reported using group therapy, while in 1959, 50 percent indicated its use. (2) When the various types of state institutions are compared with each other, reformatories and training schools are more likely to have incorporated some form of group therapy in their program than prisons. (3) In the earlier study, group therapy was often used in conjunction with more established, traditional types of treatment programs. This study points to the emergence of a type of treatment approach which is establishing a place for itself, apart from the other institutional treatment programs. The name often given to this approach is group counseling and it seems to have become a principal treatment tool in many institutions, particularly in the California correctional system. (4) Almost half of the federal institutions were using professional persons trained in education, sociology, religion, vocational education, occupational therapy and recreation as compared with 18 percent of the state institutions. There is some significance, too, in the fact that state institutions have relied heavily on nonprofessional staff members as group leaders. (5) These institutions report that almost half of the personnel who lead group meetings with inmates are nonprofessional, as contrasted with less than one-quarter who are without academic training in some discipline. About one-third of all institutions employed various com-

binations of staff members in their group therapy programs. (6) When we examine the data for differences between types of state correctional facilities in terms of group therapy personnel, we find that reformatories employ psychiatrists and psychologists as group therapists to a greater degree than either training schools, camps and diagnostic centers, or prisons. (7) It was not too surprising to discover that the highest proportion of institutions that relied on non-professional staff members as group leaders were state prisons, with 64 percent indicating this arrangement (McCorkle and Elias, 1960:58-59).

The other important points to be made with regard to group therapy has to do with the number of inmates actively involved in this type of treatment and the follow-up in terms of research and evaluation of the effects of group therapy on the inmate, staff, and institutional environment. Around 1950, McCorkle reported that

the number of sessions per month varied from 12 to 72 and the number of participants in each group from 8 to 20 inmates. There was some fluctuation in the number of inmates reached by the group therapy program. The range was from 53 to 102 (McCorkle, 1953:86).

The later survey in 1959 contained questions designed to elicit from the institutions a picture of the role of group therapy in the lives of the inmates, as well as the staff. A great deal of variation was reported among the institutions responding to the survey:

A few of them have as little as one or two groups in operation while in other instances there are as many as a hundred groups. The responses to this item were arranged in terms of two categories, institutions which were conducting five groups or less and those which were operating over five groups, at any one time. The majority, 60 percent, had in operation five or less therapy groups (McCorkle and Elias, 1960:60).

Although we are not given exact figures of therapy groups in prisons alone, it can easily be determined that a number of inmates in prisons connected with this survey were not touched by any form of treatment.

### Principles of Group Treatment

A number of principles were brought out earlier which state, in effect, that:

(1) If criminals are to be changed, they must be assimilated into groups which emphasize values conducive to law-abiding behavior and, concurrently, alienated from groups emphasizing values conducive to criminality. (2) The more relevant the common purpose of the group to the reformation of criminals, the greater will be its influence on the criminal members' attitudes and values. (3) The more cohesive the group, the greater the members' readiness to influence others and the more relevant the problem of conformity to group norms. (4) Both reformers and those to be reformed must achieve status within the group by exhibition of 'pro-reform' or anticriminal values and behavior patterns. (5) The most effective mechanism for exerting group pressure on members will be found in groups so organized that criminals are induced to join with noncriminals for the purpose of changing other criminals. (6) When an entire group is the target of change, as in a prison or among delinquent gangs, strong pressure for change can be achieved by convincing the members of the need for a change, thus making the group itself the source of pressure for change. (Cressey, 1966:469-71).

In the majority of instances where group therapy is an integral part of the treatment effort in correctional institutions, a psychoanalytic approach takes precedence over application of the above six principles. This especially holds true with regard to adult prisons. The results from a question pertaining to the type of group therapy in use in Bixby, McCorkle, and Elias' 1959 questionnaire survey were as follows:

In contrast to the previous survey, where lecture-discussion was the principal type of group therapy in operation, this survey indicates that the major emphasis is on a psychoanalytic approach. Almost half of all the institutions in the survey reported using this type of group therapy, as contrasted with lecture-discussion, 29 percent, repressive-inspirational, 10 percent, and other types, 19 percent.

The situation among the various categories of state institutions is significant in that training schools and prisons attempt to implement a psychoanalytic emphasis in their group therapy programs in greater proportions than other types of facilities. The lecture-discussion emphasis is stressed by more than one-third of the training schools, 29 percent of the reformatories, but only 16 percent of the prisons. The repressive-inspirational emphasis does not seem to have much appeal to the state facilities with group therapy programs since only 14 percent of the prisons, 13 percent of the reformatories, and 6 percent each of the training schools and camps and diagnostic centers utilized it (McCorkle and Elias, 1960:60).

Therefore, it is proposed here that if the potential of the adult prison to rehabilitate is to be increased, greater emphasis should be given the group treatment of inmates, enlisting the aid of a greater number of staff personnel to handle groups of inmates according to a set of non-directive, non-psychoanalytic principles:

The only hope for the psychologist is to work within the existing framework of the prison, and, in fact, make use of it for his programs. He must attempt to make the atmosphere of the prison more receptive to rehabilitation. He will need to enlist the aid of the other staff and coordinate his program with the other activities in the prison. The ultimate goals of therapy may have to be compromised, but at this time, it may be the only way any therapy could be of significant worth in the traditional prison (Seliger, 1969:52).

#### A Proposed Organization of Treatment Activities in the Prison

Particular attention must be given the organization of treatment activities in the prison:



The basic prerequisite is a common goal and operational framework among personnel. One tactic seems well suited for the achievement of this aim; namely, enlarging the scope of the roles assigned to custodial and treatment workers so that they overlap (Piliavin and Vadum, 1968:36).

A continued interest in the expansion of group treatment, under the heading of group counseling, and a change of status for custodial officers who have traditionally been given the job of maintaining security in the prison (a job that excludes them from active participation in the treatment process) has the opportunity of borrowing from experiences in establishing group therapy in correctional institutions. As Bixby and McCorkle point out:

An institution executive thinking to establish a program of group therapy must examine very carefully his own attitudes regarding such a program. He must foresee the problems involved in it and be prepared to deal with these in a sympathetic manner. Without continued, intelligent, and enthusiastic support of the superintendent or warden the program will deteriorate into a show piece, a new gadget, or a dangerous failure. Increasing interest in group methods is accompanied by the danger that institution executives will simulate interest in this technique without having any real convictions about it. If the program starts under such auspices it cannot succeed. Whatever the warden is interested in succeeds and whatever he does not participate in fails. Experience reveals that with each adaptation of the institutional routine occasioned by the introduction of a new type of program (vocational education, classification, individual psychotherapy), the program being introduced must compete with already existing programs. Since the importance and prestige of existing programs is threatened by the introduction of group therapy, it is only natural that these programs resist its introduction (Bixby and McCorkle, 1950:37).

#### Organizational Support for Group Counseling

It follows from the above that a program of research and

evaluation into the effects of institutional group counseling will likewise need intelligent and enthusiastic support of the various categories of institutional personnel from the warden on down. According to the Manual of Correctional Standards, the following considerations are important for the organization of any state correctional system:

Long-term planning to meet future needs and changing conditions should be a major concern of the management. All public agencies are required to do a certain amount of planning for the future if it is nothing more than planning the coming year's budget. Based on this fundamental consideration, long-term plans should be made for new construction and the modernization of old facilities, as well as for the programs that will be desirable and practicable, and the personnel needed to carry them out.

Organized scientific research designed to test the effectiveness of correctional programs and to develop new techniques for the prevention, cure, abatement and control of behavior disorder is now a recognized responsibility of a well directed correctional system. To accomplish this end, objective attitudes must be encouraged and fostered at all levels of the management. A well qualified staff person to direct and stimulate research projects is essential. Close relationships with institutions of higher learning and with philanthropic foundations must be established and the initiative for such relationships should come from top correctional administrators (American Correctional Association, 1962:49-50).

#### Group Counseling Personnel

As far as an active group counseling program, the following standards for counseling activity are recommended when considering group counseling personnel:

Institutions can and should make productive use of an on-going program of counseling using custodial, industrial, maintenance, educational and other operational personnel as group leaders in mutual discussion sessions and in giving individual attention to inmate problems. There is considerable untapped potential in the large numbers of institutional personnel who can have major impact on



relieving inmate tensions and contributing to ultimate social readjustment of offenders.

To the extent that it is practical, there is major benefit in organizing consciously structured groups for mutual discussions of inmate and staff problems in quiet and relaxed settings. Such groups would be led by custodial, industrial, maintenance or other operational personnel. While larger groups may sometimes be useful, the optimum size of the counseling groups seems to be from 8 to 12 individuals.

In the early stages and then with the development of a total program, a counseling program employing line operational personnel should be accompanied by some leadership from professional clinical services personnel. There is a continuing necessity for group meetings among counselors under professional leadership to exchange problems, to plan group discussion content, and to assess the progress of specific counseling groups (ibid.:310-11).

## CHAPTER V

### GROUP COUNSELING IN THE CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS

#### Introduction

This chapter presents a brief review of some of the more important findings from studies mentioned throughout the report. These findings will be helpful in deriving a hypothesis regarding the imposition and usefulness of group counseling as a treatment device in adult prisons. Also included is a discussion of the widely publicized group counseling program sponsored by the California Department of Corrections. This department makes available counseling programs to include highly professional individual and group counseling sessions and group living programs patterned after the therapeutic community approach used in most psychiatric hospitals. "At any given time, some 20,000 inmates are taking part in some form of regular counseling--group counseling, group therapy, individual interviews, and living unit participation programs" (Guthrie, 1968:20).

#### Significant Findings From Research

The objective sought by most of the researchers mentioned in earlier chapters centers around the possibility of improving inmate-staff communication in the prison. For example, Clarence Schrag mentioned that the irregular choice pattern--a choice between conventional and deviant prescriptions--of the asocial offender is directly related to his being restricted to fewer

relations with staff and with inmates. Lloyd Ohlin expressed the feeling that communication in the authoritarian prison is such that "inmate leaders can enforce widespread solidarity of opposition on the part of the inmate body as a whole to the administration" (Ohlin, 1956:20). Likewise, Daniel Glaser points up the fact that "voluntary isolation of inmates from each other varies directly with their isolation from officers. (This implies that staff attitudes toward inmates are the most independent variables and that if they are changed, there will be a change not only in inmate attitudes to staff but in inmate attitudes to each other)" (Glaser, 1964:130). And finally, the contention by Edward J. Galway "that professional staff could be wheeled in line to have more positive impact and that their influence could extend to custodial and supervisory and other staff, in terms of developing understanding and awareness of behaviour problems" (Reckless, 1955:140).

Accordingly, the need is for a treatment program so arranged that professional staff personnel as well as custodial officers can take an active role in some type of counseling session, in an effort to develop a sustained concern for, and confidence in, the offender's rehabilitation. If structured properly, counseling sessions have the potential to reduce isolation of inmates from staff and from each other, reduce the authoritarian and punitive handling of inmates, and reduce such major problems of the inmate social system as common problems of adjustment,

pains of imprisonment, and conflict among inmates in quest of status and power.

One of Daniel Glaser's five practical suggestions for correctional administrators, following his study of five federal prisons and correctional institutions, is this: "Improvements in correctional operations suggested by research findings will be most readily supported if introduced as piecemeal innovations, and if an evaluation program is part of the innovation proposal" (Glaser, 1964:503). Such an innovation is group counseling. As John P. Conrad notes:

New programs are somehow installed, studied, and integrated within some long-established and familiar operation. The difficulties are formidable; the resistances of any bureaucracy is heavily fortified with imagined hazards, folklore, and, sometimes, justifiable apprehension about the consequences of the introduction of a new element in a precariously unstable situation. For this reason, novelties are rare in long-established correctional systems. Correctional necessity has never been a fecund mother, but it has produced a few innovations.

Descended from the psychiatric practice of group therapy, group-counseling uses the group meeting of correctional clients, not to exert professionally grounded influences, but rather to bring to bear on individual offenders the reservoir of good will and constructive interpersonal relations in staff members and the offenders. The distinction is important. Group-counseling looks exactly like group therapy. A small gathering of inmates or probationers is gathered with a staff member. If the staff member is a psychotherapist, the content of the discussion when we get close enough to listen, includes introspection, interpretations, and a deliberate application of professional experience to the discussion with the object of achieving insight. In the group-counseling session, the leader may be a work foreman, a correctional officer, a probation officer, or, in at least one institution, an inmate.

In group-counseling a method has been developed to divert the influence of the inmate or delinquent code and

at the same time to bring to bear influence of good will and orderly, conventional standards of human relations. It is not the only way in which these objectives can be attained, nor is it an infallible way. But properly used, it appears to be helpful to some classes of offenders, and impressions are general that the elusive factor of institutional climate is improved (Conrad, 1965:236-238).

### The Group Counseling Movement in California's Prisons

Group counseling as practiced in the prisons of California was first demonstrated at Folsom State Prison in 1953 by Dr. Norman Fenton, who was appointed Departmental Deputy Director of Classification and Treatment by the then Director of Corrections, Richard A. McGee. With the strong support of McGee and the wardens and superintendents, "group counseling was initiated in all the Department's facilities, except the California Medical Facility, during 1954 and 1955. In 1954, with the support of Walter Stone, then Chief of the Parole Division, group counseling was initiated for some parolees" (Harrison and Mueller, 1964:4). One of the unique features of the group counseling program as it stands today is the idea that such basic employees as correctional officers, vocational and academic teachers, job foremen, and parole agents could effectively lead treatment groups.

To aid the various types of correctional personnel as leaders of inmate groups, Dr. Fenton wrote two important group counseling texts which are still in use in California's prisons. The first, An Introduction to Group Counseling in State Correctional Service, "emphasizes the importance of the treatment

relationships and encourages a somewhat non-directive approach to counseling" (*ibid.*:4). In discussing the preparation of group leaders, Fenton points out that,

in practice, the group leader's experience and training have been the most valuable assets of the group counseling program. Moreover, the very fact that these men have chosen to go into correctional work as a career suggests that they have other personality traits that are suitable and useful in their relationships with inmates. During this active service in correctional work, the group leader has lived and worked continuously in practical institutional situations. He has had on-the-job training and experience in the difficult and sometimes even dangerous environment of the correctional institution.

The ordinary member of the staff who conducts a group not only has had considerable experience with many kinds of inmates, but this experience has been correlated with many hours of required and compensated in-service training. Some of this instruction has been related to the improvement of their work as group counselors, especially that conducted by their supervisors of group counseling and other resource persons in the program. In addition, many leaders have supplemented instruction provided by the institution with relevant college or university courses. In view of his background of training and experience, the group leader ordinarily has no difficulty in following their train of thought when inmates discuss their feelings and point of view toward life. Because many group leaders have these resources of training and experience in correctional work, they have been able to participate effectively in group counseling to the advantage of the men in their groups. The basic issue before both group counseling and group therapy is how they can combine their resources in meeting the difficult problems they face together. For the good of the inmates, the issue is primarily not how the backgrounds and the activities of group counselors and group therapists differ, but rather how the people involved in these two procedures for the resocialization of inmates can work together in mutual understanding and respect" (Fenton, 1965:17).

The second text that Fenton has written, What Will Be Your Life, was written especially for inmates in counseling groups.



### Goals and Values for Both Inmates and Staff

If the group meetings are carried out in the proper fashion, there are benefits for both inmates and staff. The following is a brief summary of the major goals and values of group counseling for inmates and staff.

#### What Group Counseling Does for the Inmate

The first purpose of the program is the establishment of a group setting for the inmates wherein they may experience an atmosphere of good will and trust. This situation has value because the men may feel secure and free therein to talk about what is in their hearts (*ibid.*:79).

This first objective is quite similar to (a) and (b) principles for conducting group therapy in the prison; that is, the reformers and those to be reformed must have a strong sense of belonging to the same group and the more attractive the group to the criminal, the greater is the influence that the group can exert on the criminal. This first purpose is important in that past and present problems will be revealed in the group setting once this genuine "we" feeling is established.

The second purpose of group counseling is to help prisoners learn how to adjust to the frustrations which are in inescapable part of life. Group discussion of how it feels to live in an institution may sometimes be relatively calm and reasonable, even amusing. At other times it may have the opposite characteristics as the group expresses strong hostile feelings. The group is moving toward the accomplishment of the second goal when they begin to discuss with greater tolerance why frustrations are unavoidable in human life, wherever it may be lived.

The third goal of group counseling is to enable its members to recognize how emotional conflicts underlie and



trigger delinquent or criminal behavior. The effective counseling group helps its members to accept themselves as persons who have had and may still have the kind of uncontrolled strong feelings that tend to bring about antisocial behavior.

The fourth objective of group counseling is to give the inmate an opportunity to learn from his peers what others think of him. In the counseling group he will be told frankly by his fellows not only about his shortcomings, but also about his good traits, which is equally valuable because such commendation may add to his self-respect.

The fifth goal of group counseling is the advancement of inmates toward more realistic attitudes toward life. Closely related to some of the others mentioned earlier, this purpose is the improvement of the inmates' understanding of wishful thinking. The inmate's fantasy-life offers a broad avenue of escape from reality. Because they have so much leisure time, it may be especially absorbing to them.

The sixth is a general objective, including several miscellaneous values that come to the inmates from their experiences in group counseling. For example, there experiences in speaking before a group have been of value to many inmates. Many have told group leaders that their increased ability to talk before a group made them feel better about themselves. Any gain in competence in speaking before a group would be a training accomplishment. Growth in self-regard could be classified as treatment (ibid.:80-82).

If there is any validity to Stanton Wheeler's finding that the prison operates in such a way as to place antisocial inmates in highly visible positions so that the norms and attitudes held by them serve disproportionately as a source for the perception of general inmate standards, group counseling sessions on a large scale would allow lower status, less mobile, and less vocal inmates a voice in favor of (or against) certain policies and practices of the administration.

### What Group Counseling Does for the Staff

It was Glaser and his researchers who surveyed the organizational arrangements of five prisons and correctional institutions for pertinent situations which enhance inmate-staff communication. Likewise, one of Walter Reckless' researchers, Edward J. Galway, contended that professional staff (psychiatrists, psychologists, psychiatric social workers, social case workers) could be wheeled in line to have more positive impact and that their influence could extend to custodial and supervisory and other staff, in terms of developing understanding and awareness of inmate behavior problems.

The following hypotheses were advocated at the conclusion of Glaser's federal study concerning inmate-staff relationships and communication:

(1) Focusing on particularistic diffuse, primary, or community relationships, one can assert that the more comprehensive and nonritualized the duties of any employee become in dealing with inmates, the more he is inclined to treat them on the basis of their personal attributes as individuals rather than on the basis of attitudes toward inmates as a class or social status, and the more inmates are inclined to reciprocate this treatment. (2) The prison employee who has the greatest reformatory influence on an offender is the one who is able to demonstrate sincere and sustained concern for and confidence in the offender's rehabilitation. (3) The prison employee's concern is most effectively manifested by gestures of interest and acts of assistance for the offender which exceed the minimal requirements of the employee's job in the prison (Glaser, 1964: 138-146).

Group counseling sessions allow the custodial officer, for example, the time that is needed and a place in order to demonstrate sincere and sustained concern for and confidence in the

offender's rehabilitation. An extensive group counseling program also allows for a better working relationship among all line and staff personnel in contact with the inmates.

From Fenton we have mention of three criteria which must be met if the potential usefulness of a counseling program in a prison is to be realized:

- (1) The confident, supporting and even enthusiastic leadership of the head of the prison and others in top management.
- (2) The understanding acceptance of the counseling program by the middle management in custody, education, recreation, the library, the chaplaincy, and the clinical center.
- (3) The acceptance by the clinical specialists of the rank and file of correctional officers, teachers, work supervisors and the clerical staff as worthy colleagues in the treatment program (Fenton, 1963:461).

Fenton goes on to say that,

if these three criteria are met, then there is a united front of all the staff in the presentation of the treatment program to the inmate. Also there is an atmosphere of treatment generated by this mutual good will in the staff. These staff relationships are important because the theory underlying the treatment program in the prison is that a major cause of criminality has been the destructive effects of other human beings in the lives of its inmates. These influences, according to this theory, have been responsible for developing in the inmates feelings of inferiority, self-pity, resentment, or hate; sometimes, indeed, these or other feelings have been transmuted by inmates into almost complete despair about themselves and their lives (*ibid.*:461-462).

According to Fenton,

Greater job satisfaction is what employees mention most frequently in telling about the value to themselves from participation in group counseling. Men who have been employed in severely custodial institutions for many years have told the writer that they have had more satisfaction from their group counseling experiences than from anything else they have done during the many years since they first joined the prison staff. Previously their lives in the prison contained considerable tension. Boredom was another unpleasant feature of their work (Fenton, 1965:83).

Another of the values of a properly administered group counseling program is that,

staff members have better knowledge of each other's work and there is greater mutual respect. For the first time in many prisons, the members of the so-called custodial and training staffs have taken over certain functions, recognized as treatment. The custodial staff engaged in the supervision of inmates continue to accept their responsibilities for the orderly operation of the institution. Experience has already shown that group counseling not only provides treatment functions that are shared by all staff members but that after its introduction there is greater evidence of mutual cooperation of those responsible primarily for treatment and those responsible for custodial operations throughout the institution. Group counseling has not only affected the activities of correctional officers, teachers, tradesmen and other staff members, it has also increased the general acceptance and importance of the clinical specialists. Reading the studies of inmates in the case files has given group leaders increased respect for the contributions to the institutional program of the psychiatrist, psychologist and the social worker (ibid.: 84-85).

#### Evaluation of Correctional Effectiveness

The California Department of Corrections is attempting to follow the recommendations for "Planning and Research" set down by the American Correctional Association in Chapter 3 of the Manual of Correctional Standards. The Manual of Correctional Standards recommends:

Organized scientific research designed to test the effectiveness of correctional programs and to develop new techniques for the prevention, cure, abatement and control of behavior disorder is now a recognized responsibility of a well directed correctional system. To accomplish this end, objective attitudes must be encouraged and fostered at all levels of the management (American Correctional Association, 1962:49-50).

In an attempt to gain a measurement of certain staff attitudes concerning etiology of crime, appropriate penalties for law

violations, the management of inmates, and the effects of treatment programs on institutional and post-release behavior, the California Department of Corrections, the University of California in Los Angeles, many of California's adult prisons and correctional facilities and their respective officials have been involved in what is called the UCLA Study of Correctional Effectiveness.

The first Project Director from UCLA, Dr. Joseph Eaton, has published a book, Stone Walls Not A Prison Make, "which considers group counseling as a part of planned administrative change in the Department of Corrections" (Harrison, 1963:368).

According to Eaton:

The program of the Department of Corrections, including its group treatment emphasis, exists in a prison system in which many of the employees express pride. Prison walls are not used to hide practices that would be repugnant to public opinion. There is a widely shared awareness of the fact that prisons have to perform an important social function, within a network of often conflicting public, staff, and inmate expectations.

A significant minority of the employees embraced group treatment with a greater personal investment than would be true of routine administrative instructions. As a result, top correctional administrators could place increasing reliance on this form of prisoner-correctional employee interaction. It was advocated as something more than a technique. It also embodied the hopes of many a progressive step in the corrections field.

The writer's observations lead him to conclude that the group treatment idea generally, and group counseling in particular, served a number of functions important to the Department of Corrections and its mission: 1. Treatment Function. 2. Reassurance Function. 3. Achievement Function. 4. Education Function. 5. Experimentation Function. 6. Morale Function. 7. Integrative Function. 8. Professionalization Function (Eaton, 1962:188-192).



Under the achievement function Eaton notes that,

Group treatment is within the capacity of most employees, including lower echelon custody officials. Hitherto the latter were unable to participate in the system's most highly prized and rewarded goal: treatment. Group counseling provided more than one-third of the nonclinically trained personnel with institutionally acceptable means to achieve an objective formerly only within reach of professional personnel who had been employed for the exclusive purpose of providing treatment (*ibid.*:190).

Robert M. Harrison, who has been directly connected with the group counseling program as a Group Counseling Supervisor and who, with Paul F. C. Mueller, completed a study of over 8,000 men released to parole between 1957 and 1961 from five California Department of Corrections institutions, commented in August 1963 that:

Group treatment, in its various forms, now represents a large and important activity in the California Department of Corrections. Over two-thirds of the more than 25,000 inmates in the Department are currently in group treatment. About 1,000 inmates are involved in introduction to group counseling in our guidance centers. Nearly 2,000 inmates are involved in community living units utilizing some of the therapeutic community concepts, where they participate in large or small groups several times a week. Approximately 12,000 inmates and 800 employees are involved in the institutional group counseling program. Nearly one half of these 800 employees serving as group counselors are custody personnel (Harrison, 1963:362).

Two other projects under the auspices of the UCLA Study of Correctional Effectiveness that testify to the magnitude of the adult group counseling program in the California Department of Corrections are the 1963 and 1964 attitude surveys of staff members of the California Department of Corrections carried out by UCLA professors Gene G. Kassebaum, David A. Ward, and Daniel M. Wilner. The title of Drs. Kassebaum, Ward, and Wilner's

1963 survey is Group Treatment by Correctional Personnel: A Survey of the California Department of Corrections. Their 1964 survey is called, "Some Correlates of Staff Ideology in the Prison".

Some findings from the 1963 Kassebaum, Ward, and Wilner survey administered to 4,062 members of departmental staff in institutions, camps, and parole offices throughout the state, 827 of whom were engaged in group counseling, deal with counselor-non-counselor comparisons and with counselor comparisons.

1. Counselor-Non-Counselor Comparisons

- a. Nearly all respondents indicated that they felt the idea of treatment (vs. mere incarceration) is sound, but only 28 percent of the counselors and 34 percent of the non-counselors felt that the program was being carried out as well as could be expected.
- b. Counselors were more likely to consider emotional problems to be the etiological basis of crime than were non-counselors.
- c. Counseling and psychotherapy were seen as the most valuable rehabilitation activity by 42 percent of the counselors and 31 percent of the non-counselors.
- d. Counselors tended to place greater priority on treatment needs (vs. custody needs) than did non-counselors.
- e. Counselors were somewhat less inclined than non-counselors toward more severe penalties for law violation.
- f. Measured by the California F-Scale, non-counselors placed more value on conformity to traditional authority than did counselors.

2. Counselor Comparisons

A consistent tendency was found for certain opinions to go together. These included placing security considerations ahead of treatment, endorsement of a cautious, firm approach in management of inmates, and favoring more severe penalties. These attitudes reflect a general 'traditional' (punitive-custodial)



orientation as opposed to the Departmental 'rehabilitation-treatment' orientation.

Among the counselors, the traditional orientation appeared to be a minority position. Counselors with this orientation were likely to have high authoritarian values, as measured by the F-Scale, and to hold jobs with primary responsibilities of custody and supervision of inmates, rather than treatment functions.

Counselors in maximum security institutions were a little more inclined to consider security to be more important than treatment than were those in medium and minimum security institutions. Otherwise, no consistent differences were found among counselors in the different institutions.

The less authoritarian counselors, and those whose job responsibilities were primarily concerned with treatment, were more likely to use problems to stimulate group discussion than were more authoritarian counselors in custody-security positions (Kassebaum, Ward, and Wilner, 1963:7-8).

To add validity to Kassebaum, Ward, and Wilner's findings, mention should be made of a research investigation carried out in one of California's maximum-security institutions and in one of its institutions which closely corresponds to the model of a treatment-oriented prison. The sample studied was a custodial-counselor sample consisting of twenty-one counselors who had volunteered for the group counseling program. Two additional custodian groups were included for control purposes. One of the control groups was a random sample of custodians employed at another institution but not engaged in group counseling; the second control group was a sample of non-counselor custodians employed at one of California's treatment-oriented prisons. The authors felt that,

A comparison of the attitudes and perceptions of these workers with those of an appropriately matched group of peers who do not serve as counselors should indicate whether the relationships hypothesized above are valid.

Namely, we anticipated that members of the former group (custodial workers assigned the additional responsibility of counseling inmate groups) would have belief systems more congruent with the treatment enterprise than would members of the latter group (peers who do not serve as inmate counselors) (Piliavin and Vadum, 1968:37).

The conclusion of this particular study was the following:

Prison custodial officers who volunteered to counsel inmate groups were found to have attitudes toward inmates significantly more congruent with those of professionals than those of custodians who were not counselors; in addition, they were slightly more positive toward treatment personnel. The results suggest that overlap in custodial and treatment roles may be a viable device for more congruent perspectives and expectations among those carrying out these roles (ibid.:37).

Members of the California Department of Corrections and its Research Division agree that an objective evaluation of group counseling is difficult and complex. For example, no two group members are the same; each group leader is a different person and each group counseling meeting varies. Probably the major difficulty is in measuring the particular impact of the group on an inmate because of the many types of influences before a member enters a group, while he belongs to the group, and post-release influences after he stops participating in the group.

In 1960 Robert M. Harrison, Departmental Supervisor of Group Counseling, pointed out in a Review of Group Counseling that,

Qualitative improvement has been made through (a) improving the training of counselors; (b) reducing excessive turnover in group membership and leadership; (c) reducing the size of excessively large groups; (d) increasing the regularity

of attendance, and (e) providing limited feedback to counselors and groups on parole success or failure of former members (Harrison, 1960:1).

Many influences combine, as mentioned previously, to limit the effect of the group experience and limit any possible long-term success in the life of an inmate following a group counseling experience. Harrison feels that

the expectations regarding long-term impact of once a week group counseling must be conservative, when we consider the life-long negative patterns that must be modified and the many influences during a 168 hour week in the institution or in the community. However, we believe there is a cumulative increasing impact of continuous counseling, which constructively modifies the 'informal counseling' that goes on during the rest of the week (ibid.:2).

In a paper presented at the Conference on "Mental Health Aspects of Corrections" sponsored by the Massachusetts Departments of Corrections and Mental Health and the United States Public Health at Chatham Bars Inn, Harrison concluded that "it is intended that group counseling contributes to the safe confinement and smooth operation of the prisons as well as to the rehabilitation efforts. In fact, we have clearer evidence of the contributions of group counseling to the safe operation of the prison, than we do, as yet, for long-term rehabilitative benefit" (Harrison, 1960:11).

#### Pilot Studies in California's Department of Corrections Institutions

In order to do justice to the group counseling program in the California Department of Corrections, mention should be made of some of the important pilot studies carried out in several

of the prisons of California. To date, a number of active group counseling programs in several institutions have been included in a follow-up research report concerning "Clue-Hunting About Group Counseling and Parole Outcome". The authors of this extensive report and highlights of the 8,000 men studied (for example, the type of group counseling, the length of participation with one leader, research questions, definitions, theory, hypothesis, findings and recommendations) will be mentioned in connection with previous pilot studies which have contributed to the overall knowledge of the group counseling effort.

Some of the more interesting and useful pilot studies regarding various phases of testing of group counseling with inmate populations in almost all of the twelve major felon institutions in California are the following:

1. An early group process study evaluated the effect of group orientation classes in the Southern Reception Guidance Center in 1955. Park<sup>1</sup>, Lilly, Gottfredson, Feinman, Hamilton, and Cooper concluded that the program produced

changes in the personality structure of the inmates involved, as defined by the Minnesota Multi-phasic Personality Inventory (MMPI) measures. It also accomplished the aims of providing a more satisfactory attitude toward the Department of Corrections, increased the inmate's understanding of personal and social problems, and provided him with a greater degree of factual information about the penal system in general (Harrison and Mueller, 1964:7).

---

<sup>1</sup>Park, J. W. L., et. al., "Research Report on Group Orientation," Mimeographed document, California Department of Corrections, Sacramento, California, 1956.

2. Heim<sup>2</sup> found that Chino inmates, after six months of group counseling, showed "less identification with delinquent attitudes and ideas, greater probability of parole success, and more socially mature responses than inmates in a control group who were not in group counseling" (ibid.:7). 3. In a study at Folsom, January 1 through June 1956, Mechum<sup>3</sup> found that "6% of inmates in group counseling had disciplinary infractions as compared with 12% of inmates in a waiting list group; 16% of inmates showing no interest in group counseling had infractions" (ibid.:7). 4. At Soledad, between September 1955 and December 1957, Rouse and Chavez<sup>4</sup> "found a gradual reduction of infractions from 9% of the inmates a month to 3%. During this period there was a growth in group counseling participation for inmates from 0% to 67% and employee participation increased from 0% to 26%" (ibid.:7). 5. Rodgers and Heim<sup>5</sup>, in studying disciplinary cases at California Institution for Men at Chino between July 1,

---

<sup>2</sup>Heim, R., "Changes in Verbalized Attitudes Expressed by Prison Inmates Following Group Counseling," Ph.D. Dissertation, Claremont Graduate School, Claremont, California, 1956.

<sup>3</sup>Mechum, T. J., "Study of the Relationship Between Group Counseling and Disciplinary Infractions at Folsom," Mimeographed document, Folsom State Prison, Represa, California, 1956.

<sup>4</sup>Rouse, W., and Chavez, A., "Relationship Between Group Counseling and Infractions of Discipline," Mimeographed document, document, California State Prison, Soledad, California, 1956.

<sup>5</sup>Rodgers, C. L., and Heim, R., "Data Regarding Group Counseling and Disciplinary Reports," Mimeographed documents, California Institution for Men, Chino, California, 1957.

1957, "reported .086 disciplinary reports per man not in counseling during the period, as compared with .052 disciplinary reports per man in group counseling" (ibid.:7). 6. Rudoff<sup>6</sup> compared industrial work production at Deuel Vocational Institution during two periods. From July 1, 1957, to December 31, 1957, "industry staff were not leading counseling groups and the participation of inmates was voluntary" (ibid.:8). During the second period, January 1, 1958, to July 31, 1958, "when there was 100 percent participation of staff and inmates in group counseling, production increased both in terms of units produced and in dollar value" (ibid.:8). 7. In 1962, Harrison<sup>7</sup> completed a study of two-year parole outcomes by base expectancy risk group and length of participation in institutional group counseling prior to parole.

Included in the study were 4,313 adult male parolees released from all institutions of the California Department of Corrections between July 1, 1958, and June 30, 1959. No significant differences within any parole risk level were found in the two-year parole outcomes of men who had group counseling and those who had no group counseling. The overall difference slightly favored the men with no group counseling. However, subjects with group counseling were slightly over-represented in the lower parole risk levels. Only in the higher parole risk levels (high base expectancy) did parolees with long group counseling have significantly better parole outcomes, than parolees with shorter group counseling, but not significantly better than no group counseling (ibid.:8).

---

<sup>6</sup>Rudoff, Alvin, "A Report on the Effect of the Group Counseling Program on Industries at DVI," Mimeographed document, Deuel Vocational Institution, Tracy, California, 1953.

<sup>7</sup>Harrison, R. M., "Report on Group Counseling, CDC 251, Data Adjustments of 4,313 Male Adult California Parolees Released July 1, 1958, through June 30, 1959," Ditto, California Department of Corrections, Sacramento, California, 1962.



8. Bass<sup>8</sup>, et. al., "found group counselor attitudes more favorable towards rehabilitation than non-counselor attitudes in an institution with six years experience in group counseling. This was not found in an institution with six months experience in group counseling" (ibid.:8).

As part of the large research effort connected with the "California Study of Correctional Effectiveness," Alfred Katz conducted in-depth interviews with fifty-eight lay group leaders from two of the Department's institutions, one a moderate security (CIM at Chino) and the other a maximum security prison (San Quentin State Prison). Katz observed that group counseling

in its short history, has grown with amazing rapidity to unprecedented and impressive proportions. The maintenance of 'quality control' in such a burgeoning program is always difficult and requires periodic checks and evaluation.

The present study of the perceptions of limited sample of counselors at two institutions indicated enthusiastic participation on the part of the group leaders, who come from diverse backgrounds. The concepts and approaches applied in the actual leadership of groups, perceptions of the leaders' role, ideas about the dynamics of group counseling, evaluations of the types of inmates who can benefit, and the kind of discussion topics that are most helpful--all these vary widely from counselor to counselor and probably from facility to facility (Katz, 1963:289).

Katz offers some of the most helpful suggestions in the light of what others (Joseph Eaton, Gene G. Kassebaum, David A. Ward and Daniel Wilner) have discovered as weaknesses in this group treatment program. Katz feels that the next steps needed in

---

<sup>8</sup>Bass, T.; Francisco, Barbara; Frazier, T.; Jimison, T.; Lapin, Eva; and Sassano, M., "Attitudes and Role Perceptions of Correctional Officer: A Comparative Study," MSW Field Study, University of California, Berkeley, 1961.

this important social experiment "are more orientation to and in-service training for the program, greater and more regular supervision, and some further means of evaluation and study" (ibid.:289).

Clue-Hunting About Group Counseling  
And Parole Outcome

The research project by Harrison and Mueller referred to earlier called "Clue-Hunting About Group Counseling and Parole Outcome" included six studies from five institutions involving parole follow-up on 8,112 inmates. The institutions were: California Men's Colony--West, California Correctional Institution--Tehachapi, Folsom State Prison, California Institution for Men--Chino, and Deuel Vocational Institution. Harrison and Mueller worked from general and specific questions asked in this research, an initial and working definition of "stable" group counseling, a theory about stable group counseling gleaned from a series of interrelated theoretical assumptions provided in Harrison's Model For Group Counseling [see Appendix II], and the hypothesis that "men with unstable group counseling relationships would not have more favorable parole outcomes than subjects with no group counseling" (Harrison and Mueller, 1964:11).

The findings for the five California Department of Corrections institutions are significant in that "there are clues from these studies that group counseling, when well conducted, may improve inmate attitudes, reduce disciplinary difficulties, improve work production, contribute to staff development, and

increase parole success" (ibid.:iv). Harrison's and Mueller's recommendations, following their extensive study of the five California prisons, include nearly every facet of the group counseling program. Thus, these recommendations should be useful for other Department of Corrections contemplating the inclusion of group counseling sessions as part of an overall treatment program. In instituting these recommendations in any prison or correctional institution, plagued with the traditional problems of inmate corruption, inmate-staff communication problems, and line and staff conflict, particular attention should be given the Harrison Model For Group Counseling.

On the basis of the clues from the results of the six group counseling studies, the following recommendations are made:

- (1) Increase stable group counseling at institutions, camps, and parole by: (a) Increasing the length of time in group counseling with the same leader and inmate members. (b) Reducing leader and inmate member turnover in groups. (2) Continue group counseling research in the California Department of Corrections by conducting: (a) Further retrospective studies to determine types of group counseling participants associated with more favorable parole outcomes. (b) Short-term group counseling process studies. (c) Long-term studies using small, random samples, varying such factors as confidentiality, training of leaders, group size, frequency of meeting, leadership styles, and composition of groups (ibid.:35).

We can conclude the present chapter by stating that it is of particular importance in that it contains an example of the type of treatment program that has the unique possibility of including a variety of prison personnel in the treatment effort.

The system of treatment in California's major felon institutions is broad not only from the standpoint of different types of professional and nonprofessional treatment approaches, but is also organized to expand the roles of various line and staff members as well as the role of the inmate in his individual treatment group.

Administrative programs and goals for treatment are such that California prison officials give ample support and time to the development of group counseling for at least three reasons: The first one is to enhance relations between all staff (line staff included) members and members of the large inmate social system of high or low status. The technique of including custodial officers or guards in the treatment process can and should reduce the injurious "caste system" encountered in prison systems less treatment oriented.

Support is given the group counseling program in California's prisons for a second reason: to reduce to a minimum the conflict between those assigned solely to perform treatment functions and those assigned the duties of keeping watch over the inmate population to prevent agitation, disruption of schedules of production, and disciplinary infractions. Although group counseling has been proven not be a panacea in the event of reoccurring inmate problems and staff conflict, group counseling programs provide an opportunity for overlap in the roles of professional and nonprofessional prison personnel.

Thus, it is hypothesized here that a program that advances the role of nonprofessional lay personnel as group counseling leaders, under the professional guidance of psychiatrists or psychologists, should advance the treatment goal of the prison. This places more authority in the officials who are spokesmen for treatment interests (professional administrators, psychiatrists, psychologists, and others) and decentralizes the treatment activity, so as to increase the extent to which all staff (custodial personnel and other nonprofessional line personnel) in contact with inmates have a strong interest in treatment.

The experience in California's prisons in reducing the traditional conflict between professional treatment therapists and lower line officers is best summarized in the following statements by Dr. Norman Fenton, past Deputy Director of Classification and Treatment in the California Department of Corrections, who states that:

For the first time in many prisons, the members of the so-called custodial and training staffs have taken over certain functions, recognized as treatment. The custodial staff engaged in the supervision of inmates continue to accept their responsibilities for the orderly operation of the institution. Experience has already shown that group counseling not only provides treatment functions that are shared by all staff members but that after its introduction there is greater evidence of mutual cooperation of those responsible primarily for treatment and those responsible for custodial operations throughout the institution. Group counseling has not only affected the activities of correctional officers, teachers, tradesmen and other staff members; it has also increased the general acceptance and importance of the clinical specialists. Reading the studies of inmates in the case files has given group leaders increased respect for the contributions to the institutional program of the psychiatrist, psychologist and the social worker (Fenton, 1965:84).

There are possibly a number of other important and valid reasons for supporting an extensive group counseling program of the type already described in California's prisons, if introduced as a piecemeal innovation to fit in with already established treatment procedures. If introduced in this manner, with in-service training and research follow-up as active parts to aid the development and test the validity of this type of rehabilitative technique, group counseling should gain acceptance by a majority of prison personnel and inmates interested in their own rehabilitation. Support for small and increasingly bigger research efforts into all aspects of the counseling movement, then, is the third reason for supporting prison administrative policy interested in the type of prison program that has the potential of advancing the goal of treatment assigned to all prison institutions.



## CHAPTER VI

### SUMMARY

This report challenges the traditional acceptance of the idea that the nonprofessional guard or custodial officer should continue to be excluded from participating in the treatment process. Recent innovations in the correctional field include the use of custodial officers as group leaders and follow-up research concerning the group counseling process and its effect on the inmate's rehabilitation. Thus, treatment-minded correctional administrators need not exclude this potential source of therapist for lack of either a program that fits in with older methods of treatment or a program that does not provide the custodial officer with an active role in the treatment process.

The above model of treatment implies at least two things. First, any new treatment approach must compete with all other established treatment procedures. Group counseling is not so different from group therapy in that it, like group therapy, stresses the importance of the group approach to treatment. Also, group counseling does not seek its therapists from those trained to carry out individual or group therapy. The group counseling program is designed so that group leaders are sought from the force of custodial officers interested in participating in one important phase of the rehabilitation program. Second,

a group counseling program clearly implies a new role for the custodial officer and the inmate. Even though a certain amount of fear and suspicion will always exist between the custodial officer and inmate, group counseling offers the dual opportunity for the inmate to study his present and past attitudes and actions and for the group leader to bring the forces of the group to a concensus about acceptable standards of behavior. This type of sympathetic group process allows the custodial officer and the inmate time to exchange views and know each other better. A few of the goals of group counseling are to help prisoners learn how to adjust to the frustrations which are an inescapable part of life, recognize how emotional conflicts underlie and trigger criminal behavior, give the inmate an opportunity to learn from his peers what others think of him, and the advancement of inmates toward more realistic attitudes toward life.

The five recommendations that follow are for correctional administrators contemplating the inclusion of group counseling as part of an overall system of treatment. These recommendations are based on substantial research findings that the unofficial social system of inmates and the official social system of prison officers (those closest to the inmate) are far less autonomous than official administrators or inmates would like to believe. Secondly, these recommendations are based on the understanding that the program known as group counseling will be supportive rather than antagonistic of existing approaches

to treatment.

- (1) Training manuals should include enough material to stimulate the lay counselor to want to read more to improve counselor skills. This is centered around an individual approach designed to bring out "latent strengths" in the inmate.
- (2) Part of the goal of counselor training should allow the nonprofessional lay counselor a view of what his role will be like in conjunction with his advisors who will often be professional therapists.
- (3) A group counseling program should be designed so that there is a minimum amount of turnover in group counseling leaders and inmate volunteers.
- (4) A group counseling program will experience the greatest success if it attempts to learn from the experiences of individual psychotherapy and group psychotherapy as older and more experienced approaches to reforming the imprisoned inmate. At the beginning, group counseling supervisors should seek the intelligent and enthusiastic support of the various categories of institutional personnel. This allows for greater communication of understanding concerning the needs of the inmate as well as the needs of the correctional institution.
- (5) A fifth and last recommendation has to do with a follow-up program into the effects of group counseling on such things as institutional morale, disciplinary infractions, and whether or not this treatment approach, in conjunction with the other treatment approaches, reduces recidivism. Follow-up research of this kind will be very difficult at first but improvements can be made by striving for precise definitions and adequate samples of inmate experimental and control groups. The possibility exists of exchanging findings with other prisons who have experimented with group counseling. An active research division should make the results of any investigation into the effects of group counseling known to all prison staff.

## REFERENCES

- American Correctional Association.  
1962 Manual of Correctional Standards. New York: American Correctional Association.
- Bixby, F. Lovell and Lloyd W. McCorkle.  
1950 "Applying the principles of group therapy in correctional institutions." Federal Probation 14 (March):36-40.
- Cloward, Richard A.  
1960 "Social control in the prison." Pp. 20-48 in Richard A. Cloward, Donald R. Cressey, George H. Grosser, Richard McCleery, Lloyd E. Ohlin, Gresham M. Sykes and Sheldon L. Messinger (eds.), Theoretical Studies in Social Organization of the Prison. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Conrad, John P.  
1967 Crime and Its Correction: An International Survey of Attitudes and Practices. Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Cressey, Donald R.  
1954 "Contradictory theories in correctional group therapy programs." Federal Probation 18:20-26.
- Cressey, Donald R.  
1960 "Limitations on organization of treatment in the modern prison." Pp. 78-110 in Richard A. Cloward, Donald R. Cressey, George H. Grosser, Richard McCleery, Lloyd E. Ohlin, Gresham M. Sykes and Sheldon L. Messinger (eds.), Theoretical Studies in Social Organization of the Prison. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Cressey, Donald R.  
1965 "Prison organizations." Pp. 1023-1070 in James G. March (ed.), Handbook of Organizations. Chicago: Rand McNally and Company.
- Cressey, Donald R.  
1966 "Changing criminals: The application of the theory of differential association." Pp. 467-471 in Rose Giallombardo (ed.), Juvenile Delinquency: A Book of Readings. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.
- Cressey, Donald R.  
1968 "Sources of resistance to the use of offenders and ex-offenders in the correctional process." Pp. 31-49 in Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training. Report of a Seminar convened by the Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training, Washington, D. C. March 7-8.

- Etzioni, Amitai.  
1964 Modern Organizations. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Fenton, Norman.  
1963 "Counseling in correctional work." Pp. 438-463 in Ernest Harms and Paul Schreiber (eds.), Handbook of Counseling Techniques. New York: The MacMillan Company.
- Fenton, Norman.  
1965 An Introduction to Group Counseling in a Correctional Setting. State of California: Youth and Adult Corrections Agency. Department of Corrections.
- Galtung, Johan.  
1961 "Prison: The organization of dilemma." Pp. 107-145 in Cressey, Donald R. (ed.), The Prison: Studies in Institutional Organization and Change. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.
- Garritty, Donald L.  
1961 "The prison as a rehabilitation agency." Pp. 358-380 in Donald R. Cressey (ed.), The Prison: Studies in Institutional Organization and Change. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.
- Gibbons, Don C.  
1965 Changing the Lawbreaker. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Gibbons, Don C.  
1968 Society, Crime and Criminal Careers. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Glaser, Daniel.  
1964 The Effectiveness of a Prison and Parole System. New York: The Bobbs-Merrill Company, Inc.
- Grosser, George H.  
1960 "External setting and internal relations of the prison." Pp. 130-144 in Richard A. Cloward, Donald R. Cressey, George H. Grosser, Richard McCleery, Lloyd E. Ohlin, Gresham M. Sykes and Sheldon L. Messinger (eds.), Theoretical Studies in Social Organization of the Prison. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Grosser, George H.  
1968 "The role of informal inmate groups in change of values." Pp. 298-307 in Lawrence E. Hazelrigg (ed.), Prison Within Society: A Reader in Penology. New York: Doubleday and Company, Inc.

Guthrie, Phil.

1968 "California Department of Corrections." American Journal of Correction 30 (July-August):18-23.

Harrison, Robert M.

1960 "Mental health applications in the California correctional system." Paper presented at the conference on "Mental Health Aspects of Corrections" sponsored by the Massachusetts Departments of Corrections and Mental Health at Chatham Bars Inn, Cape Cod, Massachusetts, on June 4, 1960.

Harrison, Robert M.

1960 Review of Group Counseling: 1957, 1958, and 1959. Sacramento, California: California Department of Corrections.

Harrison, Robert M.

1963 "An overview of group counseling in the California Department of Corrections." Pp. 361-370 in Proceedings of the Ninety-Third Annual Congress of Correction of the American Correctional Association. Portland, Oregon. August 25-29.

Harrison, Robert M. and Paul F. C. Mueller.

1964 "Clue-hunting about group counseling and parole outcome." Pp. 1-45. Research Report Number 11. Research Division. State of California: Youth and Adult Corrections Agency, Department of Corrections.

Johnson, Elmer Hubert.

1964 Crime, Correction, and Society. Illinois: The Dorsey Press.

Kassebaum, Gene G., David A. Ward, and Daniel M. Wilner.

1963 Group Treatment By Correctional Personnel: A Survey of the California Department of Corrections. Board of Corrections. Monograph Number 3. State of California: Youth and Adult Corrections Agency.

Katz, Alfred H.

1963 "Lay group counseling." Crime and Delinquency 9 (July):282-289.

McCorkle, Lloyd W.

1952 "Group therapy in the treatment of offenders." Federal Probation 16 (December):22-27.

McCorkle, Lloyd W.

1953 "The present status of group therapy in United States correctional institutions." International Journal of Group Psychotherapy 3 (April):79-86.



- McCorkle, Lloyd W. and Richard Korn.  
1954 "Resocialization within walls." The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science 293 (May):88-98.
- McCorkle, Lloyd W. and Albert Elias.  
1960 "Group therapy in correctional institutions." Federal Probation 24 (June):57-63.
- Ohlin, Lloyd E.  
1956 Sociology and the Field of Corrections. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Piliavin, Irving M. and Arlene C. Vadum.  
1968 "Reducing discrepancies in professional and custodial perspectives." Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency 5 (January):35-43.
- Reckless, Walter C.  
1955 "The impact of correctional programmes on inmates." The British Journal of Delinquency VI (September):138-147.
- Richmond, Marks.  
1965 Prison Profiles. New York: Oceana Publications, Inc.
- Schrag, Clarence.  
1961 "Some foundations for a theory of correction." Pp. 309-357 in Donald R. Cressey (ed.). The Prison: Studies in Institutional Organization and Change. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.
- Schrag, Clarence.  
1964 "Leadership among prison inmates." Pp. 536-542 in David Dresser (ed.), Readings in Criminology and Penology. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Seliger, Stephen G.  
1969 "Toward a realistic reorganization of the penitentiaries." Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology, and Police Science 60 (March):47-58.
- Sutherland, Edwin H. and Donald R. Cressey.  
1966 Principles of Criminology, 7th ed. New York: J. B. Lippincott Company.
- Sykes, Gresham M.  
1956 "The corruption of authority and rehabilitation." Social Forces 34 (March):257-262.

- Sykes, Gresham M.  
1958 *The Society of Captives*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Sykes, Gresham M. and Sheldon L. Messinger.  
1960 "The inmate social system." Pp. 5-19 in Richard A. Cloward, Donald R. Cressey, George H. Grosser, Richard McCleery, Lloyd E. Ohlin, Gresham M. Sykes and Sheldon L. Messinger (eds.), *Theoretical Studies in Social Organization of the Prison*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Tappan, Paul W.  
1960 *Crime, Justice and Correction*. New York: McGraw-Hill Company, Inc.
- The President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice  
1967 *Task Force Report: Corrections*. Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office.
- Weinberg, S. Kirson.  
1953 "Aspects of the prison's social structure." Pp. 560-573 in Clyde B. Vedder, Samuel Koenig, and Robert E. Clark (eds.), *Criminology: A Book of Readings*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.
- Wheeler, Stanton.  
1961 "Role conflict in correctional communities." Pp. 229-259 in Donald R. Cressey (ed.), *The Prison: Studies in Institutional Organization and Change*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.

APPENDIX I

DECLARATION OF PRINCIPLES

# DECLARATION OF PRINCIPLES OF THE AMERICAN CORRECTIONAL ASSOCIATION\*

as adopted by the American Congress of Correction  
1960

The 90th Annual Congress of Correction of the American Correctional Association and the Editors of the American Journal of Correction on behalf of the members of the Association wish to express their deep appreciation for the long and arduous months of unselfish and competent labor spent by the Committee on the Revision of the Declaration of Principles which resulted in such a clear and enlightened statement of the Association's purposes and ideals. This is the first revision since 1930, and from a careful reading it may be doubted that any revision will be needed for a great many years.

Our sincerest thanks to Dr. Peter P. Lejins, Chairman, Richard A. McGee, and Dr. Benjamin Frank.

## PREAMBLE

The American Congress of Correction, to reaffirm the basic ideals and aspirations of its membership, to encourage a more enlightened criminal justice in our society, to promote improved practices in the treatment of adult and juvenile offenders, and to rededicate its membership to the high purposes stated by its founding leaders in 1870, does adopt this revised Declaration of Principles.

Principle I. The prevention and control of crime and delinquency are urgent challenges to the social sciences. The growing body of scientific knowledge, coupled with the practical wisdom and skill of those professionally engaged in society's struggle with the problem of criminality, provide the soundest basis for effective action.

Principle II. The forces for the prevention and control of crime and delinquency ultimately must find their strength from the constructive qualities of the society itself. The properly functioning basic institutions--such as the family, the school and the church, as well as the economic and political institutions--and a society united in the pursuit of worthwhile goals are the best guarantees against crime and delinquency. The willingness of the society to maintain a rationally organized and properly financed system of corrections, directed toward the reclamation of criminals and juvenile delinquents, is a prerequisite of effective control.

---

\*Eaton, Joseph W., Stone Walls Not A Prison Make. Illinois: Charles C. Thomas, Pub., 1962, pp. 201-208.

Principle III. Both punishment and correction are at present our methods of preventing and controlling crime and delinquency. Further improvement and expansion of the correctional methods should be the generally accepted goal, fully in line with the spirit of the penal reform of the past century and our current correctional progress.

Principle IV. Traditionally, violators of the criminal law have been differentiated into those who are mentally sick and should be handled as such and those who are considered criminally responsible. The best legal and psychiatric knowledge should be employed to define this distinction.

Principle V. Until the guilt of the suspected offender has been established in the course of due process of law, he should be considered innocent and his rights as a free citizen should be respected, except for such restraints as are indispensable to insure the proper investigation and trial.

Principle VI. If, as a result of a miscarriage of justice, an individual has been made to suffer, he should receive reasonable indemnification.

Principle VII. The correctional facilities, comprising both institutional and non-institutional treatment--probation and parole--should be planned and organized as an integrated system under a central authority responsible for guiding, controlling, unifying and vitalizing the whole.

Principle VIII. The variety of treatment programs corresponding to the different needs of the offenders suggests a diversification of correctional institutions resulting in a system of specialized institutions so classified and coordinated and so organized in staff and program as to meet the needs of those offenders who present specific problems. The spirit of continued experimentation with new types of institutions and agencies which show promise of more effective results should be encouraged and supported.

Principle IX. Repeated short sentences imposed for recurring misdemeanors or petty offenses, are ineffective, both as means of correction and as a punitive deterrent. These sentences often are a contributing factor in the career of the petty recidivist. An integrated system of control by means of special institutional facilities and community supervision is essential for the solution of this problem. Further research and experimentation with agencies and institutions of other than the conventional type offer the greatest promise.

Principle X. The architecture and construction of penal and correction institutions should be functionally related to the programs to be carried on in them. The great variety of existing programs, to be further diversified in the future, indicates the need for a similar variety and flexibility of architectural design and type of construction. The building standards and technological advances of the day should be re-

flected in these institutions. The current skepticism about inordinately large institutions suggests the desirability of institutions of moderate size, which may be more costly to build and operate, but which lend themselves better to the fulfillment of the objectives of a good correctional institutional program.

Principle XI. The organization and administration of correctional institutions and agencies is one of the more complex areas of public administration and deals with one of the most involved of social problems. It is essential that the administration of the correctional agencies meet the highest standards of public administration and that all employees be selected in accordance with the best available criteria and serve on the basis of merit and tenure systems.

Principle XII. The special and complex problems characteristic of criminal and delinquent behavior imply the need for suitable personality traits and specialized skills on the part of the personnel and hence the need for special professional education and training of a high standard, including pre-service and continued in-service training.

Principle XIII. Correctional institutions and agencies can best achieve their goal of rehabilitation by focusing their attention and resources on the complete study and evaluation of the individual offender and by following a program of individualized treatment.

Principle XIV. The sentence or disposition determining the treatment for the offender should be based on a full consideration of the social and personality factors of the particular individual.

In the many jurisdictions these investigations may be made at different levels, so long as the essential information is available to the court or treatment authority at the time crucial case decisions are to be made.

Principle XV. A punitive sentence should properly be commensurate with the seriousness of the offense and the guilt of the offender. Inequality of such sentences for the same or similar crimes is always experienced as an injustice both by the offender and the society. On the other hand, the length of the correctional treatment given the offender for purposes of rehabilitation depends on the circumstances and characteristics of the particular offender and may have no relationship to the seriousness of the crime committed. In a correctionally oriented system of crime control, the indeterminate sentence administered by qualified personnel offers the best solution.

Principle XVI. The principles of humanity and human dignity to which we subscribe, as well as the purposes of rehabilitation require that the offenders while under the jurisdiction of the law enforcement and correctional agencies, be accorded the generally accepted standards of decent living and decent human relations.



Their food, clothing and shelter should not be allowed to fall below the generally accepted standards, and they should be afforded the conventional conveniences made possible by our technological progress. Their health needs--both physical and mental--should be met in accordance with the best medical standards. Recreation should be recognized as a wholesome element of normal life.

Principle XVII. Religion represents a rich resource in the moral and spiritual regeneration of mankind. Especially trained chaplains, religious instruction and counseling, together with adequate facilities for group worship of the inmate's own choice, are essential elements in the program of a correctional institution.

Principle XVIII. Rewards for conformance to the highest values of our culture should be given precedence over fear of punishment in guiding the development of human character in correctional systems as well as in society at large. Enlightened self-interest must be emphasized and made operative at all times.

Principle XIX. No law, procedure or system of correction should deprive any offender of the hope and the possibility of his ultimate return to full, responsible membership in society.

Principle XX. Moral forces, organized persuasion and scientific treatment should be relied upon in the control and management of offenders, with as little dependence upon physical force as possible.

Principle XXI. The task of evaluating the individual offender and developing the most appropriate treatment program must draw upon all the available knowledge and professional skill represented by sociology, psychology, psychiatry, social case work and related disciplines. Specialists and technicians from these fields must be welded into a diagnostic and treatment team by competent administrators, so that the disciplines they represent may become the core of the correctional treatment program.

Principle XXII. To assure the eventual restoration of the offender as an economically self-sustaining member of the community, the correctional program must make available to each inmate every opportunity to raise his educational level, improve his vocational competence and skills, and add to his information meaningful knowledge about the world and the society in which he must live.

Principle XXIII. To hold employable offenders in correctional institutions without the opportunity to engage in productive work is to violate one of the essential objectives of rehabilitation. Without in any way exploiting the labor of involuntary confinees for financial gain, or unduly interfering with free enterprise, it is not only possible but imperative

that all governmental jurisdictions give full cooperation to the establishment of productive work programs with a view to imparting acceptable work skills, habits, attitudes and work discipline.

Principle XXIV. Some of the criminal law violators who are found by the courts to be criminally responsible, but who are abnormal from the point of view of the modern disciplines of psychiatry and psychology, are in need of psychotherapy. Diagnostic and treatment facilities for such mentally abnormal offenders should be further developed at the appropriate stages of the correctional process.

Psychiatric and psychological services should be provided for the pre-sentence investigations of the courts; out-patient clinics for the use of the non-institutional treatment agencies--probation and parole; and psychiatric and psychological services within the penal and correctional institutions, even to the extent of developing special institutions for this type of offender.

Principle XXV. Recent research in the community aspects of the institutional populations suggests the importance of the group approach to the problem of correctional treatment. There is a need for more attention to the implications of this new method as well as the need to support and promote experiments and demonstration projects.

Principle XXVI. The exercise of executive clemency in the pardon of criminals is a question of great delicacy and difficulty. The use of this power should be limited largely to cases of wrongful conviction, or of excessive sentences constituting injustice, or, in rare instances, where extreme hardship is involved and executive dispensation is warranted. The practice of releasing large numbers of prisoners by executive clemency is generally condemned. The use of executive clemency or pardon to restore civil rights to a fully rehabilitated person who has established a record of responsible living for a period of years is, on the other hand, to be commended.

Principle XXVII. Suitable employment for a discharged or paroled offender is one of the major factors in his rehabilitation and the regaining of his lost position in society. The most forceful efforts and comprehensive methods should be exercised to secure such work. An understanding, favorable attitude and the participation of organized labor and management should be actively sought.

Principle XXVIII. Probation has come to be accepted as the most efficient and economical method of treatment for a great number of offenders. To enhance the achievement of the full potentialities of probation, mandatory exceptions to the use of probation with respect to specific crimes or to types of offenders should be eliminated from the statutes.

Current research indicates great possibilities for developing specific types and degrees of probationary supervision adapted to the needs of the individual offender.

Principle XXIX. With a few possible exceptions, all offenders released from correctional institutions should be released under parole supervision, and parole should be granted at the earliest date consistent with public safety and the needs of rehabilitation. Decisions pertaining to an individual's parole should be made by a professionally competent board. The type and degree of supervision should be adapted to the needs of the individual offender.

Principle XXX. The collection and publication of criminal statistics designed to provide information on the extent and nature of criminality and juvenile delinquency and on the various phases of the correctional process is indispensable for the understanding of crime and for the planning and evaluation of correctional and preventive measures.

Such statistics are necessary and should be developed on the national, state and local levels and should consist of statistics of the offenses known to the police, arrest statistics as well as criminal career records.

Principle XXXI. Research and the scientific study of the problems of juvenile delinquency and criminality and of the methods of dealing with these are essential prerequisites for progress. Through its educational, research and government institutions society should sponsor, finance and carry out both basic and applied research in this area. The law enforcement and correctional institutions and agencies should lend their support, take initiative and themselves engage in appropriate research as an indispensable part of their effort to improve their performance.

Principle XXXII. In a democracy the success of any public agency, including that of correctional institutions and agencies, depends in the final analysis on popular support. An adequate financial base, emphasis on the adequacy of personnel and, in general, insistence of an alert and progressive administration in corrections is the responsibility of the public and a function of its enlightened concern with crime and delinquency problems.

Principle XXXIII. The correctional process has as its aim the re-incorporation of the offender into the society as a normal citizen. In the course of non-institutional treatment the offender continues as a member of the conventional community. In the course of his institutional stay constructive community contacts should be encouraged. The success of the correctional process in all its stages can be greatly enhanced by energetic, resourceful and organized citizen participation.

## APPENDIX II

### MODEL FOR GROUP COUNSELING

## MODEL FOR GROUP COUNSELING\*

Robert M. Harrison

Departmental Supervisor  
of Group Counseling

### I. Purpose of Model

The purpose of this model is to provide a tentative hypothetical framework for group counseling to be used in research and in counselor training. It will be modified as a result of further discussion, observation, and experience with group counseling. The model is in the form of a series of inter-related hypothetical assumptions.

### II. Definition of Group Counseling

Group counseling is a form of supportive group treatment. It is focused on past and present conscious reality experiences and problems, as well as future goals. It builds on the strengths of the members and modifies the attitudes and feelings which have contributed to criminal behavior. Basic personality change is not the objective of group counseling. The goal is to improve the attitudes and social adjustment of inmates and parolees.

### III. Who Provides Group Counseling

Group counseling is provided by career correctional employees from personnel classes which have the most sustained contact with inmates. These include correctional officers, vocational and academic teachers, work foremen in prison industry, maintenance and business services, correctional counselors, and others. The majority of these employees are not hired primarily as counselors nor are they trained in one of the clinical disciplines of psychiatry, clinical psychology, or social work.

### IV. Group Counseling Distinguished from Group Psychotherapy

Group psychotherapy performed by psychiatrists, psychologists and social workers in psychiatric hospitals, clinics, and offices, is generally a deeper form of group treatment than group counseling, having as an objective the resolution of intrapsychic conflicts by bringing them into consciousness.

---

\*Harrison, Robert M., and Paul F. C. Mueller, "Clue-Hunting About Group Counseling and Parole Outcome," Research Report No. 11. Research Division. Department of Corrections. Youth and Adult Corrections Agency, State of California, May 1964, pp. 40-45.



## V. Assumptions Regarding Counseling Goals

1. Realistic Limits - Group counseling will be most constructive when the counselor functions within realistic limits of the group counseling program and of his own experience and training. In general, counselors can be expected to listen, moderate, draw out diverse feelings and points of view, reflect feelings, help evaluate past and present experiences and future goals. It is not valid to expect group counselors to probe into unconscious areas, or to make dynamic interpretations in order to resolve unconscious conflicts.
2. Social Control and Group Control - The legally established goal of the Department is social control, to bring the behavior of inmates and parolees within legal limits. Social control is primarily a matter of group control and may be strengthened through living groups, work groups, school groups, recreation groups, church groups, and counseling and therapy groups. Group counseling changes somewhat the small group structure of the prison social system by cutting across the communication and relationship barriers between inmates and personnel.
3. Groupness and Group Goals - The effectiveness of group counseling in promoting social control will depend on the opportunity for safe member interaction and on the level of "groupness" (identification and interdependence) that develops, and whether group goals or norms develop within legal limits.
4. Resolution of Authority Problems by Constructively Modifying Employee - Inmate Relationships - Group counseling utilizes the small group method to improve the relationships between correctional employees and inmates or parolees. Stated in role terms this is a way of improving the relationship between the "prisoner" and "his keeper." The keeper is an emotionally significant person to the prisoner and represents authority, restraining force, law and order, and society in general. Through this key relationship within the small group, over a period of time, some problems with authority may be resolved, making for safer custody within the institution and improved relationships later with other authority figures such as the policeman on the beat, or the foreman on the job.



## VI. Assumptions Regarding the Counselor

1. Counselor Qualities - Important qualities of counselors to foster the development of "groupness" and constructive group goals are:
  - a. Sincerity,
  - b. Sensitivity,
  - c. Reliability,
  - d. Adequate intelligence,
  - e. Conviction that people can grow and change,
  - f. Patience,
  - g. Ability to tolerate ambiguity,
  - h. Liking for people and interest in human nature,
  - i. Ability to set limits consistently and handle authority comfortably,
  - j. Integrity,
  - k. Naturalness,
  - l. Ability to relate easily and freely with a wide range of people,
  - m. Satisfactory performance on regular job,
  - n. Acceptance of self and respect for own job role.
2. Counselor Preparation - The basic preparation for the successful group counselor comes from: (a) meaningful past group experiences including such family roles as child, parent, uncle, and from success experiences as member and leader in both formal and informal groups such as work groups, school groups, play groups, church groups, lodges, clubs, interest groups, athletic groups, unions, etc.; (b) special training and experience in correctional work; (c) special training in group counseling prior to taking group through lectures, discussions, reading, and observing groups.
3. Own Style - Each counselor should endeavor to develop his own style of counseling in keeping with his personality, his job role, and the needs of the group at the time. The counselor should be accepting of himself and his role and should not endeavor to be something that he isn't, nor attempt to do things that he cannot do validly. He should not attempt to put on a special "counselor personality." A correctional officer, for instance, should not attempt to be a "junior psychiatrist."
4. Work Role of the Counselor - The nature and effectiveness of the counselor will depend in part on the work role of the counselor. Thus it is assumed that a

correctional officer does represent authority, and that much of the interplay will involve a testing of authority and a working through of feelings towards authority. A vocational teacher, on the other hand, while representing authority to an extent, will also represent a specific vocational role and work goal.

## VII. Assumptions Regarding the Group

1. Small Size - In a small group (8 to 15 members) there is more opportunity for the group to become a psychological unit and promote "groupness" with all members aware who belongs, and with opportunity for self-expression, interaction, and the playing of shifting roles in the group.
2. Consistent Membership and Leadership - Only with relatively consistent membership and leadership can we expect members to feel safe to express themselves freely, develop a feeling of belonging, and work through difficult interpersonal problems. It takes time for the reidentification process to take place. Effective counseling relationships are frequently hard to develop and easy to destroy.
3. Criteria for Grouping - Moderate differences among group members tend to contribute to group effectiveness. Communication and interaction is stimulated by moderate differences in important characteristics as age, crime pattern, intelligence, vocational background, maturity, and social class. Very large differences among group members and also between members and leaders tend to reduce communication and to limit group effectiveness.
4. Who Can Benefit - Most inmates and perhaps most parolees can benefit from group counseling. Group counseling may in some instances prepare and motivate inmates for group psychotherapy. Where basic personality change is essential for successful functioning within law, deeper forms of treatment than group counseling are needed.

## VIII. Assumptions Regarding the Counseling Process

1. How Group Counseling May Be Effective - Group counseling may constructively modify member thinking, feeling, and behavior through:

- a. Positive identification with (and imitation of) the leader as an authority figure,
  - b. Development of "groupness" (identification and inter-dependence) and a feeling of belonging. Through the "lad on lad" effect (which is the conscious or unconscious impact of members on each other) in correcting member attitudes which are inconsistent, inappropriate, self-defeating and not in keeping with developing group norms or goals,
  - c. Through the use of the group as a mirror to help members see themselves, to increase self-understanding, and develop a more realistic self-perception,
  - d. Slowing down in member thought and reactions,
  - e. Practice in goal setting and problem solving,
  - f. Experience in self-expression,
  - g. Catharsis and reduction of tension.
2. Antidote - Group counseling may be seen as a partial antidote for:
  - a. Past emotional traumas and deprivations,
  - b. The negative form of inmate led and criminally oriented group counseling which has been going on in jails and prisons since they first started.
3. Temporarily Replace Community Groups - Group membership is essential to personally satisfying and socially constructive living. Counseling groups in the prison situation may to an extent temporarily replace family groups, interest groups, organizations, clubs, and other formal and informal groups. Parole counseling groups may be stepping stones to prepare the way for participation in other community groups.
4. Impact Beyond Group Situation - The impact of group counseling is extended beyond the actual group situation. Discussions started in the formal group are extended to informal inmate groups and other groups. Improved inmate attitudes toward the counselor extend

in part to other employees. When employees see inmates in their group as total individuals this tends to improve the perceptions and relationships with other inmates. The counseling group serves as a catalytic agent to stimulate self-study and study of others.

5. Ups and Downs - Groups will have their ups and downs in the amount of interaction in personally meaningful areas. The social facilitation of the group may stimulate more self-revelation and dropping of defenses than individuals can comfortably tolerate and this may be followed by a period of withdrawal and guarded participation. If members find, however, through testing of leader and the group, that they do not "get burned" they may, over a period of time, increasingly express themselves and drop defenses.
6. Stages - The stages in the counseling process are assumed to be:
  - a. Socialization - which is typified by superficial interaction and testing,
  - b. Expressive - which is typified by the expression of feeling,
  - c. Evaluative or Analytic - which is typified by self-study and study of others, and an attempt to evaluate the nature and appropriateness of the feelings expressed. (Analysis of the genesis of inappropriate feelings is generally limited to group psychotherapy),
  - d. Integrative - which is typified by the integration of what is learned, and by goal setting.

These stages are not clear cut, and overlap. Essentially there may be a progression through these stages on the part of members although there will be some elements of all stages throughout the counseling process. The group as a whole may go through this together if membership is consistent, thus increasing the group impact on all members.

7. Time Required for Benefit - Short-term benefits may be obtained from short-term counseling groups. Lasting benefits generally require longer periods of counseling. Long-term and deep-seated delinquent patterns may take considerable time to modify. In terms of reduction of recidivism, expectations regarding the counseling con-

tribution as a single factor are conservative, and these limited benefits are expected only as a result of a year or more, and with more difficult cases two or more years of group counseling.

8. Confidentiality - Whether or not the counselor writes reports on members for the record and the Adult Authority has considerable impact on the group process. Constructive counseling can be provided in both confidential and non-confidential groups, with certain special benefits from each. The writing of reports by the counselor may stimulate or force inmates to face certain things more realistically and to work through certain feelings with a person who is, in fact, an authority figure. On the other hand, the writing of reports may cut off honest expression and replace it either with guarded participation or a rather frantic, forced and unreal participation. Report writing may be an open invitation to manipulation and play acting. Corrective interaction by peers may not develop as in the confidential groups, or may be presented in a sham way. The confidential group offers the safest place where an inmate can ventilate, and also a place where he can relate to a free man on a more equal basis. The confidential counselor may assume more substitute father or uncle roles, while the report-writing counselor plays more the rating or grading teacher or boss role. To gain the benefits from these different kinds of experiences the inmate may be in both kinds of groups at the same time or at different times. The rating relationship is common to other prison situations; the confidential relationship is a unique contribution of group counseling.
9. Cumulative Effect - A cumulative effect increasing the constructive short-term and long-term contribution of group counseling develops as counselors gain competence by doing and by training and as increasing numbers of inmates gain benefits, become culture carriers, and imitate and support the leader within the group and outside in the informal inmate group situations.

GROUP COUNSELING: A MODERN APPROACH TO  
REFORMING THE IMPRISONED INMATE

by

JOHN BLAINE WILT

B. A., Kansas State University, 1968

---

AN ABSTRACT OF A MASTER'S REPORT

submitted in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree

MASTER OF ARTS

Department of Sociology and Anthropology

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY  
Manhattan, Kansas

1970



This study of prison organization is designed to show the feasibility of a new order in the approach to treating imprisoned inmates: namely, utilizing custodial personnel as leaders of group counseling groups. Particular attention was given to the arrangement of treatment activities in the traditional prison as opposed to a newer arrangement that enlarges the scope of the roles assigned to custodial and treatment workers so that they overlap.

In this country, prisons have evolved into one of two main types: punitive-custodial or treatment-oriented. The former prison system has its roots in a century and a half old struggle over the merits of mass handling techniques which have largely kept the prisoner isolated from the larger social order. Within such a system there has always developed an internal struggle between the official social system and the weaker unofficial social system of inmates. Consensus in satisfying inmate needs is typically based on the authority of guards who are expected to perform both custodial and treatment functions. Furthermore, treatment staff in the punitive-custodial prison are employed more for the sake of prestige than for any other reason and treatment programs are largely carried out on paper.

Fewer prisons in the United States are of the treatment-oriented type. Of the approximately 358 prisons in this country, only a dozen or so qualify as treatment-oriented. Here punitive conditions have been mitigated in favor of treatment. Deviance on the part of inmates is regarded as unintentional and the

relaxed-disciplined approach is thought to be the best posture for custodians in an institution dedicated to the goal of treatment.

An important area of investigation in this paper is concerned with relationships among inmates and staff. Despite some cohesion of small groups of inmates when in conflict with staff, significant findings from research investigations suggest that, on the whole: Voluntary isolation of inmates from each other varies directly with their isolation from officers. Thus, instead of merely a relaxed-disciplined approach to treating inmates, it was proposed that staff positions need to be altered to the point where it becomes feasible to allow interaction to become more personal and a longer time period made available during which staff members, especially treatment staff members, can develop variety and depth in their relationships to an inmate.

It was shown that, in the light of an inadequate therapist-inmate ratio, individual psychotherapy has done little to improve the rehabilitative potential of the prison. Likewise, group therapy has certain limitations. First, there is a shortage of professionally trained therapists who can handle enough groups to make this type of treatment worthwhile. Second, there are at least three different types of group therapy available in prisons. This tends to confuse other staff personnel, especially custodial, as to the actual differences between individual and

group therapy.

A final chapter gives brief consideration to the group counseling movement in California's prisons. This program is so arranged that professional staff personnel as well as custodial officers can take an active role in group counseling sessions. Group counseling sessions allow the custodial officer, for example, the time that is needed and a place in order to demonstrate sincere and sustained concern for and confidence in the offender's rehabilitation. An extensive group counseling program, of the type in California's prisons, also allows for a better working relationship among all line and staff personnel in contact with the inmates.