

EX-INMATES' PERSPECTIVES ON INFORMAL METHODS OF CONTROL UTILIZED BY
CORRECTIONAL OFFICERS

By

SASKIA DANIELE SANTOS

A THESIS PRESENTED TO THE GRADUATE SCHOOL
OF THE UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT
OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF
MASTER OF ARTS

UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA

2007

© 2007 Saskia Daniele Santos

To my brother, Alex

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I thank the members of this thesis committee: Dr. Jodi Lane, Dr. Angela R. Gover, and Dr. Lon Lanza-Kaduce. I was incredibly lucky to have a committee comprised of truly exceptional people, who offered endless amounts of support and guidance. I especially thank my mentor and thesis chair, Dr Jodi Lane. This project would not have been possible without Dr. Lane's effort, time and willingness to direct this thesis.

I owe many thanks to both of my parents for their constant love and encouragement and I am indebted to Robert French for always reminding me it was possible.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>page</u>
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	4
LIST OF TABLES	7
ABSTRACT	8
CHAPTER	
1 INTRODUCTION	10
2 LITERATURE REVIEW	12
The Prison Experience and Staff	12
Interaction Type One: Exerting Control	13
Interaction Type Two: Gaining Privileges and Possessions	14
Causes for the Interactions	15
Officers' views of inmates	15
Inmates' views of correctional officers	17
Methods of Control	19
Formal Methods of Social Control	19
Informal Methods of Social Control	20
Method Effectiveness	22
Summary	24
3 STUDY METHODS	25
Study Location	25
Sample	27
Total Sample	28
Prison Participants	31
Jail-only Participants	32
Focus Group Participants	34
Data Collection	35
Focus Groups	36
Surveys	40
Measures	41
Focus Group Questions	41
Survey	42
Participant Protection	44
Variables	44
Dependent Variables	44
Independent Variables	52
Analysis	53
Summary	54

4	RESULTS	56
	Research Question 1: Experience with Correctional Officers	56
	Frequencies: Correctional Officer and Inmate Interactions Scales	56
	Frequencies: Correctional Officers' Traits Scales	62
	Focus Group Data: Experience with Correctional Officers	66
	Correlations and Regressions: Correctional Officer and Inmate Interactions	69
	Correlations and Regressions: Correctional Officers' Traits	69
	Research Question 2: Methods of Informal Social Control	75
	Frequencies: Methods of Informal Social Control Scales	76
	Frequencies: Methods of Informal Social Control on Others Scales	81
	Frequencies: Perceived Effectiveness of Informal Methods of Social Control	86
	Focus Group Data: Methods of Informal Social Control	91
	Correlations and Regressions: Methods of Informal Social Control	92
	Correlations and Regressions: Methods of Informal Social Control on Others	97
	Correlations and Regressions: Perceived Effectiveness of Informal Methods of Social Control	101
	Summary	106
5	DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS	107
	Summary of Findings	107
	Study Limitations and Suggestions for Future Research	115
	Policy Implications	120
	Summary	121
APPENDIX		
A	SURVEY	123
B	FOCUS GROUP QUESTIONS	135
LIST OF REFERENCES		136
BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH		140

LIST OF TABLES

<u>Table</u>	<u>page</u>
3-1 Participants by Locations.....	26
3-2 Sample Characteristics.....	29
3-3 Types of Groups Held.....	38
3-4 Focus Group Questions.....	39
4-1 Inmate and Correctional Officer Interactions.....	57
4-2 Correctional Officer Traits.....	63
4-3 Correlations of Inmate and Correctional Officer Interactions.....	70
4-4 Correlations of Correctional Officer Traits.....	72
4-5 Predicting Correctional Officer Interactions and Traits.....	73
4-6 Informal Methods of Social Control.....	77
4-7 Informal Methods of Social Control on Other Inmates.....	82
4-8 Perceived Effectiveness of Informal Methods of Social Control.....	87
4-9 Correlations of Informal Methods of Social Control.....	93
4-10 Predicting Informal Methods of Social Control.....	95
4-11 Correlations of Informal Methods of Social Control for Others.....	98
4-12 Predicting the Reported Witnessing Informal Methods of Social Control.....	100
4-13 Correlations of Perceived Effectiveness of Informal Methods of Social Control.....	102
4-14 Predicting Perceived Effectiveness of Informal Methods of Social Control.....	104

Abstract of Thesis Presented to the Graduate School
of the University of Florida in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of Master of Arts

EX-INMATES' PERSPECTIVES ON INFORMAL METHODS OF CONTROL UTILIZED BY
CORRECTIONAL OFFICERS

By

Saskia Daniele Santos

December 2007

Chair: Jodi Lane

Major: Criminology, Law and Society

Within every prison in the United States there are more inmates than officers; yet correctional officers are required to maintain control. They utilize several methods, formal and informal, to control inmates. Research into informal social control methods utilized by correctional officers has been scarce but has indicated these methods are essential for prisons to operate efficiently. This study examined, from the perspectives of 106 former inmates, nine methods of informal social control as well as the context in which they occur, such as inmate and correctional officers' interactions. Participants responded to questions measuring perceptions of inmate and correctional officers' interaction and correctional officers' traits, perceived frequencies of use of informal social control methods and effectiveness, as well as questions measuring demographic and personal information. Fifty participants also took part in focus groups. Frequencies were run to examine participants' agreement with survey items and linear regression models were also estimated to identify possible predictors of agreement with survey items. Some of the participants viewed interactions with correctional officers as negative experiences and described correctional officers using negative traits, and even fewer viewed the interactions and traits held by correctional officers as positive. A limited number of the participants indicated that correctional officers use methods of informal social control to punish

or control inmates, and from their perspective all the methods included in the study were viewed as being effective in controlling inmates to some extent. Also, recommendations for future research and possible policy recommendation are made.

CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION

Sykes referred to prison as a society within a society (Sykes, 1958). Prisons have their own norms and values for those who live and work within them. The inner workings of a prison are not usually deemed to be a strange and uncharted area of research. Many works of literature as well as a number of research projects have examined the American prison system and its many facets. However, when it comes to examining the methods correctional officers utilize in order to control inmates, little has been done in examining informal social control methods. Correctional officers hold most discretionary authority in granting rewards and inflicting punishments, leaving the inmates little opportunity to ignore correctional officers' demands for conformity and discipline (Hepburn, 1985; Sykes, 1958). Correctional officers utilize two methods of control: formal and informal (Fisher-Giorlando & Jiang, 2000; Marquart, 1986). Formal methods leave an official record of the action taken by the officer, while informal methods do not leave a record (Fisher-Giorlando & Jiang, 2000). This study hopes to examine informal methods of control utilized by correctional officers.

The past several decades have seen a rise in prison populations. In 2005 there were 2,193,798 inmates housed in prisons or jails in the United States alone (Bureau of Justice Statistics, 2007). This was a 2.7% increase from the end of 2004. Though the annual growth from 2004 to 2005 is less than the average growth rate of 3.3%, it still means that for every 100,000 U.S. residents there are approximately 491 prison inmates (Austin, Bruce, Carroll, McCall & Richards, 2001; Bureau of Justice Statistics, 2007). As the prison population continues to grow, the need for examination of the prison system also continues to grow. Researchers have found that experiences during prison affect an individual's actions and behaviors upon release.

With so many individuals being incarcerated, the importance of this research is pronounced, since most of the individuals currently incarcerated will eventually be released back into society.

This study hopes to examine what types of informal social control methods are utilized by correctional officers and the impact of those methods. However, in order to fully examine informal social control methods an additional research question was added. The author felt that it was important to place informal social control methods and their use in context. This will be accomplished by examining the prison experience of former inmates and their interactions with correctional officers and the treatment they received from officers.

The research questions for the study are:

- What was the prison experience like for former inmates regarding correctional officers and what were their interactions with correctional officers like?
- What methods of informal control did officers use to control inmates and what was their impact as experienced by former inmates?

This study hopes to contribute to the current literature by first adding to the sparse literature regarding informal social control. This study will be an intensive examination into informal social control, examining nine possible methods of social control utilized by correctional officers. The second contribution this study hopes to add to the literature is examining the impact of social control methods. Both formal and informal methods are utilized within prisons, but there has been limited research done on the impact of these methods. This study will allow for the impact of informal social control to be explained by measuring former inmates' perceptions of method effectiveness. The third and final contribution to the literature is that this study will make policy suggestions. The literature regarding the examination of social control methods appears to contain little to no policy implications. This study hopes to be able to suggest policy by being able to share which, if any, methods of informal social control are effective, taken from a former inmates' perspective.

CHAPTER 2 LITERATURE REVIEW

Social control within prisons has been a research topic for several decades, but most of the literature is comprised of studies focusing on formal social control (Marquart, 1986). The literature regarding informal social control methods is sparse. So, to fully understand it and its use, one will have to examine the circumstances and situations surrounding informal methods of control. First, this study examines the literature relating to inmates' experiences with staff by looking at what types of interactions are most common between correctional officers and inmates. This literature review also examines the causes of the interactions. Once the prison experience regarding prison staff is discussed, informal social control methods are more clearly defined and possible reasons for their effectiveness are then examined.

The Prison Experience and Staff

The first purpose of this study is to gain a better understanding of the prison experience for an inmate when it comes to prison staff¹. In order to do so, one must realize that prisons are a place of, “deadening routine punctuated by bursts of fear and violence (Morris, 1995, pp. 202).” The daily life of an inmate is routine and rarely changes. Part of this daily routine involves interactions with officers. Depending on the facility, contact with officers will vary from frequent to very rare (Fisher-Giorlando & Jiang 2000; Grusky, 1959). Correctional officers and inmate interactions are bound by the prison environment in that they mainly evolve as a function of the prison itself, such as control and discipline (Poole & Regoli, 1980b; Senese, 1991). One of those functions of prison is that authorities are given almost ultimate power (Cressey, 1959; Morris 1995; Poole & Regoli, 1980b; Terry, 2004). They hold power over almost every aspect of the inmate's life (Sykes, 1958). This is believed to be necessary for the safety of society

¹ Correctional officer and staff are used interchangeably throughout this manuscript.

(Hepburn, 1985). Prison authorities dictate when inmates will do things such as eat, shower, go to the bathroom, have access to the recreation² yard, talk on the phone, and even visit with family. They also dictate where inmates will live and work, or even if an inmate will have a work assignment. But people or agencies that have complete power over others often use every opportunity to remind their subordinates that they possess nearly unlimited power and control over them (Toch, 1992). They do this especially in instances that are trivial or petty (Terry, 2004; Toch, 1992). Nowhere is this truer than in prisons.

Interaction Type One: Exerting Control

Interactions between correctional officers and inmates are often based on officers exerting their seemingly unlimited power and control over inmates (Brown, DuPont, Kozel & Spevacek, 1971; Zald, 1962). Inmates feel that correctional officers may use any and every opportunity to remind them that they are in complete control. Perhaps the best example of officers utilizing ultimate control over inmates is through the enforcement of minor rules. These rules tend to intrude into the ordinary practices and routines of an inmate's life and originate from an authority greater than a dorm correctional officer, such as the Florida Legislature (Hepburn & Albonetti, 1980; Irwin, 2005). Typically inmates find them to be frustrating because it is difficult to know all the rules and to be able to comply with all of them (Irwin, 2005).

Policies or rules that are unclear are likely to cause a decrease in compliance because individuals may be unclear as to what is and is not acceptable behavior (Mayer, 2001). The lack of compliance, precipitated by unclear rules, is likely to cause an increase in the use of more punitive sanctions (Mayer, 2001). So, petty rules may in fact contribute to noncompliance by inmates. Officers might be caught in a cycle where they must decide to enforce rules that could

² Recreation yard will be termed rec yard for the rest of the report, since this is the terminology typically used within prisons.

contribute to more conflict and a lack of compliance. They may be trying to suppress the very activity that prison policies and rules helped to create (Skyles, 1958). The interactions surrounding these rules are viewed as antagonistic since the inmate is viewed as noncompliant by the officer while the officer is viewed as petty by the inmate. The inmate may view him or herself as a victim being picked on by a correctional officer enforcing petty rules. This may be especially true since correctional officers' enforcement of these rules tends to be inconsistent and arbitrary (Irwin, 2005). Officers often address the inmates in a manner that is perceived as disrespectful (Irwin, 2005). This may lead the inmate to participate in frequent disputes or confrontations with correctional officers (Toch, 1992). The officer, on the other hand, may then use the inmate's behavior as justification for further repressive measures, including the way the officer addresses the inmate, gives the inmate orders or responds to the inmate's requests (Irwin, 2005; Sykes, 1958). Also in the interactions between the two sides, officers may also try to demean inmates and the cycle of antagonism is continued due to both sides (Irwin, 2005; Weinberg, 1942).

This is not to say that all officers participate in such behaviors or that all interactions with officers are unpleasant. Some officers will enforce rules but do not bother to enforce the petty ones (Hewitt, Poole & Regoli, 1984; Irwin, 2005; Marquart, 1986). These same officers also tend to be consistent in their enforcement of the rules, and consistent in their lack of petty rule enforcement (Irwin, 2005). It is important to note also that not all officers speak to inmates in a disrespectful and demeaning manner. However, many do, which causes this type of interaction to be a common experience for inmates.

Interaction Type Two: Gaining Privileges and Possessions

Another interaction that occurs between inmates and officers is one that is typically instigated by inmates. Many inmates may interact with officers in order to increase their

privileges or material possessions (Irwin, 2005; Sykes, 1956; Weinberg, 1942). Correctional officers hold nearly all the power within the prison walls, which also includes privileges and possessions. For example, correctional officers can determine whether a particular inmate receives a bunk under a fan or one that receives no air circulation. They have the ability to allow an inmate to work in the shade or work in the hot sun. Realizing that the officers have nearly complete control over their lives, inmates may interact with an officer in order to increase their comfort of living. They may interact with the officer in ways that will win them favor or try to convey to the officer that they are not going to be a problem for that officer (Sykes, 1956). These types of interactions may be viewed by the officers as manipulative.

Causes for the Interactions

Research shows that the interactions between inmates and correctional officers can mainly be classified as unpleasant and punctuated by distrust (Hemmens & Marquart, 2000; Toch, 1978). Interactions are typically in regard to rules and regulations that are considered to be petty by inmates. The biggest contributor to these interactions between correctional officers and inmates appears to be the views and opinions held by each. If an individual holds a negative view of a group, every interaction he or she will have with that group will be influenced by those negative views (Grusky, 1959). For example, if an individual is suspicious of a particular ethnic group, every interaction he or she has with a person of that ethnic group will be viewed with suspicion. In the case of correctional officers and inmates, both groups have preconceived notions of the opposite group, which tend to be unfavorable and marked by suspicion (Grusky, 1959; Toch, 1978).

Officers' views of inmates

Correctional officers have a shared culture (Crouch & Alpert, 1980; Irwin, 2005). This culture is mainly comprised of common attitudes and beliefs, which include a shared derogatory

attitude towards inmates. Inmates are usually viewed as being worthless, untrustworthy, manipulative, aggressive and disrespectful (Brown et al., 1971; Irwin, 2005). If inmates are constantly attempting to increase their privileges and material possessions through their interactions with correctional officers, the officers may begin to view all interactions with inmates as attempts to manipulate them (Sykes, 1956). Correctional officers also typically see inmates as vicious, cons, and “criminal scum” (Ross & Richards, 2002, pp. 47; Terry, 2004; Weinberg, 1942). The majority of officers do not empathize with inmates, and hold little respect for them as credible and decent human beings (Hazelrigg, 1967; Irwin, 2005). Of course, officers may see individual inmates as having different, more favorable characteristics, but they tend to most often view inmates unfavorably. There is some evidence that certain personal characteristics such as race and ethnicity may impact an officer’s attitude toward inmates, but other characteristics like gender and level of education will not (Jurik, 1985).

The views held by correctional officers are believed to be developed during the orientation or training process. Staff is trained to mistrust and remain socially distant from inmates perhaps as a method to prevent staff from having inappropriate relationships or arrangements with inmates (Hepburn & Albonetti, 1980; Irwin, 2005). Also, if inmates are trying to obtain material possessions or privileges through their interactions with correctional officers, administrators may want correctional officers to view all interactions with suspicion and distrust. Jurik and Musheno (1986) found that correctional officers reported that they were penalized by senior officers if they tried adapting a service orientation, which would be more favorable towards inmates. Prison administrators appear to have a vested interest in maintaining an “us versus them” mentality among officers. So as new correctional officers become indoctrinated into the informal officer

culture, they begin to distrust and hate inmates (Irwin, 2005). This unfavorable view of inmates influences how correctional officers interact with inmates.

Inmates' views of correctional officers

As is true for correctional officers, inmates' interactions with correctional officers are often guided by their opinions of officers as well. However, the inmates' perceptions of inmate-staff interactions and opinions of staff have been understudied in comparison to the correctional officers' perception of interactions and opinions (Hemmens & Marquart, 2000). Taken from what has been examined, it is believed that when inmates evaluate officers, they base their opinions on four characteristics: fairness, consistency, stringency and empathy (Irwin, 2005). Fairness is deemed the most important characteristic, and involves enforcement of the rules (Irwin, 2005). Naturally officers who tend to not enforce rules, which could be deemed petty, are seen as fair. The characteristic of consistency is evaluated by whether the officer maintains the same rule enforcement every day (Irwin, 2005). Officers who change their level of enforcement would be viewed as inconsistent, which is not favorable (Hepburn, 1985). Stringency refers to the level of supervision an officer utilizes (Irwin, 2005). Officers who are more lax in their supervision will be held in higher regard than those who take an active stance in supervision. The final characteristic that correctional officers are evaluated on is empathy. This is evaluated by whether the officer treats inmates with respect, which is measured by how they refer to inmates, give them orders and respond to inmates' requests (Irwin, 2005). If inmates view an officer as being fair, consistent, non-stringent and empathic, they would probably believe most of their interactions with that officer to be favorable.

However, inmates often hold less than favorable views of correctional officers (Ross & Richards, 2002; Weinberg, 1942). They see officers as authoritarian and stupid (Ross & Richards, 2002). Most inmates hate correctional officers and view the officers as "hated soldiers

guarding prisoners of a foreign army” (Irwin, 2005; Ross & Richards, 2002, pp.47). In classifying correctional officers, the most common category is “chicken shit” assholes (Irwin, 2005, pp. 68). Through the routines and experiences inmates endure while in prison, their sense of punishment increases (Irwin, 1970). With correctional officers holding the power over the inmate that leads to those experiences and daily routines, the inmate soon despises them for having so much control.

Often, an officer is automatically hated by inmates. As an inmate becomes more familiar with an officer it is possible he or she may begin to hold favorable views towards that officer (Hemmens & Marquart, 2000; Hepburn, 1985; Irwin, 2005). There is also evidence indicating that age of the inmate is closely related to the perception of staff and interactions with staff, with younger inmates reporting having more difficulty with staff in comparison to older inmates (Hemmens & Marquart, 2000). The officer could begin to gain respect after showing inmates that they possess the qualities previously discussed: fairness, consistency, non-stringent and empathy (Irwin, 2005). Another way officers can be viewed favorably by inmates is if they form some sort of special or illegal arrangement with inmates (Irwin, 2005; Weinberg, 1942). If an officer provides an inmate with items or privileges that violate rules and regulations, the officer may become liked.

Interactions between the two groups can be frequent. They typically involve the officer enforcing rules and regulations that are considered petty, or involve inmates trying to obtain privileges or possessions from officers. Each group generally holds a less than favorable view of the other, which is exacerbated by these two types of interactions. Officers distrust inmates due to their attempts to manipulate staff in order to obtain sought after items or services; inmates despise officers for using their unlimited power to enforce trivial rules. Though there are always

exceptions, most inmates' prison experiences are unpleasant when it comes to officer interactions and their treatment by correctional officers.

Methods of Control

The second purpose of this paper is to examine the informal social control methods utilized by correctional officers and to assess possible reasons for their impact on inmates. As stated previously, correctional officers have almost complete power over inmates and often use every opportunity to remind inmates that they possess nearly unlimited power and control (Toch, 1992). They do this by enforcing rules and regulations that may be deemed as trivial or petty by inmates. Once the officer has defined the inmate's action as a violation of a rule, they have the discretion as to whether to intervene, and how to discipline inmate if he or she does decide to intervene (Poole & Regoli, 1980a). The manner in which they may choose to enforce these rules and regulations could be through formal and informal social control methods (Fisher-Giorlando & Jiang, 2000; Marquart, 1986; Streets, 1965).

Formal Methods of Social Control

Ross (1901/1969) defined methods of formal social control as sanctions designed to carry out policy. They are implemented without regard to those who are the objects of control (as cited in Craddock, 1992). Social methods have also been defined as official reactions by the prison system concerning the behavior of an inmate (Craddock, 1992; Fisher-Giorlando & Jiang, 2000). Though official reaction was not defined, for the purposes of this paper official reactions are measures taken by correctional officers that can be officially tracked, such as the formal disciplinary procedures (Fisher-Giorlando & Jiang, 2000; Marquart, 1986). In the Florida Department of Corrections those measures would be disciplinary reports (DRs) and corrective consultations (CCs). Corrective consultations are the less punitive of the two and do not typically result in sanctions singularly. They are written reports that indicate the inmate was warned or

corrected regarding his or her behavior. One must receive two or more CCs in order to be sanctioned, while sanctions are given for only one DR. Disciplinary reports, also known as incident reports, are more formal reports written by correctional officers in response to a violation of prison rules (Fisher-Giorlando & Jiang, 2000; Ross & Richards, 2002). The punishments that one may receive from a disciplinary report can range from loss of 30 days gaintime³ to 90 days in solitary confinement (Ross & Richards, 2002).

Prison administrators establish formal policies and procedures (Craddock, 1992) such as methods of enforcing rules and regulations. DRs and CCs are formal procedures used by officers enforcing prison rules. When an inmate receives a DR or a CC, it is reflected also on his or her official Department of Corrections' record. Numerous infractions or certain types of infractions can prohibit individuals from being eligible for good adjustment transfers⁴, work release and certain job assignments. The utilization of formal social control methods by an officer will hardly ever come under scrutiny and are seldom reversed during the formal review process since it is the officially designated method of controlling inmates. However, formal social control may not always be utilized due to the time required to fill out paperwork. Also, officers may not deem the infraction worthy of official reaction, while still believing it requires some response. In some cases officers may utilize informal social control methods instead.

Informal Methods of Social Control

While formal social control methods are official reactions to an inmate's behavior, informal social control methods are unofficial reactions to an inmate's behavior. These methods are not official Department of Corrections' policies and procedures. Since correctional officers

³ Gaintime refers to credit which allows inmates to earn a day or more off the end of their sentence for each day they served with good behavior (Hoene, 2000). Gaintime has also been referred to as "good time" credit.

⁴ Good adjustment transfers are when inmates are transferred to an institution they have requested based on their appropriate behavior at their current institution.

are to maintain order through the enforcement of institutional rules, they have discretion as to how to enforce them, formally or informally (Poole & Regoli, 1980a). Informal social control methods are the actions taken by correctional officers in order to discipline or punish inmates without resorting to official procedures. Informal social control methods tend to be difficult to monitor, since they do not leave a paper trail as a DR or CC would. They also tend to cover rule violations that do not draw the attention of others as a major violation would. For example, a person having a contraband pen would not draw attention from others, such as other inmates or the officer's superiors that a person having a contraband sweatshirt might. The dorm officer may feel more inclined to formally sanction the individual with the contraband sweatshirt rather than the one who had a contraband pen that no one else noticed.

One may be able, through examining the literature regarding another hierarchical environment like schools, to more clearly understand informal social control methods. When students misbehave, teachers exercise control over their classroom (Toch, 1992). They can do so by sending students to the principal, which would be a formal social control method. They can also choose to control the misbehaving student on their own in an informal manner. This could include assigning extra homework, having the student stand at the back of the line, or other similar forms of discipline. The hope of the teacher is to exert his or her control in such a way the student will behave in the manner the teacher would like.

Prisons have very similar practices. In order for prisons to operate efficiently, correctional officers cannot respond to every infraction formally (Hewitt et al., 1984; Irwin, 2005; Marquart, 1986; Useem & Reisig, 1999). The process for formal social control methods may be time consuming and tedious. Correctional officers may tolerate minor inmate infractions, such as stealing food and gambling and sanction them in a manner that does not require a great deal of

effort (Useem & Reisig, 1999). In cases such as these, officers will utilize other forms of sanctioning rather than utilizing CCs and DRs. They may have inmates perform tasks that are not part of their typical job assignment such as picking up cigarette butts. Correctional officers may also remove certain privileges or access to privileges as a form of control. For instance, television viewing may be used as a form of informal social control through its allowance or denial. Access to weight-lifting equipment may also be used in this manner. Methods such as these may allow officers to refrain from formally sanctioning an inmate, which could result in loss of gaintime or being sent to confinement. The informal methods may punish inmates immediately where as formal methods may take a longer period of time. An inmate may not register right away that he has lost 10 days of gaintime whereas he will notice right away that he is being told to leave the canteen line and that he are not going to have access to canteen items for that day. As is true with teachers and students, officers exert their control of inmates by such informal methods.

Method Effectiveness

The use of informal social control rests on whether or not the techniques have an impact. Officers rely on the assumption that the techniques they utilize have an impact in some way or they would not utilize them. The officers might also be working based on the assumption that the formal forms of punishment they use might not make a difference in the inmate's everyday status (Sykes, 1958). An inmate may not be affected by formal methods of control since he has enough time remaining on his sentence that would allow him to still obtain his early release date through gaintime. Therefore, they may believe that formal methods of control may not be effective in controlling the inmate. If a person is serving a mandatory sentence, he or she would not receive gaintime and the loss of gaintime would not impact this person due to he or she being required to serve the mandatory sentence regardless of gaintime awarded. In order for punishment to be seen

as a true reprimand, the person being punished must see it as such (Sykes, 1958). In the case of prisons, inmates must feel that the sanction the officer is imposing upon them is punishment. For the method of control to have an impact, whether it is the promise of rewards or the threat of punishment, the individual must feel that the rewards are indeed rewards and the punishment is punishment (Sykes, 1958). An inmate may conform to the orders and demands of officers because he or she wants to avoid punishment or to receive rewards (Toch, 1992). In addition, the idea of reward and punishment may vary from person to person.

In prisons today it has been argued that control through the use of rewards and punishments is defective since the reward side has been largely stripped away (Sykes, 1958). However, it can also be argued that since inmates receive fewer rewards or privileges, that these few things may be more valuable to them as rewards. The fear of losing such items through correctional officers' removal may be a very effective method of control. The threat of the removal of those few pleasures or items is a powerful motivation to conform to prison rules and regulations (Sykes, 1958).

The items that inmates see as privileges include any increased sense of freedom. Pleasure items include access to a library, whether it is a regular library or a law library, educational unit, weight-lifting area, rec yard so one can go walking or jogging, as well as access to a television (Ross & Richards, 2002; Sykes, 1956). The phone is another privilege that is important to inmates, because for some the phone is the only method of contact with their families (Ross & Richards, 2002). Inmates also view the canteen, also known as a commissary, as a privilege and a place to obtain basic and wanted items. Inmates can purchase stationery, toiletries, clothing and other such items. Perhaps the most sought after items are the food items, which typically are generic brands of cookies, crackers, candies, and canned foods, especially fish (i.e. tuna, salmon,

and sardines) (Ross & Richards, 2002). With inmates being in a position of extreme deprivation the few privileges and luxury items that they are able to have become very valuable to them (Irwin, 2005).

Informal methods of social control utilized by officers include methods by which officers will remove privileges and methods that will add tasks or sanctions to inmates. They are likely to be effective if the inmate perceives the item being removed as a privilege or valuable and the sanction being imposed as a punishment.

Summary

Inmates' experiences regarding staff and their treatment by staff often are not pleasant ones. Typical inmate and officer interactions revolve around the enforcement of rules and regulations, or inmates trying to obtain privileges and material possessions. These interactions are guided by unfavorable opinions of the opposing side. Correctional officers utilize two forms of control methods: formal and informal. Informal methods of social control are likely to have an impact due to the inmates having few rights and privileges (Ross & Richards, 2002). The hope, in reviewing the literature, was to more fully understand the prison experience regarding interactions with staff and inmates and the treatment received by inmates from staff. In addition, the aim was to elaborate the methods of informal social control utilized by correctional officers and the impact of those methods.

CHAPTER 3 STUDY METHODS

This section describes the methodology this study utilized. First, the author first discusses the locations where the sample was drawn. Then, the author describes the target sample population. Next, the author discusses data collection methods, then gives a description of the measuring instruments: focus group questions and a survey. This is followed by a brief section on the measures taken to protect participants. Finally, the author describes the variables and data analysis techniques utilized.

Study Location

Participants were recruited from half-way houses and transitional programs throughout North Central Florida (See Table 3-1). The halfway houses and transitional programs were identified by obtaining their names on the World Wide Web or through recommendations from individuals currently working within the criminal justice system. Half-way houses and transitional programs were contacted by phone, and the researcher asked to speak with the director or manager of the half-way house or transitional program. The researcher then described the research project and asked if the director was willing to allow the researcher access to the residents of the half-way house or transitional program. The researcher typically faxed a copy of the informed consent and a description of the study procedures, including a statement that half-way house or transitional program staff members could not be present during the focus group or survey administration. Some directors or managers did not require or request a copy, and in those cases, the researcher indicated the policy and procedures during the phone conversation.

The half-way houses and transitional programs can be separated into two categories: faith-based and non-faith-based. Nine of the groups were conducted in faith-based half-way

Table 3-1. Participants by Locations

Focus Group	City	Location	Number of People	Age Range (years)	Racial Distribution		
					Black	White	Other
1. House of Hope	Gainesville	Living room of half-way house	4 Males	32- 46	3	1	
2. Salvation Army: Red Shield Lodge	Jacksonville	Room next to kitchen in the Salvation Army building	9 Males	38- 56	7	2	
3. Prisoners of Christ	Jacksonville	Room of local church	12 Males	30- 62	4	7	1
4. Prisoners of Christ	Jacksonville	Kitchen of half-way house's business office	5 Males*	38- 67	4	1	
5. Salvation Army: Red Shield Lodge	Jacksonville	Room of Salvation Army building	7 Males	31-59	6	1	
6. Prisoners of Christ	Jacksonville	Room of local church	6 Males	30-58	3	3	
7. THORM Inc Ministries	Jacksonville	Living room of half-way house	5 Males	31-45	4		1
8. Center of Hope	Clearwater	Group room of half-way house	3 Males	45-57		3	
9. Pinellas Ex-Offender Re-entry Coalition	Clearwater	Hallway of Pinellas Criminal Courthouse	49 Males	18-49	20	26	3
10. Salvation Army: Red Shield Lodge	Jacksonville	Room of Salvation Army building	7 Males	38-46	2	5	

* Missing survey from one participant in this group

houses or transitional programs. The only group that can be classified as non-faith-based was Group 9, which was a county run re-entry program. All the half-way houses or transitional programs that were faith-based were centered upon the Christian faith. However, there was much variation in terms of the required level of commitment to the religion on the part of the individual. For some of the faith-based half-way houses or transitional programs, the residents were only required to declare that they were spiritual before being granted access to the services. Other half-way houses or transitional programs required the residents to be interviewed by the director. He or she then established whether the level of faith in a person was sufficient for the house.

The type of offenders allowed into the half-way houses or transitional program varied. All the half-way houses and transitional programs allowed property and drug offenders to utilize the services. Some also allowed violent offenders to participate, while others allowed both sex offenders and violent offenders. The structures for the houses where the data were collected vary from very involved in the former inmates' lives (e.g., helping with job placement, transportation, obtaining a driver's license) to only providing individuals a place to sleep and eat. Some of the half-way houses and transitional programs allowed individuals to remain there throughout the day and emphasized the house as more of a home. One of the houses did not allow residents to remain in the house during the day and only provided them with a place to sleep and eat breakfast and dinner.

Sample

The target sample population for this study was male former inmates who had been incarcerated within the last five years in a correctional or detention facility that currently live in the State of Florida. The actual sample was comprised of males, who currently reside in the State of Florida and had been incarcerated in a state or federal prison and individuals who had been

only incarcerated in county jail. The two groups were referred to as “prison participants,” indicating these individuals had been incarcerated in a prison (N= 70) and “jail-only participants,” which indicated these individuals had only been incarcerated in jail and never in a state or federal prison (N= 36). There was also a subset group from the total sample, which was comprised of individuals who participated in both a focus group and survey. It is explained later as to why not all participants participated in focus groups. The group of individuals who participated in a focus group was referred to as “focus group participants” (N= 50). All individuals in this group had been housed in a state or federal correctional or detention facility within the last five years. The demographics of the total sample are first discussed, proceeded by the prison participants, jail-only participants, and lastly, the focus group participants (See Table 3-2).

Total Sample

The total sample was comprised of 106 males who were former inmates in either prison or jail. All participants were older than 18, with the average age of participants being approximately 38 years old. The age range of participants was 18 to 67 years of age. The total sample was comprised of approximately 49% black (52 individuals), 47% white (49 individuals), and 4% other (4 individuals). The average school years attended was 11.7. The range was 2 years of education to 16 years. Most participants indicated receiving a high school diploma or General Equivalency Diploma (GED). The sample was comprised of people who have been out of prison as long as 204 months (17 years) and as short as 1 day, with average being approximately 12 months. The average sentence of the sample served was 61 months (5 years and 1 months), with the shortest sentence having been 3 months and the longest 336 months (28 years). Based on self-report, almost the entire sample was comprised of individuals who have been housed at a

Table 3-2. Sample Characteristics

	Total Sample		Prison Participants		Jail-only Participants		Focus Group Participants	
	N= 106	Percent	N= 70	Percent	N= 36	Percent	N= 50	Percent
Age								
Total Responses	105	99.1	69	98.6	36	100	49	98
Missing Responses	1	.9	1	1.4	0	0	1	2
Average Age	37.9		42.8		28.4		45	
Age Range	18 to 67		19 to 67		18 to 46		30 to 67	
Median Age	39		43		25.5		45	
Mode Age	38		38		20		38	
Race								
Total Responses	105	99.1	70	100	35	97.2	50	100
Missing Responses	1	.9	0	0	1	2.8	0	0
Black	52	49.5	38	54.3	14	38.9	26	52
White	49	46.6	29	41.4	20	55.6	22	44
Other	4	3.8	3	4.3	1	2.8	2	4
Education								
Total Responses	103	97.2	69	98.6	34	94.4	49	98
Missing Responses	3	2.8	1	1.4	2	5.6	1	2
Average (in years)	11.7		11.7		11.7		11.5	
Range (in years)	2 to 16		2 to 16		7 to 16		2 to 16	
Median (in years)	12		12		12		12	
Mode (in years)	12		12		12		12	
Time Since Release								
Total Responses	103	97.2	70	100	33	91.7	50	100
Missing Responses	3	2.8	0	0	3	8.3	0	0
Average (in months)	11.7		14.7		5.4		5.3	
Range (in months)	.0 to 204		.0 to 204		.5 to 36		.0 to 60	
Median (in months)	3		2		3		2	
Mode (in months)	1		1		3		1	

Table 3-2. Continued

	Total Sample		Prison Participants		Jail-only Participants		Focus Group Participants	
	N= 106	Percent	N= 70	Percent	N= 36	Percent	N= 50	Percent
Length of Sentence Served								
Total Responses	103	97.2	70	100	33	91.7	50	100
Missing Responses	3	2.8	0	0	3	8.3	0	0
Average (in months)	61.0		87.1		5.8		95.4	
Range (in months)	3 to 336		5 to 336		3 to 10		5 to 336	
Median (in months)	30		48.3		6		57.5	
Mode (in months)	5		36		5		60	
States Incarcerated								
Total Responses	106	100	70	100	36	100	50	100
Missing Responses	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Florida Only	99	93.4	69	98.6	36	100	46	92
Florida & 1 Additional State	4	3.8	4	5.7	0	0	3	6
Florida & 2 Additional States	2	1.9	2	2.9	0	0	0	0
Another State Only	1	.9	1	1.4	0	0	1	2
Most Serious Offense								
Total Responses	105	99.1	69	98.6	36	100	49	98
Missing Responses	1	.9	1	1.4	0	0	1	2
Drug	26	24.5	14	20	12	33.3	8	16
Property	32	30.2	26	37.1	6	16.7	19	38
Violent	26	24.5	19	27.1	7	19.4	14	28
Violator of Probation	13	12.3	6	8.6	7	19.4	4	8
Other	8	7.3	4	5.7	4	11.1	4	8

correctional or detention center in the State of Florida at some point and time, with only one participant who had not. Four participants had served a prison sentence in an additional state to Florida, while two participants had served a prison sentence in two additional states to Florida. The total sample was comprised of approximately 24% drug offenders (26 individuals), 30% property offenders (32 individuals), 24% violent offenders (26 individuals), 12% violators of probation or parole (13 individuals), and 7% other types of offenders (8 individuals).

Prison Participants

Data were collected from 70 former inmates¹, all of whom were male. Prison participants were all older than 18, with the average age of the prison participant being approximately 43 years old. The age range of participants was 19 to 67 years of age. The prison participants sample was comprised of approximately 55% black (38 individuals), 41% white (29 individuals), and 4% other (3 individuals), which happen to be all be Hispanic. The average school years attended was 11.7. The range was 2 years of educations (2nd grade) to 16 years (receiving a Bachelor's degree). As with the total sample, most prison participants indicated having received a high school diploma or GED. Though all those who participated in the study had been released from a correctional or detention center within the last five years, some individuals had been released from prison over five years ago. For example, an individual may have been released from prison 15 years ago but was released from jail 1 year ago. The average time since release was approximately 15 months prior to participating in the study. However, the sample was comprised of people who have been out of prison as long as 204 months (17 years) and as short as 1 day. The average sentence of the prison participants served was 87 months (7 years and 3 months), with the shortest sentence having been 5 months and the longest 336 months (28 years).

¹ The total number of former inmates is actually 71, but due to researcher error one of the participant's survey was destroyed prior to the data being entered.

Almost the entire prison participant sample was comprised of individuals who have been housed by the Florida Department of Corrections. Only one participant did not serve time in Florida at all but in West Virginia. Four participants had served a prison sentence in another state in addition to Florida, while two participants had served a prison sentence in two other states as well as Florida. The states in which the individuals served an additional sentence or two included Alabama, Connecticut, Illinois, Indiana, Georgia, Maryland and West Virginia. The sample was comprised of approximately 20% drug offenders (14 individuals), 37% property offenders (26 individuals), 27% violent offenders (19 individuals), 8% violators of probation or parole (6 individuals), and 6% other types of offenders (4 individuals) (e.g., driving under the influence of drugs or alcohol, molestation, arson, and gun charges).

The demographics of the prison participants were similar to those of the total sample in age and education. On average, the prison participant group was comprised of slightly more black participants, individuals who had been released from prison longer (approximately 3 months longer), served longer sentences (over two years longer), and committed property offenses.

Jail-only Participants

There were 36 jail-only participants, all of whom had been incarcerated in the same central Florida county jail. These participants had participated in a re-entry program that began while they were incarcerated and continued after their release. The program was not open to all jail inmates. Those in the program were selected based on their offense, criminal history and willingness to participate. During their time in jail they participated in activities meant to reduce recidivism and ease re-entry back into society, such as counseling sessions, substance abuse treatment, job placement training and educational classes. While in jail they were housed in the same dorm-like wing of the county jail. The jail-only participants were also all older than 18, with the average age of the jail-only participant being approximately 28 years old. The age range

of the jail-only participant was 18 to 46 years of age. Approximately 39% of the jail-only sample was black (14 individuals), and 56% was white (20 individuals). Roughly 3% (1 individual) of the sample was listed as other (i.e., Asian). The average school years attended was 11.7. The range was 7 years of education (7th grade) to 16 years (receiving Bachelor's Degree). Most jail-only participants indicated having received a high school diploma or GED. The jail-only participants of the study were released from jail within the last five years, with the average time since release being approximately 5 months prior to study participation. The jail-only sample was comprised of people who have been out of jail as long as 3 years and as short as 2 weeks. The average sentence of the jail-only sample served was almost 6 months. The shortest sentence was 3 months and the longest 10 months. Based on self-report survey data, the entire jail-only sample was comprised of individuals who had only been housed at a Central Florida County Jail. None of the jail-only participants indicated that they had been incarcerated in another state or county. The jail-only sample was comprised of approximately 33% drug offenders (12 individuals), 17% property offenders (6 individuals), 19% violent offenders (7 individuals), 19% violators of probation or parole (7 individuals), and 11% other types of offenders (4 individuals) (e.g., violating a domestic violence injunction, providing a false ID to a law enforcement officer, failure to appear at a court event, and possession of firearm).

The demographics of the jail-only participants were only similar to those of the total sample and the prison participants in education. The jail-only participant group was comprised of more white participants, individuals who had been released from jail more recently (approximately 7 months less than total sample, 9 months less than prison participants), served significantly shorter sentences (4 and half years less than total sample, over 6 years less than prisons participants). The jail-only group was also more likely to have committed a violation of

probation or another offense, such as violated court orders, and was less likely to have been convicted of a property or violent offense than the total sample and prison participants. The jail-only participants were also more likely to have been convicted of a drug offense than prison participants and the total sample. There were more differences in the jail-only participant sample in comparison to the total sample, than there were with the prison participant sample and total sample.

Focus Group Participants

The focus group participants was a subset group of the prison participants. There were 50 focus group participants, all of whom were all older than 18, with the average age being approximately 45 years old. The age range of the group was 30 to 67 years of age. Approximately 52% of the focus group sample was black (26 individuals), and 44% was white (22 individuals). Roughly 4% of the sample was listed as other (2 individuals) (i.e. Hispanic). The average school years attended was 11.5. The range was 2 years of education (2nd grade) to 16 years (receiving Bachelor's Degree). As the case with the other groups, most focus group participants indicated they had received a high school diploma or GED. The focus group participants of the study were released from a detention or correctional facility within the last five years, with the average time since release approximately 5 months prior to participating in the study. The focus group sample was comprised of people who have been out of prison as long as 5 years and as short as 1 day. The average sentence of the focus group sample served was 95 months, with the shortest sentence being 5 months and the longest 336 months. The focus group participant sample was comprised of individuals who have been housed by the Florida Department of Corrections, with only one participant who had not served time in Florida. Three participants had served a prison sentence in another in addition to Florida. The focus group sample was comprised of approximately 16% drug offenders (8 individuals), 38% property

offenders (19 individuals), 28% violent offenders (14 individuals), 8% violators of probation or parole (4 individuals), and 8% other types of offenders (4 individuals).

The demographics of the focus group participants, as was the case with the jail-only participants, were only similar to those of the total sample in education. The focus group participant group was comprised of more black participants, individuals who had been released from prison longer ago (approximately 7 months), and served longer sentences (3 years). The focus group participants were also more likely to have committed a property or violent offense, and were less likely to have been convicted of a drug offense. The focus group participants' demographics were generally similar to the prison participants' demographics in age, race, education, and types of offenses committed. However, the focus group participants were more likely to have recently been released (approximately 10 months less) and more likely to have served a longer prison term (approximately 8 months longer) than prison participants.

Data Collection

For those participants who participated in both the focus group and the survey, the focus groups were conducted first and then the survey was administered. This ordering would prevent the researcher's prior notion about what occurs within prison from impacting focus group responses. This was the plan for data collection efforts, but as will be described later, this procedure varied in some locations due to situational circumstances.

Once the half-way house or transitional program agreed to allow the researcher access to its current residents, a convenient time and location to meet with residents who met the criteria for the study was agreed upon by the researcher and the half-way house or transitional program staff. Prior to beginning the study, the researcher informed residents that participation in the study was voluntary, that they were able to leave at any time, and that their participation in the study would not impact their relationship with the half-way house or transitional program. For

the residents who agreed to be a part of the study, the researcher passed to them a large envelope, which contained a survey, a smaller white envelope with an informed consent form inside of it and another informed consent form. The two informed consents and survey had an identical number written in the corner (e.g. 004 or 005)². While participants were signing the informed consent, the researcher typically set up multiple tape recorders. The tape recorders were placed in the center of the circle of participants. This allowed the researcher to conduct the focus group, and transcribe the session at a later date (Morgan & Spanish, 1984). Once all of the informed consents had been collected, the researcher reiterated that participation was voluntary and asked if the participants had any questions. The tape recorders were turned on and the focus group sessions began.

Focus Groups

The use of focus groups as a methodological tool allows researchers to explore experiences of individuals and groups by creating a conversation that combines personal beliefs and collective narratives (Morgan, 1996; Morgan & Spanish, 1984; Warr, 2005). Focus groups are controlled group discussions in which the group discussion is “focused” on some collective activity or topic (Frey & Fontana, 1991; Kitzinger, 1994; Morgan & Spanish, 1984; Smithson, 2000). The use of focus groups provides researchers insight on behaviors, motivations or thought processes as well as experiences of those participating in the focus group (McLafferty, 2004; Morgan, 1996). In this case, the researcher hoped to gain knowledge about individuals who have been incarcerated, and also about the group experience and prison culture, specifically experiences with correctional officers.

² The researcher plans to keep the list of participants and their responses for 5 years in order to conduct future research on recidivism among the individuals. The list of participants’ names will be kept in a locked file cabinet at the University of Florida and kept separate from the survey responses.

Though the study's protocol called for focus groups to be conducted at all study sites and times, only 8 of the 10 groups actually participated in a focus group (See Table 3-3). In one of the groups, Group 5, participants did not want to participate in a focus group. One of the participants asked if he was going to receive financial compensation for his participation. Upon hearing no from the researcher, he and several other participants stated they did not have time for a focus group. The remaining four participants stated they had worked all day and did not want to participate. The researcher asked the participants if they would be at least willing to complete the survey, which all seven participants of Group 5 were willing to do.

The other group that did not participate in a focus group was Group 9. However, unlike Group 5, these participants were not given the opportunity to participate in a focus group. When the group was set up with the director of the organization, the researcher expressed that she would require a room away from program staff for the focus groups and at least 45 minutes with the possible participants. It was believed that the researcher would be conducting 3 or 4 groups one after one another with about 12 participants in each group. However, upon arriving at the location, the director was unable to secure an unoccupied room for the researcher. The location that was provided to the researcher was a hallway of the county criminal courthouse, which would not allow for the protection of the participants or sessions to be tape recorded clearly. Also, the organization was only able to provide the researcher with access to the participants for approximately 20 minutes. Since conducting focus groups was not going to be a possibility, the researcher asked participants if they were willing to complete the survey.

As previously stated, there were 8 focus groups that were conducted. The focus groups did not exceed the recommended focus group participant size of 12 participants at a time (Frey & Fontana, 1991). The focus groups lasted approximately of 45 minutes, since time depended on

Table 3-3. Types of Groups Held

Group	Participated in Focus Group Only	Participated in Survey Only	Participated in Focus Group and Survey
1. House of Hope			X
2. Salvation Army: Red Shield Lodge			X
3. Prisoners of Christ			X
4. Prisoners of Christ			X
5. Salvation Army: Red Shield Lodge		X	
6. Prisoners of Christ			X
7. THORM Inc Ministries			X
8. Center of Hope			X
9. Pinellas Ex-Offender Re- entry Coalition ³		X	
10. Salvation Army: Red Shield Lodge			X

the group’s willingness to share and time constraints imposed by half-way houses and transitional programs’ schedules. The researcher sat in the circle with participants and asked a list of questions regarding their experiences of prison life⁴ (see Table 3-4). Due to some groups having time constraints, the researcher was not always able to ask all of the questions. The researcher typically took notes during the focus group in order to keep track of who talked and in what order. This was helpful with transcribing the session later.

The focus groups ranged from 3 to 12 participants, and varied in location (see Table 3-1). All but two of the focus groups were conducted in the evening. This created a problem with

³ All 36 jail-only participants were part of Group 9 (Pinellas Ex-offenders Re-entry Coalition). The remaining 13 participants from Group 9 were prison participants.

⁴ Additional questions for another research project were also asked following the questions related to this study.

Table 3-4. Focus Group Questions

<u>Question Number</u>	<u>Initial Question</u>
1	How would you describe your prison experience? (Explain)
	<u>Research Question 1:</u>
3	What were your interactions with staff like? (Examples)
4	What were the interactions between staff and other inmates like?
6	Did some officers treat you differently than others? How so? Why do you think this happened? (Explain)
8	If you were talking to your friends, how would you describe the staff in the prison where you were? What about the interactions you had with them?
	<u>Research Question 2:</u>
2	In your experience, what type of things did staff do to control inmates? (Please explain. Can you give us some examples?)
5	Did officers mess with you? With other inmates? How? Please give us some examples of how this happened.
7	When you did something wrong, would you be punished the same way each time? How were you generally punished? The same as other inmates? Why or why not? (Explain)
	<u>Closing Question</u>
9	What would you like people who do research on inmate-staff interactions to know that we have not discussed already?

participants complaining of being tired, since they had to wake up early in the morning and had worked all day. In Group 2, eight out of the eleven individuals left during the focus group session. Two of the participants left to talk on their cell phones, one stated the subject matter was too sensitive for him, and the remaining five who left complained of being tired. All of the eight individuals who left completed a survey prior to leaving the focus group. All evening group sessions were held following dinner and were held in lieu of a regularly scheduled required

meeting. As for the two groups that were not conducted at night, one was a morning session that was held following a staff meeting and other was an afternoon session that was held in lieu of a bible study class. Six of the focus group sessions were conducted in a room of the half-way house. Two of the other focus groups were held in a local church, where the half-way house held its regularly scheduled substance abuse support group meeting, and the other focus group session was held in the kitchen of the half-way house's business office⁵.

Surveys

Following a focus group the tape recorder was turned off by the researcher. The researcher then thanked the participants and reminded participants that participation in the study was voluntary. The participants were then asked to remove the survey from the large envelope, and complete the survey, though some participants began completing the survey during the focus group. They were also asked to not place any personal identifiers on the survey, such as their name or former Department of Corrections' inmate number. The surveys took approximately 10 to 20 minutes to complete. On one occasion the researcher read the questions and answers options to a participant who had difficulty reading. The researcher filled in or circled the answers for the participant. In the case of Group 9, which had both prison participants and jail-only participants, when the participant returned the survey, the researcher asked the participant if he had ever been incarcerated in a state or federal run prison. If the participant said no, the researcher marked the outside of the envelope with the letter J, indicating that he had only served time in county jail or jails. If the participant indicated that he had been incarcerated in a prison, no notation was made. Upon completion of the survey, participants were informed that the

⁵ As previously stated, the remaining group's participants were not given the opportunity to participate in a focus group, some of which was due to the location. The location of this group was the hallway of a county criminal courthouse.

remaining copy of the informed consent was theirs to keep and they were again thanked for their participation. Participants did not receive any financial compensation for their participation.

Measures

There were two instruments utilized in this study. The first was a list of unstructured focus group questions and the second was a written, structured survey. The measurement items were mainly selected based on previous literature and the researcher's personal experience working in the Florida Department of Corrections. In line with the beliefs of convict criminologists,⁶ the knowledge or ideas drawn from firsthand experiences gained while housed or working within the prison system allows for a more accurate understanding of the correctional system (Richards & Ross, 2001). The informal sanctions used in the survey were selected from previous literature, inmates' personal accounts and the researcher's witnessing the use of the sanctions. The questions regarding interactions with officers and adjectives describing officers were developed from conversation with inmates currently incarcerated.

Focus Group Questions

In order to answer the two research questions, several questions were formulated to ask the participants during the focus group (See Table 3-4). Nine questions were typically asked, but as previously stated, due to time constraints during some of the focus groups not all the questions were asked in some cases. There were four questions geared at determining what the prison experience was like for inmates regarding staff and their interactions with staff. The questions ranged from very broad, such as simply asking participants to describe their interactions with staff, to specific examples on how or if officers treated the participant differently than other

⁶ Convict criminologists are inmates or ex-inmates, who have Ph.D.s or are working towards obtaining one that write and publish essays and/or conducted empirical research about policies or practices regarding criminology, criminal justice, corrections and community corrections (Richards & Ross, 2001).

inmates. Three questions were developed to examine the methods of control used by officers to manage inmates. Once again the questions ranged from broad to very specific. There was an initial question that asked participants to describe their prison experience, which depending on their response could answer either research question. The hope in having such an open-ended question was to make participants feel comfortable and not threatened (Frey & Fontana, 1991). In addition, it allowed former inmates to discuss important aspects of their prison experience before being prompted. There was also a closing question which asked participants what they would like to see researchers examine regarding inmate and staff interactions in the future⁷.

Survey

The survey was 13 pages including the cover page (See Appendix A). It had 4 personal characteristics questions regarding age, sex, race and educational level and 6 additional questions about criminal history and release from prison. These questions asked about time since release, time in prison, time in half-way house (if currently in a half-way house), where the individual was incarcerated, the security level of the facility where the person was incarcerated, and what offense or offenses they had been convicted of for their last incarceration. Following the demographic and criminal history questions, the survey asked questions about officers' use of formal sanctions. Responses were based on a Likert scale, in which the respondent circled his level of agreement with the statement ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree.

The next section of the survey consisted of questions which tried to measure the occurrence of informal sanctioning while the participant was in prison as well as his beliefs and perceptions about the impact of this sanctioning. The survey asked respondents about nine possible informal sanctions. The informal sanctions were selected based on previous literature

⁷ Additional questions were asked to the focus groups regarding another student's research project.

and the researcher's personal experience working in the Florida Department of Corrections. The nine informal sanctions were: not being told when count has been cleared,⁸ being forced to remain sitting up during relax count,⁹ not having the phone turned on, not being allowed the full minutes of phone usage, being forced to rush during eating, shortened access to the yard, reduced access to smoking and rec time by means of not opening the yard, reduced access to the canteen and being yelled at. The questions asked respondents to circle the level of agreement with statements regarding officers utilizing the listed informal sanctions, either towards them or other inmates. After being asked about the occurrence of those sanctions, respondents were asked if each one of those informal sanctions were effective by circling their level of agreement, whether the sanction was not at all effective, a little effective, effective and very effective.

The survey then asked respondents questions regarding their interactions with officers on an informal level. The aim of these questions was to examine the former inmate's perception of these interactions. Once again, there was a list of statements that respondents were asked to identify their levels of agreement with by circling strongly agree, agree, unsure, disagree and strongly disagree. Statements were as follows: He/she wanted something; He/she was trying to get out of work; He/she was trying to hit on me; He/she was trying to get information from me; He/she was trying to get information about me; He/she was concerned about my problems; He/she was sincere in his/her interaction; He/she was no different than anyone else. Respondents were also asked to identify their level of agreement to the statement "I felt most officers were" and the listed word. The list of words was: educated, criminal, fair, patient, polite, wise, violent,

⁸ Count refers to the process by which the Department of Corrections verifies all inmates are accounted for by literally counting the inmates. Inmates are typically required to remain sitting upright on their bunk until an officer tells them they are allowed to do otherwise.

⁹ Relax count refers to the time period when the dorm officer has counted all inmates, but is waiting for the count to clear, meaning all inmates are accounted for. During relax counts inmates are usually allowed to lay down and do other activities such as read, as long as they remain on their bunk.

religious, cruel, rude, and drug abusers. The levels of possible agreement options ranged from strongly disagree to strongly agree.¹⁰

Participant Protection

Since the study used human subjects, the researcher took certain measures and precautions to protect the participants of the study. The researcher did not allow half-way house and transitional program directors or managers or their staff to sit in on the group session or when surveys were being administered. The researcher did not provide half-way house employees with information about participants' responses. The researcher also took precautions to minimize the risk of others linking a participant with his responses (i.e., did not have the subject's name on the survey). The list of participants with their code number that linked the informed consent and the survey together was kept password protected in a file at the University of Florida. The list was kept separate from the survey and recorded tapes.

Variables

Dependent Variables

The dependent variables for this study are eleven scales that were created and the items that the scales were comprised of. In order to develop the scales, exploratory factor analysis was conducted. Factor analysis allows for the discovery and summarizing of the pattern of inter-correlation among variables (Wuensch, 2005). Using Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS), factor analysis was conducted with the items that were meant to assess inmate and correctional officers' interactions. There were 8 items meant to measure interactions: he/she wanted something, he/she was trying to get out of work, he/she was trying to hit one me, he/she was trying to get information from me, he/she was trying to get information about me, he/she

¹⁰ There are additional questions added to the survey for future research examining the role of religion in prison, but that data will not be used in this study.

was concerned about my problems, he/she was sincere in his/her interactions, and he/she was no different than anyone else. The items' response options were based on a Likert scale with 1 strongly disagree, 2 disagree, 3 unsure, 4 agree and 5 strongly agree. In order to be able to examine the mean scores, the scale items, he/she was concerned about my problems, he/she was sincere in his/her interactions, and he/she was no different than anyone else, was recoded so 1 strongly agree, 2 agree, 3 unsure, 4 disagree and 5 strongly disagree. A higher response number indicated a "negative" response, while a lower response number indicated a "positive" response. Following the recoding, the author ran factor analysis using Varimax rotation, with the goal being to understand the relationship among the items by approximating a simple structure. Also, Varimax rotation is the most commonly used rotation (Wuensch, 2005).

It was found that three components had Eigenvalues above 1, and what items loaded on the three components or scales at .5 or above. The first component became the "suspicious interaction scale," and was comprised of the following three items: he/she wanted something, he/she was trying to get information from me, and he/she was trying to get information about me. The items loaded on the scale at .65, .89, and .87, respectively. The scale items were added to together then divided by three in order for the scale values to remain the same. Conceptually the items appeared to be related. Agreement with the items meant that participants viewed their interactions with correctional officers with suspicion. The scale items indicated that correctional officers' interactions were guided by them wanting something, which included information about the inmate and/or from the inmate. The Cronbach's alpha of .78 indicated the scale had good internal consistency.

The second scale that was formed was termed the "negative interaction scale". It was comprised of 2 items: he/she was trying to get out of work and he/she was trying to hit on me.

The item, he/she was trying to get out of work, loaded on the scale at .79, while the second item loaded at .80. The two scale items were added to together then divided by two. This was done so the scale values would remain the same for comparison purposes. The items appeared to show that some participants believed that correctional officers may have negative motives behind their interaction, such as not wanting to work or trying to make sexual advances toward inmates. The reliability for the scale was .55, which indicated lower internal consistency than the previous scale.

The final scale that was formed was comprised of two items. The two items were he/she was sincere in his/her interaction, which loaded at .83, and he/she was concerned with my problems, which also loaded at .83. The items formed the “positive interaction scale”. The scale items were added to together then divided by two in order for the scale values to remain the same. The items conceptually fit, since the items indicated positive interactions with correctional officers. Reliability for the scale was .71, showing good internal consistency.

One of the survey items that was meant to measure inmate and correctional officer interactions was dropped from the analysis. The factor analysis showed that the item, he/she was no different than anyone else, did not load on any of the three components.

Exploratory factor analysis was also run with the survey items that were designed to measure former inmates’ perception of correctional officers’ traits. There were 10 items meant to measure those traits: educated, criminal, fair, patient, polite, wise, violent, cruel, rude and drug abuser. As with the previous scale, the items’ response options were 1 strongly disagree, 2 disagree, 3 unsure, 4 agree and 5 strongly agree and in order to be able to examine the mean scores, the scale items, educated, fair, patient, polite and wise were recoded. A higher response

number, once again, indicated a “negative” response, while a lower response number indicated a “positive” response.

The “negative trait scale” was comprised of the following 3 items: drug abusers, rude and cruel, which loaded together at .5 or above. The items loaded on the component at .92, .89, and .76, respectively. The three scale items were added to together then divided by three. This allowed for the scale’s values to remain the same as scale items’ values. The items appear to be related since agreement with the items meant that participants viewed correctional officers as having negative personal characteristics and inmates did not hold them in high regard. The Cronbach’s alpha of .86 indicated the scale to have good internal consistency.

The second scale that was formed was termed the “positive trait scale”. It was comprised of 5 items: educated, fair, patient, polite and wise. The item, educated, loaded on the component at .74, while the second item, fair, loaded at .66. The items, patient, polite and wise loaded on the component at .83, .86 and .82. The scale items were added to together then divided by five in order for the scale values to remain the same as the scale items’ values. Agreement with the scale items would indicate that participants agreed with correctional officers having positive characteristics. The reliability for the scale was .86, which indicated good internal consistency.

The item, criminal, did not load on either of the previous 2 components, but stood as its own component and did so at .94. Agreement indicated that participants viewed correctional officers as criminal.

The previous five scales discussed were used to answer the first research question, what was the prison experience like for former inmates regarding correctional officers and what were their interactions with correctional officers like. Exploratory factor analysis was used to develop scales that examined survey items addressing the second research question, what methods of

informal control did officers use to control inmates and what was their impact as experienced by former inmates. First, exploratory factor analysis was run on the 9 items meant to examine informal social control experienced by the participants. Those items were: not told when it was relax count, being forced to remain sitting up during relax count, not having the phone be turned on, not allowed the full minutes of phone usage, being forced to rush during eating, shortened access to the yard, reduced access to smoking and rec time, reduced access to the canteen, and being yelled at. The items' response options were based on a Likert scale with 1 never, 2 sometimes, 3 half the time, 4 usually and 5 always, and no recoding was required. A higher response number indicated more experiences with the method, while a lower response number indicated fewer experiences with the method.

It was found that two components had Eigenvalues above 1, with items loading on the components or scales at .5 or above. The first scale was the "limit access control scale", which was comprised of the following four items: being forced to rush during eating, shortened access to the yard, reduced access to smoking and rec time, and reduced access to the canteen. The items loaded on the component at .77, .77, .70 and .72, respectively. The four scale items were added to together then divided by four. This allowed for the scale's values to remain the same as scale items' values. The scale appeared to be comprised of control items that reduced or limited access for inmates to things they valued. The Cronbach's alpha of .77 indicated the scale had good internal consistency.

The second scale that was formed was termed the "removal control scale". It was comprised of four items: not told when it was relax count, being forced to remain sitting up during relax count, not having the phone be turned on, and not allowed the full minutes of phone usage. The item, not told when it was relax count, loaded on the component at .63, while the

second item loaded at .54. The third item, not having the phone be turned on, loaded at .70. The final item, not allowed the full minutes of phone usage, loaded at .78. The items appeared to be related conceptually as well in that they all dealt with the correctional officers removing something from the inmates as a way to control them. The scale items were added together then divided by four in order for the scale's values to remain the same scale items' values. Agreement from the participants would indicate that the correctional officers removed the phone or full usage of the phone from inmates, and removed the ability of inmates to move during relax count. The reliability for the scale was .67, which indicated moderate internal consistency.

One of the survey items that was meant to measure a possible method of informal social control was dropped from the analysis. The factor analysis showed that the item, being yelled at, did not load on either of the two components.

Exploratory factor analysis was also conducted of the items meant to measure whether participants witnessed the methods of informal social control being utilized by correctional officers on *other* inmates. There were nine items meant to measure the methods participants witnessed: being forced to rush during eating, shortened access to the yard, reduced access to smoking and rec time, reduced access to the canteen, not told when it was relax count, being forced to remain sitting up during relax count, not having the phone be turned on, not allowed the full minutes of phone usage, and being yelled at. As previously stated, the items' response options were based on a Likert scale with 1 never, 2 sometimes, 3 half the time, 4 usually and 5 always, and no recoding was necessary. The higher the number the greater amount of witnessing the use of the method to control other inmates. A lower score indicated a lesser amount of witnessing the use of the method on other inmates.

Factor analysis indicated that two components had Eigenvalues above 1 and what items loaded on those two components or scales at .5 or above. The “limit access control for others scale” was the first scale and was comprised of the four items: being forced to rush during eating, shortened access to the yard, reduced access to smoking and rec time and reduced access to the canteen. The items loaded on the component at .71, .78, .71 and .80, respectively. The scale items were added to together then divided by four in order for the scales’ values to be the same as scale items’ values. The same items had formed the “limit access control scale” when participants were asked about their own experiences. The items appear to measure correctional officers’ use of limiting access for other inmates as a method of control. The Cronbach’s alpha of .77 indicated the scale to have good internal consistency.

The second scale that was formed was the “removal control for others scale”. It was comprised of 5 items: not told when it was relax count, being forced to remain sitting up during relax count, not having the phone be turned on, not allowed the full minutes of phone usage, and being yelled at. The item, not told when it was relax count, loaded on the component at .83, while the second item, being forced to remain sitting up during relax count loaded at .62. The third and fourth items, not having the phone be turned on and not allowed the full minutes of phone usage, loaded at .78 and .66. The final item, being yelled at, loaded at .52. The five scale items were added to together then divided by five. This allowed for the scale’s and the scale items’ values to be the same. The items formed a similar scale as the items measuring whether the participants had experience the methods of informal social control. The only exception was that the item, being yelled at, loaded on this factor when it did not for the scale asking participants about personal experiences. As with the previous scale, the items appeared to imply the correctional officers removing things from the inmates as a method of control. The additional

item, being yelled at, might indicate the removal of peace and quiet, a sense of calm, or perhaps the removal of some of the inmate's dignity or pride caused by the officer yelling at the inmate. The reliability for the scale was .66, which indicated moderate internal consistency.

The final scale that was formed by running factor analysis was comprised of items that were meant to measure the perceived effectiveness of the methods of informal social control. Those items were: not being told when it was relax count, being forced to remain sitting up during relax count, not having the phone turned on, not allowing the full minutes of phone usage, being forced to rush during eating, shortened access to the yard, reduced access to smoking and rec time, and reduced access to the canteen, and being yelled at. The items' response options were based on a Likert scale with 1 not at all effective, 2 a little effective, 3 effective and 4 very effective. No recoding was necessary. A higher response number indicated a higher perceived effectiveness, while a lower response number indicated a lower perceived effectiveness.

The items all loaded on one component at above .5. The first and second items, not being told when it was relax count and being forced to remain sitting up, loaded at .68 and .67. The third, fourth and fifth items, not having the phone turned on, not allowing the full minutes of phone usage, and being forced to rush during eating, loaded on the component at .82, .75 and .82, respectively. The sixth item, shortened access to the yard, loaded at .86, while the seventh item, reduced access to smoking and rec time, loaded at .81. The loading of the eighth item, reduced access to smoking and rec time, was .84. The ninth and final item, being yelled at, loaded at .73. The nine scale items were added to together then divided by nine in order for the scale's values to remain the same as the nine scale items' values. The items conceptually fit, since the items indicated whether the participant perceived the methods of informal social control were effective. Each item that was meant to measure the perceptive effectiveness of informal social

control was included in the scale. Reliability for the scale was .92, showing high internal consistency.

Independent Variables

The previously listed eleven scales were used as dependent variables, as well as the items that comprised the scales. There were six independent variables included in the analysis. The first independent variable was age. This was assessed by asking participants were asked, “how old are you?”. The variable was left as a continuous variable. The second independent variable was race. Participants were asked, “how would you describe your race and/or ethnicity”, then asked to circle one of the following response options: white, black/African American, Hispanic, or other, which had a space to specify what they defined as other. The responds were recoded to 0 indicating non-white and 1 indicating white. The third independent variable was years of education. Participants were asked, “what is the highest level of education you have obtained”, then asked to circle a response option. The options were: none, 1st grade, 2nd grade, 3rd grade, 4th grade, 5th grade, 6th grade, 7th grade, 8th grade, 9th grade, 10th grade, 11th grade, high school, GED, some college, Associate’s degree, Bachelor’s degree and other, with space to specify what they defined as other. The responses were recoded so the option matched the years of education (i.e., 2nd grade was recoded from 3 to 2 for two years of school). This created the years of school variable. In the case of high school and GED, both were coded into 12, for 12 years of school. The responses of Associate’s degree and Bachelor’s degree was recoded into 14 and 16, respectively. The fourth independent variable was time since release from prison or jail, also referred to as months out. Participants were asked, “how long since you have been out of prison¹¹?”, and participants had the option to indicate in months or years. All responses were

¹¹ In the case of jail-only participants, they were verbally instructed to indicate the amount of time since their release from jail. The same was true of the question pertaining to how much time they served in jail.

entered in as months, so responses that were written in years were converted into months. The fifth independent variable was the amount of time served in prison or jail, as referred to as months in. participants were asked, “how long were you in prison”, and participants were, once again, given the option to indicate the amount in months or years. As in the case with the previous variable, all responses were entered in as months. Responses written in years were converted into months. The sixth and final independent variable was offense type, also referred to as crime type. Participants were asked, “for your last incarceration, what offense(s) were you convicted of?”, and participants were asked to list the offense carrying the longest sentence first. Only the first offense was used for classification. Using an offense type rubric that is utilized by Alachua County Court Services in classifying offenders, participants were classified into one of the following categories: drug, property, violent, violation of probation or parole and other. The “other” category was offenses not listed on the rubric or traffic violations, which had too few numbers to create a category. The categories were then recoded to create that independent variable that was used. The categories of drug, property, violators of probation or parole and other were recoded as 0 indicating non-violent, and 1 indicating violent.

Analysis

The analysis for this study utilized techniques for both qualitative and quantitative data. There are four methods that combine focus groups and surveys (Morgan, 1996). The first method is where surveys are the primary source of data and focus groups are used to help researchers design and create the survey. The second is the reverse of the first method, focus groups are the primary method and surveys are used to help create the focus groups and focus groups’ questions. The third method uses focus groups as the primary data source and surveys are used as follow-up data to interpret the data from the focus groups. The final combination was the method that was utilized in this study. Surveys were the primary data source and focus groups were used

as follow-ups to assist in interpreting the survey data. The expectation in using this method was to obtain a clear in-depth understanding of the prison experience, especially as it relates to staff interaction.

In order to answer both research questions, frequencies were first run in order to examine how participants responded. Once frequencies were run on all scales and scale items, the percentage of participants that responded to the survey items and their mean scores were examined. This allowed the author to state approximately what percentage of participants agreed with the scales and scale items, or depending on the survey questions the percentage that reported experiencing or witnessing the method of control and their perceived effectiveness of the methods.

Following the frequencies, correlations were run with all scales and scale items across all samples. This allowed the author to examine possible correlations between the dependent variables (scales and scale items) and independent variables (age, race, years of school, months out, months in, and offense type). Once it was determined there were variables with significant relationships, ordinary least squares linear (OLS) regression was run. OLS regression analysis was used in this paper since it allows for the examination of the predictive relationship between the dependent variables and explanatory variables.

Throughout the analysis, the focus group data were examined for possible themes that matched or contradicted what was found from the survey results. Qualitative examples that supported or expanded the results that were found from the quantitative data were noted.

Summary

This section described the methodology that the study utilized. It discussed the half-way houses and transitional programs from where the sample was drawn. The method of data collection, which included describing the focus group and the survey administration, was

presented. The measures, both focus group questions and surveys, were described in detail, and there was a section describing the measures that were taken to protect participants. The variables utilized in the study were discussed, and the final section described the data analysis techniques that were utilized.

CHAPTER 4 RESULTS

This section describes the results from this study. First, the author discusses the results from the first research question. Then, the author describes the results from the second research question. For both questions, focus group data is used to try to further understand the survey data and tables are used to display data.

Research Question 1: Experience with Correctional Officers

The first research question this report hopes to answer is, ‘what was the prison experience like for former inmates regarding correctional officers and, what were their interactions with correctional officers like?’. This is accomplished by first examining how participants responded on the survey. Next, the focus group results are examined in order to determine whether they corroborated the survey results or perhaps explained the survey results. This is followed by results from the correlations that were run, and lastly, results from the regressions that were conducted on items found be significantly correlated.

In order to examine how participants responded, the percentage of participants that responded to the survey items and their mean scores were examined. All the percents reported are valid percents. From items pertaining to the first research question, there was a high response rate. The total sample had an overall 91% response rate (96 out of 106) or higher, while the prison participants had a 90% response rate (63 out of 70) or higher. The jail-only participants had the lowest overall response rate at 81% (29 out of 36) and the focus group participants had the highest response rate at 96% (48 out of 50) or higher.

Frequencies: Correctional Officer and Inmate Interactions Scales

First, frequencies were run on the “suspicious interaction scale” to determine how participants responded to the scale’s items and the means were examined (See Table 4-1).

Table 4-1. Inmate and Correctional Officer Interactions

	Total Sample (N=106)			Survey Participants Prison Participants (N=70)			Jail-only Participants (N=36)			Focus Group Participants Prison Participants (N=50)		
	N	% Agree	Mean	N	% Agree	Mean	N	% Agree	Mean	N	% Agree	Mean
Suspicious interaction scale (1 Strongly Disagree, 2 Disagree, 3 Unsure, 4 Agree, 5 Strongly Agree)			3.1			3.2			2.8			3.3
Item 1: He/she wanted something	40	40.0	3.0	32	47.0	3.2	8	25.0	2.8	27	55.1	3.3
Item 2: He/she was trying to get info from me	41	41.4	3.0	32	47.8	3.2	9	28.1	2.7	26	54.2	3.3
Item 3: He/she was trying to get info about me $\alpha = .78$	40	40.0	3.1	28	41.8	3.2	12	37.5	2.9	23	47.9	3.2
Negative interaction scale (1 Strongly Disagree, 2 Disagree, 3 Unsure, 4 Agree, 5 Strongly Agree)			2.5			2.5			2.4			2.6
Item 1: He/she was trying to get out of work	25	25.3	2.7	17	25.3	2.8	8	25.0	2.5	14	29.2	2.9
Item 2: He/she was trying to hit on me $\alpha = .55$	16	16.2	2.3	10	14.9	2.2	6	18.8	2.4	8	16.7	2.2

Table 4-1. Continued

	Total Sample (N=106)			Survey Participants Prison Participants (N=70)			Jail-only Participants (N=36)			Focus Group Participants Prison Participants (N=50)		
	N	% Agree	Mean	N	% Agree	Mean	N	% Agree	Mean	N	% Agree	Mean
Positive Interactions Scale (1 Strongly Agree, 2 Agree, 3 Unsure, 4 Disagree, 5 Strongly Disagree)			3.2			3.3			2.9			3.4
Item 1: He/she was sincere about his/her interactions	28	28.6	3.1	16	23.9	3.2	12	38.7	2.9	13	27.1	3.2
Item 2: He/she was concerned about my problems	23	23.7	3.3	13	19.4	3.4	10	33.3	3.1	9	18.8	3.5
$\alpha = .71$												

The total sample's overall mean for the scale was 3.1, indicating a response of "unsure" as to whether as the participant viewed his interactions with correctional officers with suspicion. Prison participants had similar results (mean= 3.2), as did the subset group of focus group participants (mean= 3.3). The jail-only participants' mean was 2.8, indicating "disagree". Overall, the mean scores for the "suspicious interaction scale" were close across the four groups. This pattern was present in the scale items' mean scores. For all the items, the total sample, prison participants, and focus group participants' mean scores ranged from 3.0 to 3.3, indicating "unsure", while the mean scores for jail-only participants ranged from 2.7 to 2.9, indicating "disagree".

Next, each item that the scale was comprised of was examined individually to determine what percentage of participants agreed with each item. Agreement was determined by combining "agree" and "strongly agree" responses. For the first item, he/she wanted something, fewer than half of the total sample (N= 40, 40%) and prison participants (N= 32, 47%) agreed, while only one-fourth of the jail-only participants (N= 8, 25%) did. However, over half of the focus group participants (N= 27, 55.1%) agreed. Similar, results were found with the second item, he/she was trying to get information from me. Fewer than half of the total sample (N= 41, 41.4%) and prison participants (N= 32, 47.8%) agreed, while only slightly more than one-fourth of the jail-only participants (N= 9, 28.1%) agreed. Once again, over half of the focus group participants (N= 26, 54.2%) agreed. The third and final item, he/she was trying to get information about me, had the least amount of variance across groups. Fewer than half of all four groups agreed. The subset group of focus group participants (N= 23, 47.9%) had the most agreement, followed by the prison participants (N= 28, 41.8%). The total sample (N=40, 40%) had similar agreement percentage to that of the prison participants. The jail-only participants (N= 12, 37.5%) had the

lowest percentage agreement. Overall, there appears to be some evidence that participants viewed interactions with suspicion, with the focus group participants being most likely to agree, while jail-only participants were the least likely to agree.

The next scale examined was the “negative interaction scale” (See Table 4-1). The total sample had an overall scale mean score of 2.5, indicating a response of “disagree” with the interactions they had with correctional officers being negative in orientation. Similarly, the prison participants’ mean score was 2.5; the jail-only participants’ mean score was 2.4 and the focus group participants’ mean score was 2.6, all indicating “disagree”. Across all groups, the mean scores for the two items that the scale was comprised of all indicated a “disagree” response. The scores ranged from 2.2 to 2.9.

As with the previous scale, agreement was determined by combining “agree” and “strongly agree” responses. For the first item of the “negative interaction scale”, he/she was trying to get out of work, one-fourth of the total sample (N= 25, 25.3%), prison participants (N= 17, 25.3%), and jail-only participants (N= 8, 25%) agreed. Slightly more of the focus group participants (N= 14, 29.2%) agreed with the first item. The second item, he/she was trying to hit on me, had very low levels of agreement across groups. The prison participants (N= 10, 14.9%) had the lowest, followed by the total sample (N= 16, 16.2%). The focus group participants (N= 8, 16.7%) had the second highest agreement, while the jail-only participants (N= 6, 18.8%) had the highest percentage agreement. Overall, the scale items had lower percentages of agreement in comparison to the previous scale. While some participants agreed with statements that indicated a negative interaction, most did not. The groups had similar percentages of agreement for both items, with focus group participants having a slightly higher percentage for the first item, and jail-only participants having higher agreement for the second item.

The final interaction scale was the “positive interaction scale” (See Table 4-1). The overall scale mean for the total sample was 3.2, indicating “unsure”. An “unsure” response would indicate the participant was unsure as to whether his interactions with correctional officers were positive. The prison participants (mean= 3.3) and focus group participants (mean= 3.4) had similar mean scores, also indicating “unsure”. The jail-only participants’ mean score was 2.9, indicating “disagree”. The mean scores for the two scale items were similar. For the total sample, prison participants and focus group participants the mean scores indicated “unsure” for both items and ranged from 3.1 to 3.5. However, the jail-only participants mean score indicated “disagree” for the first item (mean= 2.9), and “unsure” for the second item (mean= 3.1). Overall, the groups were similar.

For the “positive interaction scale”, agreement was determined in manner previously stated, by combining “agree” and “strongly agree” responses. The first item, he/she was sincere about his/her interaction, received approximately 30% agreement from the total sample (N= 28, 28.6%) and focus group participants (N= 13, 27.1%). Fewer than one-fourth of the prison participants (N= 16, 23.9%) agreed with the scale item, while nearly 40% of the jail-only participants (N= 12, 38.7%) agreed. The percentage in agreement were lower for the second item, he/she was concerned about my problems. The prison participants (N= 13, 19.4%) and focus group participants (N= 9, 18.8%) had roughly 20% agreement, while the total sample (N= 23, 23.7%) had slightly higher percentage agreement. Once again, the jail-only participants (N= 10, 33.3%) had the highest percentage agreement. Overall, the jail-only participants appear to be most likely to agree with statements that indicated a positive interaction with correctional officers. The remaining three groups had roughly similar percentages in agreement for each of the scale items.

Frequencies: Correctional Officers' Traits Scales

The next set of scales measured perceived correctional officer traits (See Table 4-2). The first scale was the “negative trait scale”. The total samples’ overall mean score was 3.0, indicating a response of “unsure” as to whether correctional officers hold negative traits. The prison participants (mean= 3.1) and focus group participants (mean= 3.4) also had mean scores indicating “unsure”. The jail-only participants’ overall mean score was 2.7, indicating a “disagree” response for correctional officers holding negative traits. For the three scale items, the means scored varied based on the item. For the first item the mean score ranged from 2.7 to 2.9, indicating “disagree”, for the total sample, prison sample and jail-only sample. The focus group sample had a mean score of 3.0, indicating “unsure”. For the second item, all four groups had mean score that indicated “unsure”, ranging from 3.0 to 3.7. The final item had two groups, prison participants (mean= 3.1) and focus group participants (mean= 3.3), whose mean scores indicated “unsure”. The remaining two groups, total sample (mean= 2.9) and jail-only participants (mean= 2.9) mean scores indicated “disagree”.

For the first item of the scale, drug abusers, fewer than 30% of participants from each group agreed. Agreement was determined by combining “agree” and “strongly agree”. The prison participants (N= 14, 29%) and jail-only participants (N= 9, 28%) had higher percentage agreement than did the total sample (N= 26, 26%) and prison participants (N= 17, 25%). The second item, rude, had much higher percentage of participants agreeing with it. Focus group participants (N= 33, 67%) and prison participants (N=41, 61%) had over 60% agreement, while total sample (N= 54, 55%) had over 50% agreement. While fewer in comparison to the other groups, the jail-only participants (N= 13, 42%) still had over 40% agreement. The third item, cruel, saw the most variation in percentage agreed across groups. Over half of the focus group

Table 4-2. Correctional Officer Traits

	Survey Participants												Focus Group Participants		
	Total Sample (N=106)			Prison Participants (N=70)			Jail-only Participants (N=36)			Prison Participants (N=50)					
	N	% Agree	Mean	N	% Agree	Mean	N	% Agree	Mean	N	% Agree	Mean			
Negative Trait Scale (1 Strongly Disagree, 2 Disagree, 3 Unsure, 4 Agree, 5 Strongly Agree)			3.0			3.1			2.7			3.4			
Item 1: Drug abuser	26	26.3	2.8	17	25.4	2.9	9	28.1	2.7	14	28.6	3.0			
Item 2: Rude	54	55.1	3.3	41	61.2	3.4	13	41.9	3.0	33	67.3	3.7			
Item 3: Cruel	38	39.2	2.9	30	45.5	3.1	8	25.8	2.6	25	52.0	3.3			
$\alpha = .86$															
Criminal Variable (1 Strongly Disagree, 2 Disagree, 3 Unsure, 4 Agree, 5 Strongly Agree)	31	31.6	2.9	22	32.4	3.0	9	30.0	2.9	15	30.0	2.9			
Positive Trait Scale (1 Strongly Agree, 2 Agree, 3 Unsure, 4 Disagree, 5= Strongly Disagree)			3.4			3.5			3.1			3.5			
Item 1: Educated	33	33.0	3.2	18	26.5	3.4	15	46.9	2.9	14	28.0	3.4			
Item 2: Fair	35	35.7	3.2	23	34.3	3.3	12	38.7	3.1	16	33.3	3.2			
Item 3: Patient	26	26.3	3.4	14	20.6	3.5	12	38.7	3.3	10	18.4	3.5			
Item 4: Polite	24	24.7	3.5	13	19.1	3.6	11	37.9	3.2	9	20.4	3.6			
Item 5: Wise	24	24.5	3.4	11	16.7	3.6	13	40.6	3.1	10	20.8	3.5			
$A = .86$															

participants (N= 25, 52%) agreed, while slightly fewer than half of the prison participants (N= 30, 46%) did. There was less agreement in the remaining two groups, total sample (N= 38, 39%) and jail-only participants (N= 8, 26%). Overall, focus group participants were most likely to agree with negative traits describing correctional officers. Across all groups, the item receiving most agreement was the trait describing correctional officers as being rude.

As discussed in the data analysis section, the criminal variable loaded on its own component when factor analysis was run. In examining the criminal variable by itself, the mean score for total sample, jail-only and focus group participants was 2.9, indicating “disagree” (See Table 4-2). With a very slight increase in overall mean score, prison participants (mean= 3.0) indicated “unsure”. Across all groups, 30% or slightly higher indicated the response “agree” or “strongly agree” to the criminal variable, with prison participants (N= 22, 32%) had the highest percentage agreement. Total sample (N= 31, 32%) had the next highest level agreement, and lastly the two remaining groups, jail-only participants (N= 9, 30%) and focus group participants (N= 15, 30%). The criminal variable received some support, in terms of agreement, across all groups.

The “positive trait scale” was the final scale examined (See Table 4-2). The overall mean score was 3.4 for the total sample, 3.5 for the prison participants and the focus groups participants and 3.1 for the jail-only participants, in all cases indicating “unsure”. An “unsure” response indicated that a participant was unsure if correctional officers held positive traits. For the first item, the total sample, prison participants, and focus group participants means ranged from 3.2 to 3.4, indicating “unsure”, while jail-only participants mean score was 2.9, indicating “disagree”. For all four of the remaining items and across all groups, the mean scores indicated “unsure”, and ranged from 3.1 to 3.6.

The “positive trait scale’s” first item, educated, had slightly fewer than half of the jail-only participant’s (N= 15, 47%) agreement. Agreement, once again, was determined by combining “agree” and “strongly agree” responses. A little greater than one-fourth of the prison participants (N= 18, 27%) and focus group participants (N= 14, 28%) agreed, whereas one-third of the total sample (N= 33, 33%) did. The second item, fair, had one-third or higher agreement for all four groups, with highest percentage agreement from jail-only participants (N= 12, 39%). The total sample (N= 35, 36%) had the next highest percentage agreement, followed by prison participants (N= 23, 34%). The focus group (N= 16, 33%) had the lowest percentage agreement. There was more variance in percentage agreed for the third item, patient. Jail-only participants (N= 12, 39%) had the highest percentage agreement, followed by the total sample (N= 26, 26%). The remaining two groups, prison participants (N= 14, 21%) and focus group participants (N= 10, 20%), had similarly low percentage agreement with the scale item. The fourth item, polite, also had staggered percentages of agreement across groups. Once again, jail-only participants (N= 11, 38%) had the highest percentage agreement, followed by the total sample (N= 24, 25%). Both, prison participants (N= 13, 19%) and focus group participants (N= 9, 18%), had fewer than 20% agreement. The fifth and final item, wise, received over 40% agreement from jail-only participants (N= 13, 41%) but only fewer than 20% agreement from prison participants (N= 11, 17%). The total sample (N= 24, 25%) and focus group participants (N= 10, 21%) ranged between the two groups in agreement.

Overall, jail-only participants were the most likely to agree with items that used positive terms to describe correctional officers. In the case of all five scale items, jail-only participants had the highest percentage agreement in comparison to the three other groups, whose percentages in agreement were usually similar to each other.

Focus Group Data: Experience with Correctional Officers

As previously mentioned, approximately half of the former inmates involved in the study participated in a focus group. The hope was that the focus groups would help gain a better understanding of inmate and correctional officer's interactions and how correctional officers are viewed by inmates. The survey questions examined what participants thought during their interactions with correctional officers. The focus group questions allowed participants to describe the interactions and expand on what they thought about their interactions. As was true with the surveys, participants were more likely to describe negative interactions experienced by themselves or witnessed by others than describe positive interaction. In total the "suspicious interaction scale" and the "negative interaction scale" were comprised of five survey items. The focus group participants were the most likely to have indicated agreement for four of the five items, and of those four items 50% or more of the focus group participants indicated agreement.

A number of focus group participants discussed negative interactions with correctional officers during focus group sessions, lending credibility to the survey results. A white male from Jacksonville said "they [correctional officers] treated me like I was a piece of shit". This was echoed by a 42-year-old white male who served a 1-year-sentence. He stated "they do whatever to humiliate you and make you feel like a worthless piece of dog shit". While 42-year-old black male who served a 5-year-sentence said "I would say officers don't, don't respect you...most of the time they don't even see you as human" and that correctional officers "...call you every name but your name". A 45-year-old white male who served an 18-month-sentence reported witnessing correctional officers being "disrespectful towards others inmates". When asked to describe interactions with correctional officers, a 43-year-old black male who served a 7-year-sentence stated, "I seen them treat other people like animals instead of humans". A white participant who served a 25-year-sentence said "see, an officer curse you and talk to you in any

kind of way”. Some comments came from participants whose voices were not able to be identified during the interview. One participant stated the interactions with correctional officers were “traumatic...cause the way they [correctional officers] treat people”. The second unidentified participant said “they have an attitude from the time they come on the yard until the time they leave”.

None of the participants stated verbatim what the survey asked them (i.e., thought he/she was trying to get out work). However, several participants did suggest that they viewed their interaction with suspicion. For example, a 44-year-old Hispanic male who served over a 10-year-sentence stated, “they’re looking for trouble”. His sentiment was reiterated by a 58-year-old black male from a different Jacksonville focus group. He stated, “they do stuff on the sly”. Both comments suggested suspicion about correctional officers’ motives.

The focus group results seem to indicate support of the survey results for inmates describing negative interactions with correctional officers, as well as positive interactions with correctional officers. However, in the survey overall the number of focus group participants that indicated having some positive interaction was fewer than the number of focus group participants indicating negative interactions. This was also found to be true in for the qualitative focus group results.

A 44-year-old, white male from Clearwater stated, “I had good interactions”, supporting survey results indicating some participants had positive interactions. A comment from a 38-year-old, black male from Gainesville, who said, “I had some officers that was alright” indicated he had no complains about some of his interactions. Comments such as these were the exception, however.

The literature has suggested that the biggest contributor for negative interactions may be the negative views and opinions held by each group about one another (Grusky, 1959). Since neither officers nor former officers were interviewed, it is impossible to verify the opinions of correctional officers. However, it can be verified from the perspective of former inmates on their views of correctional officers. In the survey results, focus group participants were most likely to indicate agreement with scale items that negatively described correctional officers. The focus groups results supported the survey results. For the most part, they did not hold positive views of officers. For example, a 43-year-old black male described correctional officers as being “very unprofessional” and “very judgmental”.

A white male who resided in Jacksonville, when asked to describe correctional officers said, “they’re all crooked. They’re all dogs”. Another Jacksonville participant said that correctional officers “...manipulate like a child”, implying that correctional officers are manipulative.

In the survey results, some participants did indicate agreement with correctional officers having positive traits and views of correctional officers. The focus group participants did not offer many comments that indicated they held correctional officers in high regard, or viewed them as having positive traits; however, there was a little support. In an example from a 42-year-old black male from Gainesville, he discussed his work officer. He stated, “he was a good man...he was encouraging”. Another Gainesville participant, who was a 38-year-old black male, shared that “...some officers just genuinely care”.

The focus group results support the results found from the surveys. Focus group participants were more likely to discuss negative interactions and describe officers in a negative manner, than discuss positive interactions and describe officer in a positive manner.

Correlations and Regressions: Correctional Officer and Inmate Interactions

Following the frequencies, correlations were run with the dependent and independent variables for correctional officers' interactions (see Table 4-3). There were six independent variables used: age, race, years of school, months out, months in and crime type. The three scales about interactions with correctional officers were used as the dependent variables as well as the seven total survey items that the three scales were comprised of. There were no significant correlations found for the total sample, prison participants and jail-only participants for any of the dependent and independent variables. However, for the subset group focus group participants the second item of the "suspicious interaction scale", he/she was trying to get information from me, age and months in prison were found to be significant. Both indicated a negative correlation. As age and months in prison increased, agreement with the survey item decreased.

Next, ordinary least squares regression was run with he/she was trying to get information from me as the dependent variable and the age and months in as independent variables (See Table 4-5). Neither variable was found to be a significant predictor of the survey item, once the other variable was controlled. No other regressions were run with the interaction scales using any of the other three samples, because the variables were not correlated at the bivariate level.

Correlations and Regressions: Correctional Officers' Traits

Correlations were also run in order to examine correctional officer traits (See Table 4-4). The same six independent variables were used that are listed above. The two trait scales, "negative trait scale" and "positive trait scale", with their combined eight items, and the criminal variable were the dependent variables. As with the interaction scales, no significant relationships were found for the total sample, prison participants or jail-only participants. For focus group participants, the "positive trait scale", age, race and years of school were found to be significant. Age had a negative relationship indicating as age increased agreement with the item decreased.

Table 4-3. Correlations of Inmate and Correctional Officer Interactions

	Total Sample (N=106)						Prison Participants (N=70)					
	Age	Race	Years of School	Months Out	Months In	Crime Type	Age	Race	Years of School	Months Out	Months In	Crime Type
Suspicious Interaction Scale	.02	.00	.03	-.00	-.11	-.06	-.07	.11	.10	-.02	-.22	-.02
Item 1: He/she wanted something	.04	.07	.09	.00	.01	.01	-.07	.14	.17	.01	-.06	-.03
Item 2: He/she was trying to get info from me	.05	-.04	.01	.00	-.11	-.11	-.06	.07	.05	-.04	-.25*	.02
Item 3: He/she was trying to get info about me	-.03	-.02	-.02	-.02	-.15	-.05	-.04	.08	.04	-.02	-.24	-.06
Negative Interaction Scale	-.04	.03	-.06	-.19	-.07	-.08	-.05	.14	.05	-.25	-.09	-.11
Item 1: He/she was trying to get out of work	-.01	-.04	-.08	-.12	-.05	-.05	-.12	.04	-.03	-.19	-.12	.01
Item 2: He/she was trying to hit on me	-.06	.09	-.02	-.19	-.07	-.07	.05	.18	.10	-.21	-.04	-.18
Positive Interactions Scale	.02	.09	.16	-.09	.07	.11	-.01	.20	.14	-.16	-.01	-.01
Item 1: He/she was sincere about his/her interactions	.01	.07	.11	-.03	-.02	.09	-.02	.15	.10	-.10	-.11	-.02
Item 2: He/she was concerned about my problems	.02	.10	.17	-.12	.14	.11	.00	.21	.14	-.20	.10	.01

* p<.05 **p<.01 ***p<.001

Table 4-3. Continued

	Jail-only Participants (N= 36)						Focus Group Participants (N= 50)					
	Age	Race	Years of School	Months Out	Months In	Crime Type	Age	Race	Years of School	Months Out	Months In	Crime Type
Suspicious Interaction Scale	-.13	-.16	-.19	-.17	.16	-.08	-.32*	.15	.20	-.15	-.28	.11
Item 1: He/she wanted something	-.03	.00	-.16	-.32	.26	.12	-.19	.19	.29*	-.21	-.03	.06
Item 2: He/she was trying to get info from me	-.10	-.18	-.09	.10	.07	-.29	-.33*	.09	.11	-.10	-.33*	.19
Item 3: He/she was trying to get info about me	-.18	-.19	-.20	-.18	.03	-.02	-.27	.12	.10	-.06	-.33*	.02
Negative Interaction Scale	-.09	-.15	-.39*	.08	.34	-.03	-.20	.13	.16	-.14	-.09	-.29*
Item 1: He/she was trying to get out of work	-.05	-.13	-.24	.25	.26	-.12	-.24	.05	.07	-.13	-.10	-.10
Item 2: He/she was trying to hit on me	-.10	-.14	-.42*	-.12	.31	.07	-.07	.15	.18	-.09	-.04	-.33*
Positive Interactions Scale	-.27	-.05	.29	.27	.10	.38*	-.07	.32*	.17	-.28	-.05	.14
Item 1: He/she was sincere about his/her interactions	-.22	-.04	.16	.31	.13	.33	-.02	.31*	.11	-.22	-.14	.09
Item 2: He/she was concerned about my problems	-.25	-.04	.31	.16	.04	.31	-.11	.26	.19	-.28	.05	.16

* p<.05 **p<.01 ***p<.001

Table 4-4. Correlations of Correctional Officer Traits

	Total Sample (N=106)						Prison Participants (N=70)					
	Age	Race	Years of School	Months Out	Months In	Crime Type	Age	Race	Years of School	Months Out	Months In	Crime Type
Negative Trait Scale	.02	.13	.02	-.10	-.02	-.00	-.04	.19	-.06	-.14	-.12	.09
Item 1: Drug abuser	-.10	-.10	.03	-.09	-.04	-.04	-.09	.19	-.01	-.11	-.09	.04
Item 2: Rude	.06	.06	.04	-.05	-.01	.03	.04	.20	-.02	-.07	-.08	.09
Item 3: Cruel	.05	.05	-.04	-.12	-.02	-.04	-.04	.13	-.12	-.17	-.13	.04
Criminal Variable	-.10	-.14	.09	.05	.01	-.03	-.13	-.04	.13	.06	-.03	.07
Positive Trait Scale	-.09	.08	.33**	-.09	.01	-.03	-.14	.21	.39**	-.16	-.16	-.09
Item 1: Educated	-.04	.07	.20	-.14	.08	.12	-.13	.22	.19	-.22	-.04	.17
Item 2: Fair	-.16	-.14	.09	-.12	-.16	.11	-.18	-.06	.11	-.16	-.29*	.07
Item 3: Patient	-.12	.12	.28**	-.11	-.03	-.05	-.11	.20	.39**	-.16	-.12	-.21
Item 4: Polite	-.04	.15	.33**	-.10	-.01	-.04	-.08	.23	.39**	-.16	-.12	-.09
Item 5: Wise	-.04	.07	.42**	.04	.12	-.19	-.01	.19	.52**	.02	.01	-.22
	Jail-only Participants (N= 36)						Focus Group Participants (N=50)					
	Age	Race	Years of School	Months Out	Months In	Crime Type	Age	Race	Years of School	Months Out	Months In	Crime Type
Negative Trait Scale	-.28	.15	.20	-.22	-.01	-.04	-.37*	.18	-.11	-.10	-.24	.19
Item 1: Drug abuser	-.34	.01	.17	-.27	.12	-.14	-.27	.08	-.06	-.10	-.13	.07
Item 2: Rude	-.21	.02	.22	-.21	.02	-.02	-.34*	.27	-.05	.03	-.23	.13
Item 3: Cruel	-.20	.07	.24	-.22	-.16	-.08	-.28	.15	-.13	.00	-.22	.16
Criminal Variable	-.28	-.31	-.03	-.01	-.11	-.14	-.22	-.05	-.10	-.00	-.01	-.06
Positive Trait Scale	-.57*	-.07	.16	-.00	.19	.17	-.32*	.33*	.46**	-.20	-.15	-.07
Item 1: Educated	-.45*	-.18	.23	.15	.01	.14	-.34*	.28	.27	-.06	-.12	.15
Item 2: Fair	-.43*	-.30	-.02	.15	.34	.22	-.41	.04	.09	-.25	-.32*	.18
Item 3: Patient	-.46*	.03	-.01	-.13	.22	.23	-.27	.34*	.47**	-.24	-.08	-.29*
Item 4: Polite	-.38*	.12	.12	-.01	.15	.12	-.28	.34*	.46**	-.22	-.05	-.10
Item 5: Wise	-.53*	-.05	.17	.03	.06	-.08	-.01	.28	.52**	-.06	.10	-.25

* p<.05 **p<.01 ***p<.001

Table 4-5. Predicting Correctional Officer Interactions and Traits

	Focus Group Participants		
DV: He/she was trying to get info from me	b	B	SE
Age	-.031	-.232	.022
Months In	-.002	-.200	.002
Model R ²	.140		
Model R ² Adjusted	.101		
Model F	3.582*		
Model df	2, 44		
DV: Positive Trait Scale	b	B	SE
Age	-.024	-.248	.013
Race	.147	.088	.256
Years of School	.137*	.395	.052
Model R ²	.288		
Model R ² Adjusted	.233		
Model F	5.256**		
Model df	3, 39		
DV: Patient	b	B	SE
Race	.228	.115	.299
Years of School	.136*	.372	.054
Offense Type	-.424	-.153	.402
Model R ²	.266		
Model R ² Adjusted	.215		
Model F	5.190**		
Model df	3, 43		
DV: Polite	b	B	SE
Race	.407	.192	.305
Years of School	.149*	.378	.057
Model R ²	.242		
Model R ² Adjusted	.208		
Model F	7.166**		
Model df	2, 45		

* p<.05 ** p<.01 *** p<.001

Race had a positive relationship indicating a correlation with white participants and items that comprise the “positive trait scale”. The relationship was also positive for years of school, so as years of school increased so did agreement with the item. The third survey item, patient, was found to have a significant relationship with race, years of school and crime type. There was a correlation with white and non-violent participants being more likely to agree, and as years of school increase so did agreement. A correlation was also found for the fourth survey item, polite, race and years of school. Both had a positive correlation, indicating white participants and an increase in years of school were more likely to indicate agreement.

Ordinary least squares (OLS) regression was run with the items found to be significantly related at the bivariate level (See Table 4-5). A model predicting the “positive trait scale” with age, race and years of school as predictors was run first. Age and race were not found to be predictors when the others were controlled, but years of school ($b= 14$) remained significant. The more years of school, the more likely to agree with the “positive trait scale”. Years of school ($b= .15$) was also found to be a significant predictor for the dependent variable of patient, while race and offense type were not significant when the others variables were in the model. The last regression that was run predicted polite as the dependent variable. Race was found not to be a significant predictor, while years of school again remained significant. The more years of school a person had the more likely he was to indicate agreement with the survey item, polite.

The correlations run found that most scales and scale items were not correlated with any of the dependent variables. For the interaction and trait scales, no correlations were found for the total sample, prison participants and jail-only participants. It was found that one interaction scale item and one trait scale with two of its scale items did have significant correlations with some of the focus group participants’ independent variables. Regressions were then run, and the only

significant predictor was years of school for the “positive trait scale” and its two scale items. As years of school increased so does agreement with positive traits (e.g., patient and polite) being used to describe correctional officers, suggesting those with more years of school are more likely to hold favorable views of correctional officers.

When examining the focus group data, the comments describing correctional officers in the positive are scarce. As previously discussed, most participants did not discuss correctional officers in a positive manner. The few comments that were made, such as describing them as caring, came from participants who had at least 12 years of school or higher. This lends credence to the survey findings, since the focus group participants who did discuss correctional officers in a positive manner were on the higher range of years of school.

Research Question 2: Methods of Informal Social Control

The second half of the result section of this report hopes to answer the second research question, ‘what methods of informal social control did officers use to control inmates and what was their impact as experienced by former inmates?’ As with the first question, this is accomplished by first examining how participants responded to questions regarding informal social control on the survey. The focus group results are examined next, in order to determine whether they corroborated or perhaps explained the survey results. Results from the correlations that were run are also included. The final section reports the results from the regressions that were conducted on items found to be significantly correlated.

As with the first part of the results section, in order to examine how participants responded, the percentage of participants that responded to the survey items and their mean scores were examined. All the percents reported are valid percents. The response rates were high for items pertaining to the second research question, and similar to the response rates for the items pertaining to the first research question. The total sample had an overall 92% response rate (97

out of 106) or higher, while the focus group participants had the response rate at 92% (46 out of 50) or higher. The jail-only participants had the lowest overall response rate at 81% (29 out of 36) and the prison participants had a 94% highest response rate (66 out of 70) or higher.

Frequencies: Methods of Informal Social Control Scales

The first scale that measured informal social controls experienced by the participants was the “limit access control scale” (See Table 4-6). The “limit access control scale” had an overall mean of 2.8 for the total sample, indicating “sometimes”, while the focus group participants (mean= 3.1) score indicated “half the time”. The responses options indicated the frequency in which they experienced methods of informal social control. The prison participants (mean= 2.9) and jail-only participants (mean= 2.4) had a mean score that also indicated “sometimes”. The first “limit access control scale” item had varying mean scores, with jail-only participants’ (mean= 2.7) mean score indicating “sometimes”. Prison participants (mean= 3.9) and the total sample’s (mean= 3.5) mean scores indicated “half the time”, while focus groups participants’ (mean= 4.2) mean score indicated “usually”. For the remaining three items the mean scores across all groups indicated “sometimes”. The mean scores ranged from 2.0 to 2.9.

In order to examine the reported experiences of the participants with each method of informal social control, frequencies were run. The responses “half the time”, “usually”, and “always” were combined, and those are the response percents reported. The first item of the “limit access control scale”, being forced to rush during eating, had a large percentage of participants indicating that it occurred half the time or more (See Table 4-6). Over 70% of the focus group participants (N= 43, 86%), prison participants (N= 55, 78.6%), and the total sample (N= 72, 71.3%) indicated this method of informal social control had happened to them, while over 50% of jail-only participants (N= 17, 53.1%) indicated it. The second item, shortened

Table 4-6. Informal Methods of Social Control

	Total Sample (N=106)			Survey Participants Prison Participants (N=70)			Jail-only Participants (N=36)			Focus Group Participants Prison Participants (N=50)		
	N	% Half the time or more	Mean	N	% Half the time or more	Mean	N	% Half the time or more	Mean	N	% Half the time or more	Mean
Limit Access Control Scale (1 Never, 2 Sometimes, 3 Half the Time, 4 Usually, 5 Always)			2.8			2.9			2.4			3.1
Item 1: Being forced to rush during eating	72	71.3	3.5	55	78.6	3.9	17	53.1	2.7	43	86.0	4.2
Item 2: Shortened access to the yard	44	43.6	2.6	29	43.5	2.7	15	45.5	2.6	23	46.9	2.7
Item 3: Reduced access to smoking and rec time	37	37.8	2.6	27	40.3	2.7	10	32.3	2.3	22	44.9	2.9
Item 4: Reduced access to the canteen	34	34.3	2.4	27	40.3	2.6	7	21.9	2.0	21	43.8	2.8
$\alpha = .77$												

Table 4-6. Continued

	Total Sample (N=106)			Survey Participants Prison Participants (N=70)			Jail-only Participants (N=36)			Focus Group Participants Prison Participants (N=50)		
	N	% Half the time or more	Mean	N	% Half the time or more	Mean	N	% Half the time or more	Mean	N	% Half the time or more	Mean
Removal Control Scale (1 Never, 2 Sometimes, 3 Half the Time, 4 Usually, 5 Always)			2.4			2.5			2.2			2.4
Item 1: Not told when it was relax count	44	41.5	2.5	30	42.6	2.5	14	42.4	2.4	16	42.0	2.4
Item 2: Being forced to remain sitting up during relax count	41	40.6	2.5	30	42.6	2.7	11	34.4	2.1	22	44.0	2.7
Item 3: Not having the phone be turned on	32	32.3	2.3	23	33.8	2.4	9	25.8	2.1	16	32.7	2.5
Item 4: Not allowed the full minutes of phone usage	34	34.0	2.2	20	29.4	2.2	14	43.8	2.3	13	26.5	2.0
A = .67												

access to the yard, received over 40% of each group's participants indicating that this method had been imposed on them. The focus group participants (N= 23, 46.9%) was the group with the largest percentage reporting occurrence, followed by the jail-only participants (N= 15, 45.5%). The remaining two groups, prison participants (N= 29, 43.5%) and the total sample (N= 44, 43.6%) had identical reporting percentages. More focus group participants (N= 22, 44.9%) reported having experienced the third item, reduced access to smoking and rec time, than did prison participants (N= 27, 40.3%), the total sample (N= 37, 37.8%) and jail-only participants (N= 10, 32.3%). The fourth scale item, reduced access to the canteen, saw the most variance in percentage experiencing half the time or more. Focus group participants (N= 21, 43.8%) reported the most occurrence, while jail-only participants (N= 7, 21.9%) reported the lowest. Both other groups, the total sample (N= 34, 34.3%) and prison participants (N= 27, 40.3%) reports of occurrence fell between the other two groups.

Overall, focus group participants, the prison subset group, were the most likely to report having experienced the methods of informal social control related to limiting access. Jail-only participants were least likely to report experiencing the methods, except in the case of the second item, shortened access to the yard. The total sample and prison participants had similar percentage of reported occurrences.

The second scale that measured informal social control was the "removal control scale" (See Table 4-6). The overall mean score for the total sample (mean= 2.4) indicated "sometimes". Prison participants (mean= 2.5), jail-only participants (mean= 2.2) and focus group participants (mean= 2.4) mean scores for the "removal control scale" also indicated "sometimes". For all four items that comprised, all four groups had mean scores that indicated "sometimes" for all four items that comprise the scale, mean scores range from 2.0 to 2.7.

The responses of “half the time,” “usually” and “always” were, once again, combined and examined. Approximately 40% of participants from all four groups, indicated that they were not told when it was relax count, the first item. Focus group participants (N= 16, 42%), jail-only participants (N= 14, 42.4%) and the total sample (N= 44, 41.5%) had the same percentage of participants saying they experienced the method of control. The remaining group, prison participants (N= 30, 42.6%), had a slightly higher percentage of participants saying it occurred half the time or more. The second item, being forced to remain sitting during relax count, received the largest percentage of participants stating it occurred half the time or more, from the focus group participants (N= 22, 44%), followed closely by prison participants (N= 30, 42.6%). Jail-only participants (N= 11, 34.4%) had the lowest percentage of participants expressing they experienced the method of control, while the total sample’s percentage (N= 41, 40.6%) was just a little larger. Approximately one-third of the prison participants (N= 16, 33.8%) and focus group participants (N= 16, 32.7%) expressed having experienced the third scale item, not having the phone be turned on. Slightly fewer of the total sample (N= 32, 32.3%) and even fewer of the jail-only participants (N= 9, 25.8%) stated experiencing the method. The final item, not allowed the full minutes of phone usage, had the most variance in percentage of participants having experienced the control method half the time or more. Jail-only participants (N= 14, 43.8%) had the most participants expressing occurrence, followed by the total sample (N= 34, 34%). The remaining groups, prison participants (N= 20, 29.4%) and focus group participants (N= 13, 26.5%), had fewer than 30% of the participants indicating occurrence. The amount of participants who indicated experiencing the methods of informal control indicating removal of valued items was comprised of ranged from 26% to 44%, and typically fell in range of the percentage of the other groups.

Frequencies: Methods of Informal Social Control on Others Scales

The scales that measured methods of informal social control imposed on other inmates and witnessed by participants were the “limit access control for others scale” and the “removal control for others scale” (See Table 4-7). As with the previous scales, the percentage of participants that indicated the response options of “half the time”, “usually” and “always” when asked for the frequency in which they witnessed the particular method of control were examined. The first scale’s overall means indicated “sometimes”. The total sample’s mean was 2.5, while the prison participants and focus group participants mean scores were both 2.6. The jail-only participants’ mean score was 2.4. For the first item, being forced to rush during eating, prison participants (mean= 4.1) had mean scores which indicated “usually”, while jail-only participants had a mean score which indicated “sometimes”. The remaining two groups, the total sample (mean= 3.4) and prison participants (mean= 3.9) had mean scores that indicated “half the time”. For all four groups, the remaining three scale items had mean scores from all four groups that indicated “sometimes,” with the mean scores ranging from 2.0 to 2.8.

The first scale item, being forced to rush during eating, had a large percentage of the total sample (N= 59, 59.6%), prison participants (N= 51, 76.1%) and focus group participants (N= 38, 79.2%) indicating that they observed this method being utilized on other inmates. A lot fewer jail-only participants (N= 8, 25%) indicated that experience. The second item, shortened access to the yard, also had fewer jail-only participants (N= 7, 21.9%) indicating witnessing the method being used on other inmates than did the total sample (N= 37, 37.4%), prison participants (N= 30, 44.8%) and focus group participants (N= 20, 41.7%). For the third item, reduced access to smoking and rec time, there was a higher similarity across groups expressing that they had witnessed this happening more than half the time or more. Prison participants (N=27, 40.9%) and focus group participants (N= 19, 40.4%) had roughly 40% indicating so, while the total

Table 4-7. Informal Methods of Social Control on Other Inmates

	Total Sample (N=106)			Survey Participants Prison Participants (N=70)			Jail-only Participants (N=36)			Focus Group Participants Prison Participants (N=50)		
	N	% Half the time or more	Mean	N	% Half the time or more	Mean	N	% Half the time or more	Mean	N	% Half the time or more	Mean
Limit Access Control for Others Scale (1 Never, 2 Sometimes, 3 Half the Time, 4 Usually, 5 Always)			2.5			2.6			2.4			2.6
Item 1: Being forced to rush during eating	59	59.6	3.4	51	76.1	3.9	8	25.0	2.3	38	79.2	4.1
Item 2: Shortened access to the yard	37	37.4	2.6	30	44.8	2.7	7	21.9	2.3	20	41.7	2.7
Item 3: Reduced access to smoking and rec time	37	37.8	2.6	27	40.9	2.7	10	31.3	2.4	19	40.4	2.8
Item 4: Reduced access to the canteen	39	39.4	2.5	29	43.3	2.7	10	31.3	2.0	21	43.8	2.8
$\alpha = .77$												

Table 4-7. Continued

	Total Sample (N=106)			Survey Participants Prison Participants (N=70)			Jail-only Participants (N=36)			Focus Group Participants Prison Participants (N=50)		
	N	% Half the time or more	Mean	N	% Half the time or more	Mean	N	% Half the time or more	Mean	N	% Half the time or more	Mean
Removal Control for Others Scale (1 Never, 2 Sometimes, 3 Half the Time, 4 Usually, 5 Always)			2.8			3.0			2.3			3.1
Item 1: Not told when it was relax count	35	35.7	2.4	25	37.3	2.5	10	32.3	2.4	17	34.7	2.5
Item 2: Being forced to remain sitting up during relax count	35	35.7	2.5	27	40.3	2.6	8	22.6	2.2	19	38.8	2.6
Item 3: Not having the phone be turned on	36	37.1	2.4	26	39.4	2.8	10	32.3	2.3	18	37.5	2.5
Item 4: Not allowed the full minutes of phone usage	28	28.9	2.3	21	31.8	2.3	8	22.6	2.1	11	23.4	2.1
Item 5: Being yelled at	49	49.5	3.1	34	50.7	3.1	15	46.9	2.9	24	50.0	3.2
$\alpha = .66$												

sample (N= 37, 37.8%) had slightly fewer. The jail-only participants (N= 10, 31.3%), once again, indicated witnessing the methods being utilized on others the least. The fourth item, reduced access to the canteen, had the same pattern as the previous item, with some percentages increased. Prison participants (N=29, 43.3%) and the subset focus group participants (N= 21, 43.8%) had slightly higher than 40% of the participants indicating witnessing the methods being utilized on other inmates half the time or more, while the total sample (N= 39, 39.4%) had fewer than 40%. Jail-only participants (N= 10, 31.3%) indicated witnessing the method the least. Overall, jail-only participants were the least likely to report having witnessed other inmates being punished by the methods of informal social control. The three other groups had no major differences among the percentage participants indicating witnessing in comparison with each other. The percentage of participants that reported witnessing the methods that comprised the “limit access for others scale” being utilized on other inmates seemed to be similar to the percentage of participants having reported experiencing the methods found for the “limit access scale”. This appears to indicate there were only minor differences in the percentage of participants reporting having experienced the method and having witnessed the methods being used on other inmates.

The second scale, “removal control for others scale”, was also meant to measure informal social control methods (See Table 4-7). The overall mean score for the total sample (mean= 2.8) and jail-only participants (mean= 2.3) indicated “sometimes”. Both other groups, prison participants (mean= 3.0) and focus group participants (mean= 3.1), mean scores indicated “half the time”. The first four items that constituted the scale mean scores that indicated “sometimes”, with a range of 2.1 to 2.8. For the final item that comprised the scale, the total sample (mean= 3.1), prison participants (mean= 3.1), and focus group participants (mean= 3.2) had mean scores

that indicated “half the time”. The jail-only participants (mean= 2.9) mean score indicated “sometimes”.

For the “removal control for others scale”, over one-third of the total sample (N= 35, 35.7%), prison participants (N= 25, 37.3%) and focus group participants (N= 17, 34.7%) indicated that they had witnessed the first item, not told when it was relax count, being utilized on other inmates. Jail-only participants (N= 10, 32.3%) had slightly fewer participants indicating so. The second item, being forced to remain sitting up during relax count, had roughly 40% of the prison participants (N= 27, 40.3%) and focus group participants (N= 19, 38.8%) indicating they witnessed it. The remaining two groups, total sample (N= 35, 35.7%) and jail-only participants (N= 8, 22.6%), had a lower percentage of participants reporting witnessing its use on other inmates half the time or more. Prison participants (N= 26, 39.4%) had the largest percentage of participants indicating having witnessed the third item, not having the phone be turned on, followed by focus group participants (N= 18, 37.5%). The total sample (N= 36, 37.1%) and jail-only participants (N= 10, 32.3%) had lower levels of percentage indicating witnessing. Roughly 30% of the total sample (N= 28, 28.9%) and prison participants (N= 21, 31.8%) reported witnessing the fourth item, not allowed the full minutes of phone usage. The remaining groups, jail-only participants (N= 8, 22.6%) and the subset of focus group participants (N= 11, 23.4%), reported fewer than 25% of the group witnessed the method utilized on other inmates half the time or more. The fifth item, being yelled at, received the largest percentage of participants indicating witnessing correctional officers utilizing the method. Approximately half of the total sample (N= 49, 49.5%), prison participants (N= 34, 50.7%) and focus group participants (N= 24, 50%) indicated so, while slightly fewer of the jail-only participants (N= 15, 46.9%) did so. In summary, the prison participants were the most likely to report having witnessed other inmates

being punished through the listed informal social control methods half the time or more, while jail-only participants were the least likely to report witnessing the methods. The percentage that reported witnessing the items that comprised the “removal control for others scale” appeared to indicate there were only minor differences in the percentage of reported witnessing and having experienced the methods for oneself. The percentages of the “removal control for others scale” seem to fall in range of the percentage of the “removal control scale”.

Frequencies: Perceived Effectiveness of Informal Methods of Social Control

The final scale examined was the “perceived effectiveness scale” (See Table 4-8). The scale had overall mean scores from all four groups, total sample (mean= 2.2), prison participants (mean= 2.1), jail-only participants (mean= 2.3) and focus group participants (mean= 2.2), that indicated “a little effective”, as did the mean scores for the first item. The first item was not told when it was relax count, while the second item was being forced to remain sitting up during relax count. The second items’ mean scores for total sample (mean= 2.0) and jail-only participants (mean= 2.1) indicated “a little effective”, while prison participants (mean= 1.9) and focus group participants’ (mean= 1.9) mean scores indicated “not at all effective”. The total samples (mean= 2.1), jail-only participants (mean= 2.4) and focus group participants’ (mean= 2.0) mean scores indicated “a little effective” for the third item, while the prison participants’ (mean= 1.9) mean score indicated “not at all effective”. The third item was not having the phone be turned on. The fourth item, not allowed the full minutes of phone usage, had similar mean scores. The total samples (mean= 2.1), jail-only participants (mean= 2.3) and focus group participants’ (mean= 2.0) mean score indicated “a little effective”, while the prison participants’ (mean= 1.9) mean score indicated “not at all effective”. The fifth, sixth, seventh and eighth items’ mean scores indicated “a little effective” for all four groups. The mean scores ranged from 2.1 to 2.5. The fifth item was being forced to rush during eating; the sixth item was shortened access to the yard;

Table 4-8. Perceived Effectiveness of Informal Methods of Social Control

	Total Sample (N=106)			Survey Participants Prison Participants (N=70)			Jail-only Participants (N=36)			Focus Group Participants Prison Participants (N=50)		
	N	% Effective or Very Effective	Mean	N	% Effective or Very Effective	Mean	N	% Effective or Very Effective	Mean	N	% Effective or Very Effective	Mean
Perceived Effectiveness Scale (1 Not at all effective, 2 a little effective, 3 effective, 4 Very effective)			2.2			2.1			2.3			2.2
Item 1: Not told when it was relax count	30	30.6	2.1	19	29.2	2.1	11	33.3	2.1	15	32.6	2.2
Item 2: Being forced to remain sitting up during relax count	28	28.6	2.0	16	23.9	1.9	12	38.7	2.1	12	24.5	1.9
Item 3: Not having the phone be turned on	36	36.4	2.1	18	26.9	1.9	18	56.3	2.4	13	27.1	2.0
Item 4: Not allowed the full minutes of phone usage	36	36.4	2.1	21	31.3	1.9	15	46.9	2.3	16	33.3	2.0

Table 4-8. Continued

	Total Sample (N=106)			Survey Participants Prison Participants (N=70)			Jail-only Participants (N=36)			Focus Group Participants Prison Participants (N=50)		
	N	% Effective or Very Effective	Mean	N	% Effective or Very Effective	Mean	N	% Effective or Very Effective	Mean	N	% Effective or Very Effective	Mean
Item 5: Being forced to rush during eating	34	34.3	2.1	23	34.3	2.1	11	36.7	2.1	17	35.4	2.2
Item 6: Shortened access to the yard	40	40.4	2.3	25	36.8	2.2	15	48.4	2.5	19	38.8	2.2
Item 7: Reduced access to smoking and rec time	42	42.0	2.2	28	41.2	2.2	14	43.8	2.2	20	40.8	2.2
Item 8: Reduced access to the canteen	42	42.0	2.3	29	42.6	2.4	13	40.6	2.2	21	42.9	2.5
Item 9: Being yelled at	34	34.3	2.1	20	29.4	1.9	14	45.2	2.2	14	28.6	1.9

the seventh item was reduced access to smoking and rec time, while the eighth item was reduced access to the canteen. For the ninth item, being yelled at, the total sample (mean= 2.1) and jail-only participants' (mean= 2.2) mean scores indicated "a little effective", while the mean score for the remaining two groups, prison participants (mean= 1.9) and focus group participants (mean= 1.9), indicated "not at all effective". Across all four groups, there were no major differences in mean scores for any of the items.

In order to examine the percentage of participants that perceived the scale items as effective, the response options "effective" and "very effective" were combined. Roughly 30% of the total sample (N= 30, 30.6%) and prison participants (N= 19, 29.2%) perceived the first item, not told when it was relax count, to be effective while a slightly higher percentage of jail-only participants (N= 11, 33.3%) and focus group participants (N= 15, 32.6%) did so (See Table 4-8). A higher percentage of jail-only participants (N= 12, 38.7%) indicated perceiving the second item, being forced to remain sitting up during relax count, more effective than the three other groups, total sample (N= 28, 28.6%), prison participants (N= 16, 23.9%) and the subset focus group participants (N= 12, 24.5%). For the third item, not having the phone be turned on, the jail-only participants (N= 18, 56.3%) once again had a higher percentage of participants indicating the method as being effective. The total sample (N= 36, 36.4%) had the next highest percentage of participants indicating so, followed by prison participants (N= 18, 26.9%) and focus groups participants (N= 13, 27.1%). The fourth item, not allowed the full minutes of phone usage, had a similar pattern as the previous two items with jail-only participants (N= 15, 46.9%) having the largest percentage. The total sample (N= 36, 36.4%) had the next largest percentage of participants finding the method effective, followed by focus group participants (N= 16, 33.3%) and prison participants (N= 21, 31.3%). Approximately thirty-five percent of the total

sample (N= 34, 34.3%) and focus group (N= 17, 35.4%) indicated the fifth item, being forced to rush during eating, was effective or very effective in controlling inmates, while slightly fewer prison participants (N= 23, 34.3%) indicated so, and slightly more jail-only participants (N= 11, 36.7%) indicated so. Across all groups, the sixth item, shortened access to the yard, had more participants that indicated the method as being effective or very effective than previous methods. The jail-only participants (N= 15, 48.4%) had the largest percentage, followed by the total sample (N= 40, 40.4%). The focus group participants (N= 19, 38.8%) and prison participants (N= 25, 36.8%) had slightly fewer participants indicating the methods effectiveness. Over 40% of all four groups, the total sample (N= 42, 42%), prison participants (N= 28, 41.2%), jail-only participants (N= 14, 43.8%) and focus group participants (N= 20, 40.8%), indicated that the seventh item, reduced access to smoking and rec time, was effective or very effective in controlling inmates. The subset focus group participants (N= 21, 42.9%) and prison participants (N= 29, 42.6%) both had slightly larger percentages of participants indicating the effectiveness of the eighth item, reduced access to the canteen, than the total sample (N= 42, 42%) and jail-only participants (N= 13, 40.6%). The ninth and final item, being yelled at, had more differences than the previous item. Jail-only participants (N= 14, 45.2%) had the largest percentage of participants indicating effectiveness, followed by the total sample (N= 34, 34.3%). Roughly 30% of the prison participants (N= 20, 29.4%) and focus group participants (N= 14, 28.6%) perceived the method as effective in punishing inmates.

Summarizing the results, jail-only participants were the most likely to indicate the informal social control methods listed as effective, except for the eighth item, reduced access to the canteen. The remaining three groups typically had a similar percentage of participants indicating effectiveness. The two items that had the highest percentage of participants indicating

effectiveness across all groups were reduced access to smoking and rec time and reduced access to the canteen.

Focus Group Data: Methods of Informal Social Control

For the second research question, the focus group results offered minimal support for the survey findings. Some focus group participants listed having experienced or witnessed one of the informal social control methods that the survey asked about. When participants were asked, “what type of things did staff do to control inmates”, some of their responses indicated that the phone was used as methods of control. For example, a 57-year-old white male who served a 5-year-sentence said “they could turn the phones off”. This was echoed by a 38-year-old black male who served a 10-year-sentence, who said correctional officers “take the telephone from you”. Another black male who served a 3-year-sentence stated “they wouldn’t cut the phone on sometimes, so you couldn’t call out”. A participant whose voice was not able to be identified said that correctional officers used “telephone, chow hall, privilege system” to control inmates.

More interestingly, participants listed other methods of informal control that officers utilized that were not included in the survey. Access to the television was one of those methods. For example, a white male from Clearwater stated “they would cut your privileges...television” while a black male from Gainesville said “they take the TV from you”.

Another method of control that was not included in the survey but brought up by a 46-year-old black male who resided in Gainesville, was access to their mail. He stated, “they wouldn’t give you your mail, they would hold it”. A 57-year-old white male from the Clearwater focus group, shared perhaps the most interesting methods that was not included in the survey. He described, “jail house loaf, which is every, all the food they would normally get, they put in a blender. Anything from main course to dessert gets blended together as punishment for throwing food”.

Unfortunately none of the focus group questions asked the participants whether they perceived the informal social control methods as being effective. Overall, there was minimal support for the survey results found from the focus groups, perhaps in great part due to the lack of focus group questions regarding informal social control, which is a limitation of this study. Most of the participants did not give example of informal social control methods, but some did and even listed some methods that were not included in the survey.

Correlations and Regressions: Methods of Informal Social Control

After examining the frequencies for measures of informal methods of social control occurrence across all samples, correlations were examined (See Table 4-9). There were six independent variables: age, race, years of school, month out, months in, and crime type. The dependent variables were the “limit access control scale”, the “removal control scale” and the eight total scale items that constituted them. No significant correlations were found for the prison participants and focus group participants. For the total sample, a significant relationship was found for the “limit access control scale”, years of school and months in prison/jail. Years of school indicated a negative correlation, meaning as years of school increased, reported experiences with the scale items decreased. Months in prison/jail had a positive correlation, so as months in increased so did the reported experiences with scale items. No other significant relationship was found for the total sample. For the jail-only participants, the first item of the “limit access control scale” was found to have a significant relationship with age and months out. The negative correlation indicated as age and months out increased the participants were less likely to report being forced to rush during eating. The second “limit access control scale” item, shortened access to the yard, was only found to have a significant relationship for jail-only participants in age and months out. As in the case with the previous scale item, the correlation was negative and indicated that as age and months out increased the participants were less likely

Table 4-9. Correlations of Informal Methods of Social Control

	Total Sample (N=106)						Prison Participants (N=70)					
	Age	Race	Years of School	Months Out	Months In	Crime Type	Age	Race	Years of School	Months Out	Months In	Crime Type
Limit Access Control Scale	.09	-.16	-.22*	-.00	.27*	-.06	.04	-.09	-.22	-.04	.18	.01
Item 1: Being forced to rush during eating	.14	-.01	-.12	-.10	.29**	-.07	.02	.06	-.08	-.18	.15	.00
Item 2: Shortened access to the yard	-.02	-.12	-.03	.01	.19*	.01	.11	-.12	-.05	.03	.23	-.01
Item 3: Reduced access to smoking and rec time	.03	-.15	-.29**	-.02	.13	-.09	-.05	-.14	-.29*	-.05	.08	.02
Item 4: Reduced access to the canteen	.12	-.23*	-.19	.13	.19	.02	.10	-.16	-.29*	.12	.10	.04
Removal Control Scale	-.16	-.19	-.03	.14	-.01	-.11	-.24*	-.10	-.09	.15	-.14	-.06
Item 1: Not told when it was relax count	-.21	.02	.19	.06	-.10	.06	-.22	.16	.26*	.05	-.21	.08
Item 2: Being forced to remain sitting up during relax count	-.01	-.07	-.08	.11	.05	-.13	-.17	-.09	-.17	.09	-.10	-.05
Item 3: Not having the phone be turned on	-.07	-.16	-.17	.08	.08	-.05	-.11	-.12	-.25*	.08	.01	-.08
Item 4: Not allowed the full minutes of phone usage	-.19	-.31*	-.06	.16	-.06	-.14	-.15	-.27*	-.08	.20	-.08	.33

* p<.05 **p<.01 ***p<.001

Table 4-9. Continued

	Jail-only Participant (N= 36)						Focus Group Participants (N=50)					
	Age	Race	Years of School	Months Out	Months In	Crime Type	Age	Race	Years of School	Months Out	Months In	Crime Type
Limit Access Control Scale												
Item 1: Being forced to rush during eating	-.46*	-.16	-.21	-.26	-.28	-.13	-.13	-.11	-.24	.19	.11	.12
Item 2: Shortened access to the yard	-.43*	.08	-.24	-.39*	-.14	-.03	-.24	-.01	-.04	.08	.05	.10
Item 3: Reduced access to smoking and rec time	-.48*	-.09	.06	-.37*	-.08	.06	.06	-.04	-.04	.19	.19	.01
Item 4: Reduced access to the canteen	-.14	-.11	-.26	-.08	-.23	-.26	-.14	-.19	-.34*	.12	.07	.13
Removal Control Scale												
Item 1: Not told when it was relax count	-.33	-.28	.13	.12	-.14	.06	-.08	-.09	-.32*	.21	.02	.13
Item 2: Being forced to remain sitting up during relax count	-.42*	-.30	.17	.11	-.05	-.16	-.29*	-.09	-.13	.11	-.11	.14
Item 3: Not having the phone be turned on	-.42*	-.24	.04	.10	-.23	.03	-.31*	.15	.26	.01	-.21	.17
Item 4: Not allowed the full minutes of phone usage	-.20	.09	.16	.12	-.01	-.16	-.26	-.12	-.26	.26	-.04	-.05
	-.39*	-.20	.15	-.12	.03	.05	-.12	-.09	-.26	.05	.00	.16
	-.31	-.47*	.00	.15	.05	-.20	-.01	-.24	-.11	-.04	-.02	-.03

* p<.05 **p<.01 ***p<.001

Table 4-10. Predicting Informal Methods of Social Control

		Total Sample		Jail-only Participants		
DV: Limit Access Control Scale	b	B	SE			
Years of School	-.107*	-.231	.047			
Months In	.003*	.252	.001			
Model R ²	.110					
Model R ² Adjusted	.089					
Model F	5.364**					
Model df	2,87					
DV: Being forced to rush during eating				b	B	SE
Age				-.062*	-.401	.027
Months Out				-.047	-.259	.031
Model R ²				.296		
Model R ² Adjusted				.242		
Model F				5.468*		
Model df				2,26		
DV: Shortened access to the yard				b	B	SE
Age				-.036	-.309	.021
Months Out				-.036	-.264	.024
Model R ²				.220		
Model R ² Adjusted				.162		
Model F				3.799*		
Model df				2,27		

* p< .05 ** p<.01 *** p<.001

to report being granted less access to the rec yard. No other significant relationships were found for the jail-only participants.

To further examine whether the items found to have a significant correlation were predictors, after other variables were controlled, ordinary least squares (OLS) regressions were run (See Table 4-10). First, using the total sample, years of school and months in were examined for their predictive value for the “limit access control scale”. In both cases, they were found to be significant, showing with an increase in years of school ($b = -.107$) the less likely the total sample was to indicate experiencing the limit access control survey items. However, as months in prison/jail ($b = .003$) increased so did the likelihood that participants indicated experiencing the methods. Though significance was found, the impact of months in prison/jail on the dependent variable was very small, almost non-existent. Using the jail-only participants, regressions were run to determine whether age and months out were predictors of experiencing the method, being forced to rush during eating. Months out ($b = -.047$) was not found to be a predictor but age ($b = -.062$) was, when both were in the model. As age increased the likelihood of reporting having experienced the methods decreased. However, the difference was quite small. The final regression was run, once again, using age and months out of prison/jail but this time as possible predictors of the method, shortened access to the yard. Neither variable was found to be predictors at a significant level.

When examining the reported experiences of informal methods of control, there were few significant relationships found for the total sample and jail-only sample. None were found for the prison participants and focus group participants. Those relationships were then examined for their predictive value. In the case of the total sample, years of school was found to be significant but have a negative relationship with “limit access control scale”, while months in was also

found to be significant but have a positive relationship. For the jail-only participants, age was a predictor for reporting experiencing being forced to rush during eating, with older jail-only participants being less likely to report experience. The focus group data did not offer any support for the survey data, since none of the relationships were found to be significant. Also, in reviewing the focus group data there appeared to be no pattern in the type of responses and type of respondents¹. Respondents ranged in race, age and length of sentence serviced in prison.

Correlations and Regressions: Methods of Informal Social Control on Others

The scales and scale items that measure the reported frequency of witnessing other inmates being punished by methods of informal social control were also examined (See Table 4-11). The previously listed six independent items were once again used, and the “limit access control for others scale” and the “removal control for others scale”, with their nine total scale items served as the dependent variables. No significant relationships were found for prison participants, jail-only participants and focus group participants when correlations were run. For the total sample, the first item for the “limit access control for others scale”, being forced to rush during eating, age and months in had a significant correlation, both indicating a positive relationship. The “removal control for others scale”, years of school and months in had a significant correlation. Years of school had a negative relationship, meaning an increase in years of school the less reporting of witnessing the scales items, while months in had a positive relationship, meaning as the amount of months in prison/jail increased so did the reported witnessing of scale items being used on others.

OLS regression was used to examine whether any of the previously listed items were significant predictors (See Table 4-12). The first regression used dependent variables, being

¹ The answers given during focus groups sessions by participants about methods of informal social control methods utilized by correctional officers to control inmates were listed in a previous section.

Table 4-11. Correlations of Informal Methods of Social Control for Others

	Total Sample (N=106)						Prison Participants (N=70)					
	Age	Race	Years of School	Months Out	Months In	Crime Type	Age	Race	Years of School	Months Out	Months In	Crime Type
Limit Access Control for Others Scale	-.07	-.01	.00	.10	-.05	-.16	-.10	.03	-.02	.13	-.17	-.13
Item 1: Being forced to rush during eating	.28*	-.07	-.11	-.01	.34**	-.14	.01	-.06	-.11	-.12	.18	-.02
Item 2: Shortened access to the yard	-.02	-.03	-.28**	.03	.07	-.07	-.13	-.03	-.35**	.02	-.02	-.02
Item 3: Reduced access to smoking and rec time	-.07	-.11	-.11	-.09	.12	-.21*	-.08	-.11	-.14	-.10	.09	-.25*
Item 4: Reduced access to the canteen	.16	-.13	-.21*	.05	.19	-.14	.10	-.13	-.24	.04	.07	-.11
Removal Control for Others Scale	.13	-.11	-.23*	-.00	.24*	-.17	-.02	-.11	-.27*	-.05	.11	-.12
Item 1: Not told when it was relax count	-.05	-.01	.07	.01	.01	-.09	.01	.09	.07	.02	-.03	-.18
Item 2: Being forced to remain sitting up during relax count	.04	-.02	-.14	.02	-.01	-.15	-.00	-.06	-.25*	.01	-.12	.03
Item 3: Not having the phone be turned on	-.04	-.06	-.01	.12	-.12	-.13	-.11	.03	-.04	.13	-.25*	-.03
Item 4: Not allowed the full minutes of phone usage	-.06	-.01	-.04	.16	-.05	-.27**	-.12	.01	-.02	.10	-.11	-.22
Item 5: Being yelled at	-.21*	-.01	.06	.05	-.07	.00	-.19	.01	.06	.07	-.15	-.01

* p<.05 **p<.01 ***p<.001

Table 4-11. Continued

	Jail-only Participant (N= 36)						Focus Group Participants (N= 50)					
	Age	Race	Years of School	Months Out	Months In	Crime Type	Age	Race	Years of School	Months Out	Months In	Crime Type
Limit Access Control for Others Scale	-.41*	-.02	.09	-.17	-.02	-.18	-.21	.13	-.04	-.02	-.26	-.05
Item 1: Being forced to rush during eating	-.09	.15	-.14	-.09	-.14	-.21	-.22	-.08	-.06	-.15	.09	.12
Item 2: Shortened access to the yard	-.32	.12	-.06	-.23	-.13	-.11	-.06	.02	-.39*	.18	-.02	.16
Item 3: Reduced access to smoking and rec time	-.36*	-.06	-.06	-.33	-.23	-.12	.00	-.19	-.13	-.13	.13	-.17
Item 4: Reduced access to the canteen	-.30	.00	-.12	-.35	-.03	-.09	.09	-.08	-.25	.02	.03	-.03
Removal Control for Others Scale	-.34	.06	-.13	-.31	-.18	-.18	-.12	-.12	-.27	-.03	.08	.03
Item 1: Not told when it was relax count	-.36*	-.21	.05	-.10	-.04	.10	-.07	.19	.09	-.00	-.02	-.22
Item 2: Being forced to remain sitting up during relax count	-.18	.14	.15	-.14	.01	-.37*	-.10	-.05	-.29*	.20	-.17	-.01
Item 3: Not having the phone be turned on	-.13	-.17	.09	.13	.08	-.25	-.25	.13	-.07	-.19	-.31*	.08
Item 4: Not allowed the full minutes of phone usage	-.24	-.01	-.10	-.27	.11	-.35	.02	.08	-.08	-.04	-.17	-.16
Item 5: Being yelled at	-.56*	-.21	.05	-.10	-.02	.02	-.28	-.00	.11	-.02	-.26	.19

* p<.05 **p<.01 ***p<.001

Table 4-12. Predicting the Reported Witnessing Informal Methods of Social Control

	Total Sample		
DV: Being forced to rush during eating	b	B	SE
Age	.007	.055	.015
Months In	.006*	.320	.002
Model R ²	.125		
Model R ² Adjusted	.106		
Model F	6.591**		
Model df	2, 92		
DV: Removal Control for Others Scale	b	B	SE
Years of School	-.109*	-.248	.044
Months In	.003*	.231	.001
Model R ²	.106		
Model R ² Adjusted	.086		
Model F	5.348**		
Model df	2, 90		

* p< .05 ** p<.01 *** p<.001

forced to rush during eating, and age and months in as independent variables. Only months in prison/jail (b= .006) was found to be a significant predictor, with the more months in the more likely to report the witnessing of this method being used on other inmates. Significance was found but the impact of months in prison/jail was almost non-existent. The second regression found that both independent variables, years of school (b= -.109) and months in (b= .003), were significant predictors for the “removal control for others scale”. With an increase in years of school there was a decrease in the reported witnessing of scale items, while with an increase in the amount of time in there was an increase in the reported witnessing. No other regressions were run since no other significant relationships were found.

There were few significant relationships found when examining the reported witnessing of informal social control methods being used on other inmates. There were none found for prison participants, jail-only participants and focus group participants. For the total sample, the significant relationships that were found were then examined for their predictive value. Months

in was found to be the only significant predictor for witnessing others being forced to rush during eating, with the participants who have been in longer being more likely to report witnessing. As previously found, months in prison/jail was found significant but the impact was incredible small. Years of school and months in were both found to be predictors for the “removal control for others scale”. Years of school had a negative relationship and months in prison/jail had a positive relationship. Once again, the focus group data did not offer any support for the survey data. As in the previous case, none of the relationships that were found to be significant were with the focus group participants and after reviewing the focus group data, there were no obvious patterns in the type of responses and type of respondents.

Correlations and Regressions: Perceived Effectiveness of Informal Methods of Social Control

The perceived effectiveness of the informal social control methods were the final items examined, first for relationships, then for predictive value (See Table 4-13). Six independent variables were used, and have been previously listed, while the perceived effectiveness scale and its nine scale items served as the dependent variables. There were no significant relationships found for the jail-only participants and focus group participants. For the total sample, the first scale item, being forced to rush during eating, race and years of school had a significant negative correlation. It appears that non-white participants were more likely to perceive it as effective, as were individuals who had less years of school. There was also a correlation found between the fifth item, not told when it was relax count, race and years of school. The relationships were, once again, negative indicating the same pattern. There were no other significant correlations found for the total sample. For the prison participants, the only significant relationships that were found between the fifth item, not told when it was relax count, age and race. The relationships were both negative, and appeared to indicate that non-white were more likely to perceive the

Table 4-13. Correlations of Perceived Effectiveness of Informal Methods of Social Control

	Total Sample (N=106)						Prison Participants (N=70)					
	Age	Race	Years of School	Months Out	Months In	Crime Type	Age	Race	Years of School	Months Out	Months In	Crime Type
Perceived Effectiveness Scale	.00	-.28*	-.19	.06	-.01	.02	.10	-.38*	-.19	.09	.05	.10
Item 1: Being forced to rush during eating	.05	-.23*	-.21*	.03	.10	-.05	.06	-.31*	-.22	.03	.12	.05
Item 2: Shortened access to the yard	-.05	-.21*	-.08	.04	.00	.00	.07	-.31*	-.09	.06	.09	.06
Item 3: Reduced access to smoking and rec time	.08	-.29*	-.12	.06	.09	-.04	.08	-.42*	-.17	.08	.11	-.01
Item 4: Reduced access to the canteen	.08	-.28*	-.16	.08	.11	-.02	.10	-.43*	-.19	.08	.09	.03
Item 5: Not told when it was relax count	-.03	-.23*	-.31**	.05	-.13	-.02	-.08	-.32*	-.32*	.07	-.16	.06
Item 6: Being forced to remain sitting up during relax count	.12	-.13	-.11	.12	-.02	.02	.15	-.18	-.07	.14	-.00	.05
Item 7: Not having the phone be turned on	-.07	.01	-.10	.03	-.11	.04	.07	-.17	-.09	.08	.01	.11
Item 8: Not allowed the full minutes of phone usage	.01	-.08	-.15	.07	-.03	.07	.14	-.19	-.15	.11	.04	.20
Item 9: Being yelled at	-.09	-.20	-.11	-.03	-.07	.01	.62	.02	.21	.94	.73	.32

* p<.05 **p<.01 ***p<.001

Table 4-13. Continued

	Jail-only Participants (N=36)						Focus Groups Participants (N=50)					
	Age	Race	Years of School	Months Out	Months In	Crime Type	Age	Race	Years of School	Months Out	Months In	Crime Type
Perceived Effectiveness Scale	.04	-.11	-.26	-.06	-.11	-.20	.14	-.55*	-.16	.11	-.00	.10
Item 1: Being forced to rush during eating	.00	.03	-.16	-.21	-.19	-.29	.08	-.44*	-.21	.10	.08	.03
Item 2: Shortened access to the yard	.03	-.09	-.07	.17	-.17	-.20	.05	-.40*	-.05	.08	.03	.07
Item 3: Reduced access to smoking and rec time	.14	.02	.08	-.09	-.02	-.09	.13	-.53*	-.16	.07	.08	.01
Item 4: Reduced access to the canteen	-.11	.12	-.03	-.19	-.30	-.10	.09	-.58*	-.17	.24	.02	.09
Item 5: Not told when it was relax count	.02	-.05	-.29	-.18	.01	-.13	.02	-.49*	-.34	.08	-.14	.17
Item 6: Being forced to remain sitting up during relax count	.24	-.07	-.26	.21	.24	-.05	.17	-.31*	-.07	.18	.02	-.07
Item 7: Not having the phone be turned on	.13	.31	-.12	-.04	-.08	-.21	.09	-.27	-.05	.14	-.03	.16
Item 8: Not allowed the full minutes of phone usage	.09	.08	-.16	-.27	.01	-.22	.19	-.28	-.13	.05	-.01	.22
Item 9: Being yelled at	.05	-.12	.05	-.26	-.11	-.22	-.09	-.34*	-.14	-.10	-.14	.07

* p<.05 **p<.01 ***p<.00

Table 4-14. Predicting Perceived Effectiveness of Informal Methods of Social Control

	Total Sample			Prison Participants		
	b	B	SE	b	B	SE
DV: Being forced to rush during eating						
Race	-.378	-.175	.233			
Years of School	-.077	-.153	.055			
Model R ²	.072					
Model R ² Adjusted	.051					
Model F	3.473*					
Model df	2,90					
DV: Not told when it was relax count						
Race	-.303	-.155	.199	-.442	.251	-.223
Years of School	-.122*	-.268	.046	-.100	.053	-.240
Model R ²	.117			.145		
Model R ² Adjusted	.098			.117		
Model F	6.039**			5.178**		
Model df	2,91			2,61		

* p< .05 ** p<.01 *** p<.001

method as being effective, while the more years of school a participants had the less likely they were to perceive the method as being effective.

In order to determine the predictive value, ordinary least squares regression was used (See Table 4-14). Using the total sample, the survey item, being forced to rush during eating, race and years of school were first examined. Neither independent variable, race nor years of school, were found to be significant predictors when in the model together. The second regression examined race and years of education as predictors for the item, not being told when it was relax count. Race was not found to be a predictor, but years of school ($b = .122$) remained significant. As the years of school increased the perceived effectiveness of not being told when it was relax count decreased. Using the prison participants, the same dependent and independent variables were examined. But in the case of prison participants, race and years of school were not found to be predictors for the perceived effectiveness of not being told when it was relax count. No other regressions were run, because the variables were not significantly correlated at the bivariate level.

Examining the perceived effectiveness of informal social control items and the scales found few significant relationships. Jail-only participants and focus group participants had no significant relationships at the bivariate level. For the total sample, the significant relationships were found and then examined for their predictive value in a multivariate level. However, of the two survey items and two possible predictors, years of school was found to be the only significant predictor. Participants who reported having received more years of education were less likely to perceive not being told when it was relax count as effective. For the prison participants, the one scale item and two possible predictors produced no significant predictors. The data obtained during the focus group did not offer any support for the data obtained from the

survey. None of the relationships were found to be significant for the focus groups participants and no focus group questions asked about perceived effectiveness of informal social control methods.

Summary

This section described the results found during the study. It discussed the findings about inmate and correctional officer interactions, as well as what traits are used to describe correctional officers. Focus group data was used to further explain or lend credibility to the survey data. Next, findings into informal social control methods experienced by inmates or other inmates were described, as well as the perceived effectiveness of those methods. The focus group data that pertained to this research question was also discussed. Tables were used to display data, and direct quotes from the focus group data were also used when applicable.

CHAPTER 5 DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

This is the final section of this study. First, the author discusses a summary of the findings for both research questions and reviews the previous literature. Then, the author describes the limitations of the study and makes suggestions for future research. Finally, the author makes policy suggestions.

Summary of Findings

The first research question was ‘what was the prison experience like for former inmates regarding correctional officers and, what were their interactions with correctional officers like?’. More often the survey data indicated former inmates viewed their interactions with correctional officers in a negative light than in a positive light, but in both cases the support was limited. However, this did not extend to jail-only participants, who were the least likely to view the interactions in a negative light, and most likely to view interactions with correctional officers as positive. The subset focus group participants were the most likely to report having unpleasant interactions with correctional officers. The remaining two groups, the total sample and the prison participants, generally had slightly lower percentages in agreement than the focus group participants, but higher than jail-only participants.

Similar survey results were found when examining former inmates’ view of correctional officers’ traits. Overall, there was some support found that former inmates were more likely to agree with traits that described correctional officers negatively than positively. The exception was jail-only participants, who were more likely to agree with positive traits being used to describe correctional officers than negative traits. Focus group participants were the most likely to agree with negative traits describing correctional officers, with the total sample and the participants having similar but lower percentages in agreement. The most agreement from

participants was for the use of the word “rude” to describe correctional officers. Once again the findings were limited, since most participants neither agreed nor disagreed with any of the traits, positive or negative, being used to describe correctional officers.

The results drawn from the focus group discussions reiterated the survey findings. The number of focus group participants that indicated having negative interactions was greater than the number of focus group participants indicating positive interactions, but in both cases the number was small. The focus group participants offered more comments that indicated they felt correctional officers possessed negative traits. However, there was a little support indicating some believed correctional officers held positive traits.

Using six demographics variables, correlations and then regressions were run in order to determine whether any were predictors for the scales measuring officer interactions and scale items, as well as the trait scales and scale items. From all the scales and scale items and for all four samples, the only significant predictor was years of school for the “positive trait scale” and its two scale items (e.g., patient and polite) for focus group participants. It appeared as years of school increased so did agreement with positive traits being used to describe correctional officers. The limited amount of focus group data available supported this finding, since those participants that used positive descriptions to describe correctional officers indicated having attended at least twelve years of school.

The results from this study offered some support for the previous literature on inmates’ experiences regarding correctional officers and their interactions with them. Previous research had indicated that the interactions between inmates and correctional officers were mainly classified as unpleasant and punctuated by distrust (Hemmens & Marquart, 2000; Toch, 1978). Interactions between inmates and correctional officers are often perceived as disrespectful from

the perspective of inmates (Irwin, 2005). This study found some support for this. Though not overwhelming, across all samples some participants agreed with survey items that indicated negative interactions with officers. Previous literature had found that former inmates' perspective of inmate-staff relations did not vary significantly based on education level, socioeconomic status, and criminal history, but did so based on race and age (Hemmens & Marquart, 2000). This study also did not find personal demographic variables to be significant predictors for perceptions of inmate-staff interactions.

The review of the literature suggested the biggest contributor for negative interactions may be the negative views and opinions held by each group about one another (Grusky, 1959). It was found that, as suggested in the literature review, for the most part the former inmates did not hold positive views of correctional officers (Ross & Richards, 2002; Weinberg, 1942). Inmates often hold preconceived notions of the correctional officers as a group, which tend to be unfavorable and marked by suspicion (Grusky, 1959; Toch, 1978). The items that used negative adjectives to describe correctional officers received some support in the form of agreement from some participants across all samples, partially supporting previous research.

Not all interactions and correctional officers are viewed as being bad or negative, however. Inmates may hold favorable views of officers (Hemmens & Marquart, 2000; Hepburn, 1985; Irwin, 2005). Inmates and staff do not always view each other as opposition (Streets, 1965). Though not overwhelming, this study did offer some support for this previous research as well. Across all groups, participants showed some agreement for items that indicated inmates having positive interactions with inmates, as well as correctional officers holding positive traits.

Overall, this study was able to answer the first research question, 'what was the prison experience like for former inmates regarding correctional officers and, what were their

interactions with correctional officers like?’ by examining the responses of former inmates. It was found that some participants viewed interactions with correctional officers as negative experiences, and even fewer viewed the interactions as positive. Similar findings were found for the views of correctional officers. However, a majority of participants did not indicate having either negative interactions or holding negative views of correctional officers, or positive interactions or holding positive views of correctional officers. Though, this study offers some support for previous research, it suggests an exaggeration on part of the previous literature, which often paints a picture of extreme dislike and negative experiences with correctional officers. The respondents in this study were more ambivalent, possibly because they were no longer dealing with officers daily.

The second research question asked, ‘what methods of informal control did officers use to control inmates and what was their impact as experienced by former inmates?’ This study found some support for the occurrence of each of the nine informal controls discussed in the study, and some support for the method’s perceived effectiveness. In the case of the total sample, prison participants and focus group participants, roughly one-third of the participants or more reported experiencing all nine methods of control half the time or more, with the average percentage of participants being around 42%. The focus group participants were the most likely to report having experienced the methods. The jail-only participants were slightly less likely to report experiencing the methods. The survey item, being forced to rush during eating, had the largest amount of reported agreement across all samples.

In the case of witnessing other inmates being punished through methods of informal social control, overall the percentage of participants reported witnessing was slightly less than the percentage of participants that reported experiencing the methods themselves. Typically

approximately 40% of the total sample, prison participants, and focus group participants reported witnessing the methods being used to control other inmates. Prison participants were the most likely to report having witnessed other inmates being punished through the listed informal social control methods half the time or more. Jail-only participants were the least likely to report witnessing, with an average of 30% indicating having witnessed the methods being used on other inmates. There appears to be only minor differences in the percentage of participants reporting having experienced the methods of informal social control and the witnessing the methods being used on other inmates.

The results for examining the perceived effectiveness of the nine listed informal social control methods found that the jail-only participants were most likely to indicate the methods as being effective, with an average of 43% of the participants indicating so. The remaining groups had a similar percentage of participants indicating effectiveness, with approximately 34% of the participants indicating effectiveness. The two items that appeared to be found the most effective, based on the percentage of participants indicating effectiveness, were reduced access to smoking and rec time and reduced access to the canteen.

There was minimal support for the survey results found from the focus group data due to focus group questions not specifically asking about methods of informal social control. Most of the participants did not give examples of informal social control methods, but the few that did offered support to the survey findings. Participants also listed some informal social control methods that were not included in the survey, such as limiting access to the television, mail and the use of “jail house loaf”. Unfortunately none of the focus group questions asked the participants whether they perceived the informal social control methods as being effective, so the focus group data can not be used to confirm or deny the survey data.

Regressions were run in order to determine whether any of the six demographic variables were predictors for the scales and scale items that pertained to the second research question. There were no significant predictors found for prison participants or focus group participants for any of the scales and scale items. For the jail-only participants, the only predictor found was age for reporting experiencing being forced to rush during eating, with older jail-only participants being less likely to report experience. However, there were more predictors found for the total sample. For scales and scale items pertaining to the participants' experiences with informal social control, years of school was found to be significant but have a negative relationship with "limit access control scale", while months in was also found to be significant but have a positive relationship. For the witnessing of the methods being used on others, months in prison/jail was found to be a significant predictor for witnessing others being forced to rush during eating, with the participants who have been in longer being more likely to report witnessing. Months in was also found to be a predictor of the "removal control for others scale", as did years of school, with years of school having a negative relationship and months in having a positive relationship. The only significant predictor found for the "perceived effectiveness scale" and its survey items was years in school. Participants who reported having been in more years of school were less likely to perceive not being told when it was relax count as an effective method of control.

The focus group data did not offer any support for the survey data, since none of the relationships was found to be significant. Also, in reviewing the focus group data there appeared to be no pattern in the type of responses and the type of respondents. The participants that discussed methods of informal social control utilized by officers on them or other inmates varied in age, length of sentenced served, as well as race. Also, the questions were not written in a way

that would necessarily elicit responses about informal social control methods utilized by correctional officers or the perceived effectiveness of informal social control methods.

This study offers support for the limited amount of literature regarding the use of informal social control methods. Previous literature has found that prisons could not operate efficiently if correctional officers responded to every infraction formally, since the process tends to be time consuming (Hewitt et al., 1984; Irwin, 2005; Marquart, 1986; Useem & Reisig, 1999). Correctional officers have the option of choosing to enforce the rules and regulations through either formal or informal social control methods (Fisher-Giorlando & Jiang, 2000; Marquart, 1986; Poole & Regoli, 1980a; Streets, 1965). Officers report a small fraction of the violations they actually observe (Hewitt et al., 1984). This suggests that officers may be using informal social control methods, which are the actions taken by correctional officers in order to discipline or punish inmates without resorting to official procedures. Correctional officers also may tolerate minor inmate infractions and sanction inmates in an informal manner that does not require a great deal of effort and time from their part (Useem & Reisig, 1999). This study found that former inmates reported being punished through methods of informal social control or witnessing other inmates being punished through the methods. On average, at least 33% of the participants indicated experiencing the methods, meaning nearly one out of three inmates had been corrected through at least one of the methods. The witnessing of informal social control methods being utilized had similar numbers. These results support previously literature that points to correctional officers utilizing methods of informal social control as a way to try to control inmates.

Besides being less of a burden in time and effort for correctional officers, informal social control methods may also be used since they are perceived to be effective. The correctional

officer might be working based on the assumption that the formal forms of punishment they use might not make a difference in the inmate's everyday status since the punishment is not immediate (Sykes, 1958). Informal social control methods tend to be immediate, and remove or limit access to items or activities the inmate wants to engage in. With inmates having such few pleasure items or activities, the threat of the removal of those few pleasures or items is a powerful motivation for compliance with prison rules and regulations (Sykes, 1958). With inmates being in a position of extreme deprivation, the few privileges and luxury items that they are able to have become very valuable to them (Irwin, 2005). Though this study did not examine what made the methods of informal social control effective, it did examine whether the methods were perceived to be effective. Overall, all methods were found to be effective by nearly one-fourth of the participants. This study built upon previous literature which had suggested that correctional officers utilized the informal social control methods since they believed them to be effective by finding that some former inmates reported the methods to be effective.

By examining the responses from former inmates, this study was able to answer the second research question which was, 'what methods of informal control did officers use to control inmates and what was their impact as experienced by former inmates?' It was found that some participants did report being punished by correctional officers through the use of methods of informal social control. There were also some participants who reported witnessing other inmates being punished through methods of informal social control. From the perspective of former inmates, all the methods had some participants indicating that the methods were effective in controlling inmates. Unfortunately, the focus group data did not offer much by way of support for the understanding of informal social control methods use in prison, because no questions specifically addressed this issue. However, this study offered support for previous research,

which suggested that correctional officers utilized informal methods to control inmates. It would appear that these methods of control are being utilized in correctional facilities and detention centers to some extent.

Study Limitations and Suggestions for Future Research

There are limitations associated with the study that limits the generalizability. The first limitation is that the entire sample was not comprised of participants who had been incarcerated in a federal or state prison. Participants who had only been housed in jail were included in the survey. Though not part of the initial target sample, the researcher was able to get access to jail participants and did not want to lose the opportunity to include them in the study. However, this greatly limited the generalizability of the study, since there were noticeable differences within the sample. The sentences served by jail-only participants were shorter than the rest of the sample, which may have affected the amount of interactions jail-only participants had with correctional officers and opportunities to experience methods of informal social control. In addition, jail officers may be different than prison officers.

The second limitation of the study is that not all of the participants participated in focus groups. Over half of the sample did not participate in a focus group. One group refused, while another group, comprised of 49 individuals, were not afforded the opportunity to do so because of inadequate space. The focus group results were very limited in their ability to be generalized to the sample or beyond. Another limitation that is associated with the focus groups is that not all focus group participants spoke or offered comments during the group. It was often found that the same three or four participants spoke, also limiting the ability of the focus group results to generalize to others.

There were also limitations associated with the questions asked during the focus groups. There were no direct questions asking about informal social control methods, just general

questions asking about control methods utilized by correctional officers. There were also no questions asking participants if they perceived the methods of control that correctional officers implement were effective or what the impact of those methods had. The absence of such questions did not allow for the thorough examination of informal social control this study had hoped to accomplish.

Other limitations involved the construction of survey. There were several demographic variables that should have been included but were not. For example, most of the study participants indicated having receiving a high school diploma or a GED. However, there was no measure that asked participants to indicate whether they received their GED while being incarcerated or while living on the streets. This may be important because the type of inmate who would try to obtain a GED during his period of incarceration may be a different type of inmate than one who does not. He may be less likely to have negative interactions or place himself in a situation that requires the correctional officer to punish or control him. There were also no measures that allowed for the examination of approximately how much time and opportunity each inmate had to interact with correctional officers and an inmate's contact with officers can vary from frequent to very rare (Fisher-Giorlando & Jiang 2000; Grusky, 1959). But perhaps, more significantly, there were no measures that asked about prior incarceration history. Inmates who have been incarcerated more than once may have had more opportunities to have interactions with correctional officers, as well as experience or witness the utilization of informal social control methods. Also, the type of person who has been incarcerated multiple times is more than likely a different type of person than someone who has only been incarcerated once. Lastly, the variable that was meant to measure the custody level of the facilities the participants were housed at was unable to be used, and is a limitation for the study. Participants seemed

confused about what was being asked. Some listed the name of the facilities they had been housed in, while others circled the listed example custody level. The variable should have been split into two separate variables. First, asking participants how many facilities had they been housed in, and then asking them to list those facilities by name in the order of which they were housed. This would have allowed the researcher to look up the facilities and verify the custody levels of the facilities, as well as control for how many facilities a participant had been housed in. The current study does not allow for the comparison of individuals who had been housed in many facilities versus just one facility, or for comparison of differences in facility classification levels.

Another limitation is that the survey only asked participants about eight reactions they might have had during their interactions with correctional officers. There should have been more possible reactions or at least an option for the participants to write in the reaction they most commonly felt during interactions. The same limitation is true for the questions asking participants about possible correctional officers' traits. There were only ten possible traits listed, when either more possible traits should have been included or an option for participants to list some possible traits. Though this study allowed for the examination of nine informal social control methods, there may be more informal social control methods that correctional officers utilize. Some focus group participants discussed other methods that correctional officers used. Perhaps the most obvious informal social control method that was excluded was the removal of the television. A variable that asked participants about the use of the television as a control method should have been included as well as an option for participants to list other informal social control methods they experienced or witnessed being used.

Future research should first address the limitations associated with the study. The sample should be comprised of only participants who have been incarcerated in a federal or state prison, or participants who have only been incarcerated in jail. If one wanted to compare the two groups, a larger sample of both would be required. Also, all participants should be afforded the opportunity to participate and share in a focus group.

As far as the measures used in the study, future research should expand the focus group questions and include questions about informal social control methods and what the perceived effectiveness or impact the methods of control that correctional officers use have. In the future, the survey should include a variable that indicates whether the participant received his GED in prison, prior incarceration history, a measure that allows for the examination of how much time and opportunity each inmate had to interact with correctional officers, a measure for how many facilities a participant had been housed in, and the names of specific facilities.

Also, future research should try to measure more possible reactions or have an option for the participants to write in the reaction they most commonly felt during their interactions with correctional officers. Additional possible correctional officers' trait should also be measured. The two traits suggested during the focus group, unprofessional and judgmental, should be included as well as an option for participants to list more possible traits. At a minimum, a variable that asked participants about the use of the television as a control method should added. The two other informal social control methods that were suggested during the focus groups were "jail house loaf" and the withholding of mail might be considered for inclusion in future research, as well as an option for participants to list other informal social control methods they experienced or witnessed being used.

Going beyond the current study, future research should also extend into prison or jails. Inmate and correctional officers' interactions and correctional officers' use of informal social control methods should be studied from the perspective of current inmates, as well as correctional officers. Though inmates' perception of correctional officers have been examined from the perspective of former inmates, examining the responses of current inmates may allow for different responses than those from former inmates since the interactions and control methods would be more current and not require participants to draw from their memory (Hemmens & Marquart, 2000). To date, few studies have explored staff's attitudes and perceptions on interactions and other aspects of prison life, so there is a need to expand this research to include correctional officers (Crouch & Alpert, 1980; Hemmens & Marquart, 2000).

The final suggestion for future research is that informal social control methods and their context for which they occur should as be extended to include female participants. Female former inmates and inmates may have very different experiences when it comes to inmate and correctional officer interactions in comparison to male former inmates and inmates (Bloom, Owen & Covington, 2003). Studies have shown that correctional officers often indicate having a preference for male inmates, since female inmates often make more demands, more complaints and are less likely to follow orders (Pollock, 1986; Rasche, 2000). Also males and females have different styles of communicating (Tannen, 1990). With a preference for male inmates and differences between communication styles, the possibility that female inmates have a very different perception of interactions with correctional officers and views of correctional officers is quite great. More importantly though, the informal social control methods that officers utilize for controlling female inmates may be different than those used for male inmates. If different

methods of control are being used for females, they need to be identified and effectiveness examined.

Policy Implications

One of the hopes of this study was for the author to be able to make policy recommendations. This study examined nine possible methods of informal social control: not told when it was relax count, being forced to remain sitting up during relax count, not having the phone be turned on, not allowed the full minutes of phone usage, being forced to rush during eating, shortened access to the yard, reduced access to smoking and rec time, reduced access to the canteen and being yelled at. It was found that there was some indication that all methods are utilized by correctional officers to some degree based on self reported experiences or reported witnessing of other inmates' experiences. With some evidence that informal methods of social control already being utilized, prison administrators may want to consider officially implementing these methods as part of their formal control methods and procedures. Instead of having corrective consultations (CCs) and disciplinary reports (DRs) being the methods by which inmates are corrected or punished, have more options officially available for officers to correct and punish inmates. These informal social control methods offer a "happy-medium" for situations in which the officer feels the inmate needs to be corrected but the infraction does not warrant formal punishment. Since the methods are already being utilized to some extent, including the methods into official procedures may also protect the officers from grievances and other inmate legal retaliation that claim discrimination on the part of the officer.

Though not overwhelming, a number of participants perceived these methods to be effective. Typically at least one out of three participants felt the method was effective, and in most cases the number was higher. This also lends support for their use because at least in some of the cases the inmates are viewing the method as a punishment. For the method of control to

have an impact, the individual must feel that the punishment is punishment (Sykes, 1958). The two methods that were found to be perceived as the most effective were reduced access to smoking and the rec time and reduced access to the canteen. Across all four samples, both methods received over 40% of the participants indicating they perceived the method to be effective. Prison administrators may want to allow dorm officers to have a say regarding whether inmates in their dorms get access to smoking, rec time and the canteen, instead of allowing the general population to have the same access. It would give the dorm officer more say and control by being able to use items perceived as a reward or privilege by over 40% of the inmates.

There is evidence that correctional officers already utilize the methods, and some former inmates did perceive the methods to be effective. Correctional officers already are outnumbered by inmates, and if the methods are effective in helping control one-third of those inmates, that is one-third less inmates the correctional officers have to formally sanction. With prison populations increasing, prison administrators may need to be examining what works for controlling some inmates versus trying to find the illusive what works for controlling all inmates.

Summary

This study offered an exploratory examination into informal social control methods utilized by correctional officers and their perceived effectiveness. In order to examine the circumstances and situations surrounding informal methods of control, inmate and correctional officers' interactions and correctional officer traits from the perspective of former inmates was also examined. It was found that some of the participants viewed interactions with correctional officers as negative experiences and described correctional officers using negative traits, and even fewer viewed the interactions and traits held by correctional officers as positive. Reviewing the literature, perhaps there is some exaggeration, which often paints a picture of extreme dislike and negative experiences from the perspective of inmates on correctional officers. It was also

found that some of the participants did indicate correctional officers use methods of informal social control to punish or control inmates. From the perspective of former inmates, all the methods included in the study had some participants that indicated each method was effective in controlling inmates. Policy suggestions were made following a discussion of the study's limitations and recommendations for future research. This study only started the examination and exploration into the use of informal social control methods as part of prison management, much more is needed.

APPENDIX A
SURVEY

Perceptions of Prison Life

Code Number

Circle or fill in the response that best fits your answer.

1. How old are you? (*indicate age*) _____

2. What is your sex? (*circle one*)

Male
1

Female
0

3. How would you describe your race and/or ethnicity? (*circle one*)

White	1	Hispanic	3
Black/African American	2	Other	4

Specify

4. What is the highest level of education you have obtained? (*circle one*)

None	1	10 th grade	11
1 st grade	2	11 th grade	12
2 nd grade	3	High school	13
3 rd grade	4	GED	14
4 th grade	5	Some college	15
5 th grade	6	Associate's degree	16
6 th grade	7	Bachelor's degree	17
7 th grade	8	Other	18
8 th grade	9	(Specify) _____	
9 th grade	10		

5. How long since you have been out of prison?

_____ months

_____ years

6. How long were you in prison? (*specify number of months or years*)

_____ months

_____ years

7. What state(s) were you incarcerated in?

1.

2.

3.

4.

5.

8. What level of security were the facility (facilities) you were housed in? (*minimum, medium, close, etc.*)

1. _____

2. _____

3. _____

4. _____

5. _____

9. How long have you resided/did you reside in the half-way house where you live (or lived)?

_____ months

_____ years

10. For your last incarceration, what offense(s) were you convicted of? *(Please list the offense carrying the longest sentence first)*

1.

2.

3.

4.

5.

6.

7.

8.

9.

10.

Circle the response that best fits your answer. Please remember to answer these questions based on your last incarceration experience.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Unsure	Agree	Strongly Agree
11. Officers were more likely to formally punish inmates through corrective consultation (CCs). <i>(circle one)</i>	1	2	3	4	5
12. Officers were more likely to formally punish inmates through disciplinary reports (DRs). <i>(circle one)</i>	1	2	3	4	5
13. Officers were more likely to informally punish inmates through taking away privileges. <i>(circle one)</i>	1	2	3	4	5
14. I would have rather received informal sanctions than formal sanctions. <i>(circle one)</i>	1	2	3	4	5

Now I would like to know about your experiences during your last incarceration. Which informal sanctions did YOU receive by officers? (Circle the response that best fits your answer.)

	Never	Sometimes	Half the Time	Usually	Always
15. Not told when it was relax count. <i>(circle one)</i>	1	2	3	4	5
16. Being forced to remain sitting up during relax count. <i>(circle one)</i>	1	2	3	4	5
17. Not having the phone be turned on. <i>(circle one)</i>	1	2	3	4	5
18. Not allowed the full minutes of phone usage. <i>(circle one)</i>	1	2	3	4	5
19. Being forced to rush during eating. <i>(circle one)</i>	1	2	3	4	5
20. Shortened access to the yard. <i>(circle one)</i>	1	2	3	4	5
21. Reduced access to smoking, and rec time through not opening the yard. <i>(circle one)</i>	1	2	3	4	5
22. Reduced access to the canteen. <i>(circle one)</i>	1	2	3	4	5
23. Being yelled at. <i>(circle one)</i>	1	2	3	4	5

Now I would like to ask you about how other inmates were treated. How often were the following informal sanctions utilized by officers towards OTHER inmates? (Circle the response that best fit your answer.)

	Never	Sometimes	Half the Time	Usually	Always
24. Not being told when it was relax count. <i>(circle one)</i>	1	2	3	4	5
25. Being forced to remain sitting up during relax count. <i>(circle one)</i>	1	2	3	4	5
26. Not having the phone be turned on. <i>(circle one)</i>	1	2	3	4	5
27. Not allowed the full minutes of phone usage. <i>(circle one)</i>	1	2	3	4	5
28. Being forced to rush during eating. <i>(circle one)</i>	1	2	3	4	5
29. Shortened access to the yard. <i>(circle one)</i>	1	2	3	4	5
30. Reduced access to smoking, and rec time through not opening the yard. <i>(circle one)</i>	1	2	3	4	5
31. Reduced access to the canteen. <i>(circle one)</i>	1	2	3	4	5
32. Being yelled at. <i>(circle one)</i>	1	2	3	4	5

How effective do you believe the following sanctions were at informally CONTROLLING THE INMATES during your last incarceration experience? (Circle the response that best fits your answer.)

	Not at all Effective	A Little Effective	Effective	Very Effective
33. Not being told when it was relax count. <i>(circle one)</i>	1	2	3	4
34. Being forced to remain sitting up during relax count. <i>(circle one)</i>	1	2	3	4
35. Not having the phone be turned on. <i>(circle one)</i>	1	2	3	4
36. Not allowing the full minutes of phone usage. <i>(circle one)</i>	1	2	3	4
37. Being forced to rush during eating. <i>(circle one)</i>	1	2	3	4
38. Shortening access to the yard. <i>(circle one)</i>	1	2	3	4
39. Reducing access to smoking, and rec time through not opening the yard. <i>(circle one)</i>	1	2	3	4
40. Reducing access to the canteen. <i>(circle one)</i>	1	2	3	4
41. Being yelled at. <i>(circle one)</i>	1	2	3	4

Correctional officers often interact with inmates for a variety of reasons. I am interested in knowing why correctional officers interacted with YOU on an informal level. (Circle the response that best fits your answer.)

When an officer interacted with me I thought:

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Unsure	Agree	Strongly Agree
42. He/she wanted something. <i>(circle one)</i>	1	2	3	4	5
43. He/she was trying to get out of work. <i>(circle one)</i>	1	2	3	4	5
44. He/she was trying to hit on me. <i>(circle one)</i>	1	2	3	4	5
45. He/she was trying to get information <u>from</u> me. <i>(circle one)</i>	1	2	3	4	5
46. He/she was trying to get information <u>about</u> me. <i>(circle one)</i>	1	2	3	4	5
47. He/she was concerned about my problems. <i>(circle one)</i>	1	2	3	4	5
48. He/she was sincere in his/her interaction. <i>(circle one)</i>	1	2	3	4	5
49. He/she was no different than anyone else. <i>(circle one)</i>	1	2	3	4	5

I felt most officers were: (Circle the response that best fits your answer. For each question, circle one answer.)

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Unsure	Agree	Strongly Agree
50. Educated	1	2	3	4	5
51. Criminal	1	2	3	4	5
52. Fair	1	2	3	4	5
53. Patient	1	2	3	4	5
54. Polite	1	2	3	4	5
55. Wise	1	2	3	4	5
56. Violent	1	2	3	4	5
57. Religious	1	2	3	4	5
58. Cruel	1	2	3	4	5
59. Rude	1	2	3	4	5
60. Drug abusers	1	2	3	4	5

Finally, we would like to ask you questions about religion. We are hoping to learn more about the role of religion in prison. Circle or fill in the response that best fit your answer.

61. How would you describe your religious preference/denomination now? (*circle one*)

None	1	Protestant	3
Catholic	2	Other	4

(Specify) _____

62. Before you went to prison, how important was religion in your life? (<i>circle one</i>)	Not at all important	A little important	Important	Very important
	1	2	3	4

63. In the year before you were incarcerated, how often did you go to religious services? (*circle one*)

Never	Weekly
1	4
Seldom	More than once a week
2	5
Monthly	Daily
3	6

64. While you were in prison, how important was religion in your life? (*circle one*)

Not at all important	A little important	Important	Very important
1	2	3	4

65. How often did you go to religious services while in prison? (*circle one*)

Never	Weekly
1	4
Seldom	More than once a week
2	5
Monthly	Daily
3	6

66. Since you left prison, how important is religion in your life? (*circle one*)

Not at all important	A little important	Important	Very important
1	2	3	4

67. Since you left prison, how often do you go to religious services? (*circle one*)

Never	Weekly
1	4
Seldom	More than once a week
2	5
Monthly	Daily
3	6

Please tell me how much religion affected your life while you were incarcerated. Circle the response that best fits your answer.

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Unsure	Agree	Strongly Agree
68. I turned to religion to relieve guilt. <i>(circle one)</i>	1	2	3	4	5
69. I attended religious services to gain access to outsiders. <i>(circle one)</i>	1	2	3	4	5
70. I turned to religion to deal with the loss of my freedom. <i>(circle one)</i>	1	2	3	4	5
71. I turned to religion for safety. <i>(circle one)</i>	1	2	3	4	5
72. I turned to religion to build relationships with other inmates. <i>(circle one)</i>	1	2	3	4	5
73. I turned to religion to learn a new way of living. <i>(circle one)</i>	1	2	3	4	5
74. I turned to religion because of a lack of anything else to do. <i>(circle one)</i>	1	2	3	4	5
75. I turned to religion because it reminds me of home. <i>(circle one)</i>	1	2	3	4	5
76. I turned to religion to forget I am in prison. <i>(circle one)</i>	1	2	3	4	5

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Unsure	Agree	Strongly Agree
77. I turned to religion to get out of work. <i>(circle one)</i>	1	2	3	4	5
78. I turned to religion as something to do. <i>(circle one)</i>	1	2	3	4	5
79. I turned to religion to receive privileges. <i>(circle one)</i>	1	2	3	4	5
80. I turned to religion because staff treated me better. <i>(circle one)</i>	1	2	3	4	5
81. I turned to religion to rebuild family relationships. <i>(circle one)</i>	1	2	3	4	5
82. I turned to religion to get out of the hot/cold weather. <i>(circle one)</i>	1	2	3	4	5
83. My turning to religion was an act. <i>(circle one)</i>	1	2	3	4	5

APPENDIX B
FOCUS GROUP QUESTIONS

1. How would you describe your prison experience? (Explain)
2. In your experience, what type of things did staff do to control inmates? (Please explain. Can you give us some examples?)
3. What were your interactions with staff like? (Examples)
4. What were the interactions between staff and other inmates like?
5. Did officers mess with you? With other inmates? How? Please give us some examples of how this happened.
6. Did some officers treat you differently than others? How so? Why do you think this happened? (Explain)
7. When you did something wrong, would you be punished the same way each time? How were you generally punished? The same as other inmates? Why or why not? (Explain)
8. If you were talking to your friends, how would you describe the staff in the prison where you were? What about the interactions you had with them?
9. What would you like people who do research on inmate-staff interactions to know that we have not discussed already?
10. Now I'd like to ask you some questions about your experiences since you have been out of prison. First, have any of you re-offended since you have been out? If so, what have you done and why? If not, why not?
11. What do you think will keep you from re-offending in the future? What do you need help with? (Family, friends, church?)
12. Are you religious? If so, how has this impacted your attitude and experience since you have left prison?
13. If you are religious, what do you like most about your religion?
14. What do you believe you must do to lead a religious life?
15. Do you feel you have been forgiven? Why do you feel this way?
16. Have you ever claimed to be religious to get benefits from the system (e.g., in prison, to gain entry to a halfway house, etc.?)
17. Is there anything else you'd like to tell me about your experiences since you left prison?

LIST OF REFERENCES

- Austin, J., Bruce, M.A., Carroll, L., McCall, P.L., & Richards, S.C. (2001). The Use of Incarceration in the United States. *Critical Criminology*, *10*, 17-41.
- Bloom, B., Owen, B., & Covington, S. (2003). *Gender-Responsive Strategies: Research, Practice, and Guiding Principles for Women Offenders*. Washington, DC: National Institute of Corrections.
- Brown, B.S., DuPont, R.L., Kozel, N.J., & Spevacek, J.D. (1971). Staff Conceptions of Inmate Characteristics: A Comparison of Treatment and Custodial Staffs at Two Differing Institutions. *Criminology*, *9*, 316-329.
- Craddock, A. (1992). Formal Social Control in Prisons: An Exploratory Examination of the Custody Classification Process. *American Journal of Criminal Justice*, *27*, 63-84.
- Cressey, D.R. (1959). Contradictory Directives in Complex Organizations: The Case of the Prison. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *4*, 1-9.
- Crouch, B.M., & Alpert, G.P. (1980). Prison Guards' Attitudes Toward Components of the Criminal Justice System. *Criminology*, *18*, 227-236.
- Fisher-Giorlando, M., & Jiang, S. (2000). Race and Disciplinary Reports: An Empirical Study of Correctional Officers. *Sociological Spectrum*, *20*, 169- 194.
- Frey, J. H., & Fontana, A. (1991). The group interview in social research. *The Social Science Journal*, *28*, 174-187.
- Grusky, O. (1959). Role Conflict in Organization: A Study of Prison Camp Officials. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *3*, 452-472.
- Hazelrigg, L.E. (1967). An Examination of the Accuracy and Relevance of Staff Perceptions of the Inmate in the Correctional Institution. *The Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology and Police Science*, *58*, 204-210.
- Hemmens, C., & Marquart, J.W. (2000). Friend or Foe? Race, Age, and Inmate Perceptions of Inmate-Staff Relations. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, *28*, 297-312.
- Hepburn, J.R. (1985). The Exercise of Power in Coercive Organizations: A Study of Prison Guards. *Criminology*, *23*, 145-164.
- Hepburn, J.R., & Albonetti, C. (1980). Role Conflict in Correctional Institutions: An Empirical Examination of the Treatment-Custody Dilemma Among Correctional Staff. *Criminology*, *17*, 445-459.
- Hewitt, J.D., Poole, E.D., & Regoli, R.M. (1984). Self-reported and Observed Rule-breaking in Prison: A look at Disciplinary Response. *Justice Quarterly*, *1*, 437-447.

- Hoene, Paula M. 2000. Keeping the Streets Safe: Truth in Sentencing and Public Opinion in Idaho. *The Justice Professional*, 12, 291-304.
- Irwin, J. (1970). *The Felon*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Irwin, J. (2005). *The Warehouse Prison: Disposal of the New Dangerous Class*. Los Angeles, California: Roxbury Publishing Company.
- Jurik, N.C. (1985). Individual and Organizational Determinants of Correctional Officer Attitudes Toward Inmates. *Criminology*, 23, 523-539.
- Jurik, N.C., & Musheno, M.C. (1986). The Internal Crisis of Corrections: Professionalism and the Work Environment. *Justice Quarterly*, 3, 457-480.
- Kitzinger, J. (1994). The Methodology of Focus Groups: The Importance of Interaction between Research Participants. *Sociology of Health and Illness*, 16, 103-121.
- Mayer, G.R. (2001). Antisocial Behavior: Its Causes and Prevention within Our Schools. *Education and Treatment of Children*, 24, 414-429.
- McLafferty, I. (2004). Focus Group Interviews as a Data Collecting Strategy. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 48, 187-194.
- Morgan, D.L. (1996). Focus Groups. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 22, 129-152.
- Morgan, D.L., & Spanish, M. T. (1984). Focus Groups: A Tool for Qualitative Research. *Qualitative Sociology*, 7, 253-269.
- Morris, N. (1995). The Contemporary Prison: 1965-Present. In N. Morris and D. J. Rothman (Eds.), *The Oxford History of The Prison: The Practice of Punishment in Western Society* (pp. 202-231). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Marquart, J.W. (1986). Prison Guards and the Use of Physical Coercion as a Mechanism of Prisoner Control. *Criminology*, 24, 347-366.
- Pollock, J. (1986). *Sex and Supervision: Guarding Male and Female Inmates*. New York, NY: Greenwood Press.
- Poole, E.D., & Regoli, R.M. (1980a). Role Stress, Custody Orientation, and Disciplinary Actions: A Study of Prison Guards. *Criminology* 18(2):215-226.
- Poole, E.D., & Regoli, R.M. (1980b). Examining the Impact of Professionalism on Cynicism, Role Conflict, and Work Alienation Among Prison Guards. *Criminal Justice Review*, 5, 57-65.

- Rasche, C.E. (2000). The Dislike of Female Offenders among Correctional Officers: Need for Special Training. In R. Muraskin (Ed.), *It's a Crime: Women and Justice* (pp. 237-252). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Richards, S.C., & Ross, J.L. (2001). Introducing the New School of Convict Criminology. *Social Justice, 28*, 177-190.
- Ross, J.I., & Richards, S.C. (2002). *Behind Bars: Surviving Prison*. Indianapolis, IN: Alpha Books
- Senese, J.D., (1991). Communications and Inmate Management: Interactions among Jail Employees. *Journal of Criminal Justice, 19*, 151-163.
- Smithson, J. (2000). Using and Analysing Focus Groups: Limitations and Possibilities. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology, 3*, 103-119.
- Streets, D. (1965). The Inmate Group in Custodial and Treatment Settings. *American Sociological Review, 30*, 40-55.
- Sykes, G. (1956). The Corruption of Authority and Rehabilitation. *Social Forces, 34*, 257-262.
- Sykes, G. (1958). *The Society of Captives*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Tannen, D. (1990). *You Just Don't Understand: Men and Women in Conversation*. New York, NY: William Morrow.
- Terry, C.M. (2004). Managing Prisoners as Problem Populations and the Evolving Nature of Imprisonment: A Convict Perspective. *Critical Criminology, 12*, 43-66.
- Toch, H. (1978). Is a "Correctional Officer," By Any Other Name, a "Screw"? *Criminal Justice Review, 3*, 19-35.
- Toch, H. (1992). *Living in Prison: The Ecology of Survival*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- U.S. Department of Justice Office of Justice Program Bureau of Justice Statistics. (2007). Prison Statistics. Retrieved on March 22, 2007, Revised on January 21, 2007, from the World Wide Web: <http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/bjs/prisons.htm>
- Useem, B., & Reisig, M.D. (1999). Collective Action in Prisons: Protests, Disturbances, and Riots. *Criminology, 37*, 735- 759.
- Warr, Deborah. (2005). It was Fun...But We Don't Usually Talk about These Things: Analyzing Sociable Interaction in Focus Groups. *Qualitative Inquiry, 11*, 200-225.

Weinberg, S.K. (1942). Aspects of the Prison's Social Structure. *The American Journal of Sociology*, 47, 717-726.

Wuensch, K. (2005). Principal Components Analysis-SPSS. Retrieved on September 23, 2007, Updated on August 17, 2007, from the World Wide Web:
<http://core.ecu.edu/psyc/wuensch/MV/FA/PCA.doc>

Zald, M.N. (1962). Power Balance and Staff Conflict in Correctional Institutions. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 4, 22-49.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

Saskia Daniele Santos earned her Bachelor of Science degree in psychology and Bachelor of Arts in criminology in 2003 from the University of Florida. Following two years working within the Florida prison system, she entered the graduate program in the Department of Criminology, Law and Society at the University of Florida in the fall of 2005 where she earned her Master of Arts degree in 2007.