

THE ROLE OF CORRECTIONS IN
PURE CRIME PREVENTION

by

Allen John Reynolds

A Thesis Submitted to the Faculty of the
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION
In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
For the Degree of
MASTER OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION
In the Graduate College
THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA

1 9 7 4

STATEMENT BY AUTHOR

This thesis has been submitted in partial fulfillment of requirements for an advanced degree at The University of Arizona and is deposited in the University Library to be made available to borrowers under rules of the Library.

Brief quotations from this thesis are allowable without special permission, provided that accurate acknowledgment of source is made. Requests for permission for extended quotation from or reproduction of this manuscript in whole or in part may be granted by the head of the major department or the Dean of the Graduate College when in his judgment the proposed use of the material is in the interests of scholarship. In all other instances, however, permission must be obtained from the author.

SIGNED: _____

Allin J. Reynolds

APPROVAL BY THESIS DIRECTOR

This thesis has been approved on the date shown below:

Thomas A. Johnson

THOMAS A. JOHNSON

Associate Professor of Public
Administration

July 30, 1974

Date

PREFACE

The presentation to follow is an attempt to discover what role, if any, the various correctional functions within the United States can play in pure crime prevention activities. The term, "pure crime prevention," has been chosen by this author to indicate a concept of prevention before the initial act occurs, and also indicates the basis for this thesis insofar as it concerns the prevention aspect. All too often, when one speaks of prevention, the listener or reader finds himself attempting to reach his own conclusions about a definition of prevention and, as a result, the role of corrections may well be seen as prevention of future criminal activities. For this reason the first chapter of this work is an attempt to set forth some definitions of crime prevention so that the reader more fully understands this author's use of the term "pure crime prevention." The chapter is also intended to indicate the present attitudes as to which criminal justice agency, police, courts, or corrections, is in the best position to accomplish the crime prevention function.

Since this thesis is intended to explore the role of corrections in crime prevention, Chapter II bears directly on this role. Chapter II sets forth information received

from various state correctional systems, and practitioners, concerning the topic of this thesis.

The final chapter of this work pertains to suggestions for correctional programs in crime prevention. Some of the suggestions are based on programs which correctional systems are currently involved in but are not designed to provide a pure crime prevention function and so have been placed in a suggestion chapter rather than in Chapter II.

Throughout this work, it is hoped that the reader may gain some insights into not only the role of corrections in crime prevention, but also gain some idea of whether or not corrections, as a functioning criminal justice agency, should be concerned with pure crime prevention. In addition, this thesis is intended to provide material relative to what corrections can bring to prevention activities by way of information or expertise.

This thesis is by no means attempting to be the final word on the subject posed. It is, however, an attempt to ascertain whether or not corrections should become a "prevention partner" along with the other criminal justice agencies. It is this author's opinion that corrections, as a pure crime prevention partner, has been overlooked in the past, as is evidenced by the lack of written material concerning corrections and its involvement in pure prevention programs. It is the hope of this author that the work to follow will begin to evoke some serious thought that may

lead to including corrections in the total effort toward crime prevention in America.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT	vii
CHAPTER	
I. CRIME PREVENTION AND THE CORRECTIONAL CYCLE . . .	1
II. THE ROLE OF CORRECTIONS IN CRIME PREVENTION	13
III. CORRECTIONAL PROGRAMS FOR CRIME PREVENTION	28
Georgia	29
Nebraska	31
Arizona	36
Illinois	39
Alaska	47
Georgia, Florida, Iowa, Texas, Virginia, and Wyoming	50
California	53
IV. SUGGESTED PROGRAMS FOR CORRECTIONAL CRIME PREVENTION	61
Shock Prevention	72
V. CONCLUSION	77
APPENDIX A. QUESTIONNAIRE: CRIME PREVENTION	82
APPENDIX B. SAMPLE LETTER	84
REFERENCES	85

ABSTRACT

The thesis to follow examines the feasibility of involving the correctional function, in the United States, in crime prevention activities. The thesis is not aimed toward future crime prevention through rehabilitation, nor is it intended to indicate that, following incarceration, future criminal activity, on the part of the released offender, will be a reality due to the fear of re-incarceration. The thesis does, however, attempt to indicate that there is a role to be played by correctional systems in prevention prior to the criminal act, and that, in fact, this role is being played by several state corrections agencies.

Various crime prevention programs involving corrections, both formally and informally, are reviewed in order that the reader can more fully understand exactly what role corrections might play in the concept of crime prevention.

The conclusion that can be drawn from this thesis is that there is a definite place for corrections in applied crime prevention judging from the correspondence with correctional officials, and the research that was involved in this presentation. In line with this conclusion, there is presented a number of programs that correctional

officials might wish to consider to begin involving their particular operations in crime prevention prior to the act.

CHAPTER I

CRIME PREVENTION AND THE CORRECTIONAL CYCLE

If one is seeking information concerning prevention programs that are currently in operation throughout the United States, he need only conduct a short investigation, for prevention project information abounds in the criminal justice literature. As he begins to narrow his search, seeking specific sub-systems within the continuum of the criminal justice system that are intended to function in this area, he would find that the majority of programs fall within the province of law enforcement services and juvenile court systems.

The concept of crime prevention has proven to be a problematical one in that there can arise some confusion as to exactly what one means by the term "crime prevention." The editors of Police Programs for Preventing Crime and Delinquency define crime prevention as follows:

Crime prevention is any organized activity aimed at keeping unlawful behavior from occurring originally or keeping such behavior to a minimum and thus avoiding police intervention; or any organized activity aimed at deterring unlawful behavior.

This definition would include programs for both juveniles and adults. It would also include programs aimed at removing the desire on the part of an individual to commit an unlawful act or reducing the opportunity to break the law. Prevention

activity would cease to exist at the point of police intervention for an alleged law violation.¹

Sutherland and Cressey, in their oft-quoted text Criminology, view crime prevention as follows:

Two general systems for reducing the frequency of crimes have been tried. One method aims at reducing the amount of repeated crime, the other at forestalling commission of first crimes. The name "crime prevention" has been given to both systems, but it is becoming common practice to consider the effort to prevent recidivism as the method of "reformation," the effort to forestall first crimes as the method of "prevention." This terminology is slightly inaccurate, for the policies of execution and of segregation for certain offenders are aimed at reduction of repeated crimes, yet they can hardly be considered methods of reformation. Furthermore, a single program of police, such as imprisonment, may be aimed at both reformation and prevention.²

Elmer Johnson is the next theorist to be considered here because he makes two general statements which are basic to the problem presented within this paper. In his summary to the chapter on preventive reaction Johnson states the following:

Prevention implies that delinquency and crime are undesirable but that their existence is not inevitable. A crimeless society is unlikely, but delinquency can be reduced. Prevention involves either of two targets: elimination of antisocial behavior at 1st source or the forestalling of further offenses. The first target is emphasized

1. Dan G. Pursuit, John D. Gerletti, Robert M. Brown, Jr., and Steven M. Ward, eds., Police Programs for Preventing Crime and Delinquency (Springfield, Ill.: Charles C. Thomas, 1972), p. xi.

2. Edwin H. Sutherland and Donald R. Cressey, Criminology, 8th ed. (New York: J.B. Lippincott Co., 1970), p. 607.

by agencies interested in promoting healthy personality development of all children or in taking action against other broad social problems. Other agencies have the same target in serving persons with behavioral or emotional problems likely to lead to delinquency. Law enforcement, judicial, and correctional agencies focus on the second target [italics mine]. Theories related to prevention tend to be oriented toward the individual and family or toward the environment to which the individual is exposed. However, the effective employment of any approach is within the context of the community [italics mine]. The rise of social awareness of the nature and functioning of the community is a basis of social solidarity. .

3

The last theorist to be considered here is Peter P. Lejins who views prevention as a "measure taken before a criminal or delinquent act has actually occurred for that purpose of forestalling such an act."⁴ Lejins sees three types, or three distinct meanings, of the concept of prevention by way of clarification in order to make communication meaningful and to allow the obtaining of meaningful research data. He says that "Three types of prevention or three distinct meanings of the concept can be differentiated: punitive prevention, corrective prevention, and mechanical prevention."⁵

3. Elmer Hubert Johnson, Crime, Correction, and Society (Rev. ed.; Homewood, Ill.: The Dorsey Press, 1968), p. 358.

4. Peter P. Lejins, "The Field of Prevention," in Delinquency Prevention: Theory and Practice, ed. by William E. Amos and Charles F. Wellford (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1967), p. 2.

5. Ibid., p. 3.

Punitive prevention focuses on the threat of punishment for commission of a criminal act and assumes that the awareness of the punishment is a motive for not committing the act. Some, however, including Dr. George Betto, the director of the Texas Department of Corrections, would apparently disagree that the "threat of punishment" does much toward prevention. In an article in Playboy magazine, in September of 1972, Dr. Betto was quoted as telling a legislative committee that "certainty of punishment, not its severity, was the chief deterrent to crime. . . ." ⁶ Along this same line, Lejins notes that "the effectiveness of punitive prevention presumably depends on the certainty and severity of punishment." ⁷ Punitive prevention, in the context of placing it within the correctional cycle, apparently finds its expression through the court system.

"Corrective prevention deals with the assumption that criminal behavior, just as any other human behavior, has its causes, is influenced by certain factors, and is the result of certain motivation. . . ." ⁸ To prevent criminal activity, using a corrective prevention approach, the agency or agencies involved would, of necessity, be required to attack the root causes within society as a whole. In isolated

6. "Texas Justice," Playboy Magazine, September, 1972, p. 56.

7. Lejins, "The Field of Prevention," p. 3.

8. Ibid., p. 4.

cases there is of course the possibility of ascertaining specific causes and dealing with those. The problem found in corrective prevention is obviously the magnitude of any program which must be developed for this concept as it begins to address such areas as poverty as a cause of crime. It is easily seen here that to attack poverty as a cause of criminal activity is an undertaking outside the realm of isolated agencies within the criminal justice system.

The last prevention concept posed by Peter Lejins is the concept of mechanical prevention which appears to be the direction now taken by American law enforcement agencies. Mechanical prevention programs are those which are not aimed at the personality of the criminal actor nor at threatening punishment. These programs are in the form of obstacles "placed in the way of the potential offender that make it difficult or impossible for him to commit an offense."⁹ Such actions as increased police patrols, increased street lighting, and various security measures (adequate locking systems, barred windows, alarm systems, etc.) fall within the area of mechanical prevention.

Another, and relatively new prevention method which comes within the province of mechanical prevention, is the concept of "Defensible Space." This concept is the result of a study undertaken by the Institute of Planning and

9. Ibid., p. 5.

Housing at New York University with funds from the National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice of the United States Department of Justice. Oscar Newman, the Director of New York University's program, describes the concept:

Defensible Space is a model for residential environments which inhibits crime by creating the physical expression of a social fabric that defends itself. . . . Defensible Space is a surrogate term for the range of mechanisms--real and symbolic barriers, strongly defined areas of influence, and improped opportunities for surveillance--that combine to bring an environment under the control of its residents.¹⁰

What is apparently required here is that housing authorities and city planners begin concerning themselves with building "multi-family residential environments" in forms that insure residential control of the areas surrounding them. Mr. Newman sees Defensible Space as aiming "at formulating an architectural model of corrective prevention."¹¹

The role of the police in mechanical prevention has been briefly mentioned as it applies to increased patrol surveillance. Police, for the purposes of this particular work, are placed in the role of mechanical preventors purely because their place in the correctional cycle, and because of their many duties, preclude their acting as punishers or correctors. Neither punishment nor correction is a part of

10. Oscar E. Newman, Defensible Space (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1972), p. 3.

11. Ibid., p. 4.

the police function and so law enforcement agencies must be viewed, at least in a preventive context, as mechanical preventors. They are the social control agency which must erect the mechanical barriers that stand in the way of criminal activity.

Typical of the mechanical prevention function of police departments is the Special Crime Attack Team program conducted by the Denver Police Department with the aid of Federal Hi-Impact Crime funds. This is a program which involves the use of such activities as increased patrol surveillance, house-to-house and business-to-business contact by police for the purpose of security consultation. This program also calls for an increase in criminalistic crime scene searches in an attempt to decrease the occurrence of burglaries as well as to increase the numbers of prosecutions for this particular type of crime.

Such programs as Operation I.D., which is now national in scope and is intended to mark personal property of citizens for later identification, and anti-burglary and robbery units, are no more than mechanical prevention devices. In point of fact, such prevention programs are preventive only insofar as publicity of such programs is utilized. Programs such as these are, in short, effective detection devices with prevention the by-product that may result from publicity and increased prosecution as a result of the program.

That police departments can practice prevention in its applied form, intervention before the act, has been demonstrated by such programs as school resource officers, community service officers, store front operations, crisis intervention teams, and the like. The effectiveness of such programs must be viewed however in the light of spiralling crime rates and the fact that police prevention programs are not uniform across the country.

In light of the preceding definitions and examples, there is the need to answer the question that is to be found at the heart of the prevention program: Which social control agency has the total responsibility of crime prevention, and who can best accomplish it? Exact statements concerning the answer to this question are not readily available, although it is generally assumed that the police function is charged with the prevention and detection of criminal activity. If this is, in fact, a police function, then it would seem that police administrators should concern themselves with factors other than arrest rates as measures of success or failure, and community services should become more than token responses to community frustrations. Police departments, if they are to be a moving force in crime prevention, should remove themselves from the correctional cycle influence, and should alter the individual officer's attitudes toward citizens if police departments are to

become the prime sources of crime prevention in fact and not by inference.

A. F. Branstatter and James J. Brennan, writing in Delinquency Prevention: Theory and Practice, stated the following, concerning the attitudes toward police by the average citizen:

There is almost a universal stereotype of police as repressive agents concerned only with enforcing laws and apprehending violators. The patrolman who tries doors to see that they are secure and tickets illegal parkers, the "cop" who responds to fires and ambulance calls, accepts a bribe and chases the kids --these form the stereotype.¹²

That these views of the police by society are incorrect to a great extent does not detract from the fact that such observations can severely limit the ability of policemen to function in preventive areas. The community must accept the preventive agent if he is to function adequately, but the community can not, and will not, as long as their views are as stated above.

In an informal questionnaire given to 138 students majoring in criminal justice at the University of Nebraska at Omaha, the definition of crime prevention stated on page one of this chapter was given to them and they were asked if they saw the police as adequately functioning toward that

12. A. F. Brandstatter and James J. Brennan, "Prevention Through the Police," in Delinquency Prevention: Theory and Practice, ed by William E. Amos and Charles F. Wellford (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall Inc., 1967), p. 189.

goal.¹³ Of the 138 students responding to the questionnaire, 51% felt that police departments were not functioning adequately toward the goal of crime prevention, 59% felt that the police did not provide the best delivery system for crime prevention services, and yet 53% felt that the police were the most logical service to provide a crime prevention function. It would appear then, that, at least in the minds of future criminal justice practitioners, even though police are the most logical choice to perform crime prevention services, they are not doing an adequate job.

The next "partner" in the correctional cycle is the court system, and its status concerning crime prevention may be even more questionable than that of the police.

An examination of the empirical data and experience of the last ten years indicates that there has been a failure to control the growth of crime and delinquency in the United States. To what degree this must be blamed on failures of the judicial process is a question relatively unanswerable in light of the complexities of causation and of the relation of lawless behavior to the entire institutional fabric. Nevertheless, the last several years raise questions as to the adequacy of the judicial process' performance of its function in social control and, more fundamentally, of the assumptions that underlie these functions.¹⁴

Regardless of the above statement, this author feels that the courts are not serving as a preventive function

13. See Appendix I for questionnaire and results.

14. Gary Bellow, "Prevention Through the Judicial Process," in Delinquency Prevention: Theory and Practice, ed. by William E. Amos and Charles F. Wellford (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentic-Hall Inc., 1967), p. 212.

because their contact with the individual comes only after he or she has been charged. The process of prevention has already failed in this case. The courts' only other contact with the offender comes about through the probation service, again after the preventive process has failed. It can be argued here then, that the court is in the position of being a "middle-man" and cannot function in a preventative capacity since the structure of the criminal justice system has effectively removed it from contact before the offense.

In the questionnaire cited previously, the students were asked if they saw the court system as adequately functioning toward the goal of crime prevention. Of the 138 students, 137 responded to the question, and 81% apparently felt that the court system was not adequately functioning toward the goal of crime prevention. Interestingly enough, 59% did not agree that the courts could not function in such a capacity because of their position in the correctional cycle.

The remaining function within the correctional cycle is that of corrections. Why it has not apparently been a viable prevention partner may possibly be because of its "tail" position in the cycle. Another reason for its not being a true prevention partner may be because corrections have been viewed in the past as existing merely to punish and attempt to rehabilitate those individuals who have been unfortunate enough to get caught. Regardless of the

position of corrections in the correctional cycle, and regardless of its operations being viewed as punitive ones, it is this author's contention that correctional systems can operate in a pure prevention capacity and it is hoped that the information to follow will support such a contention.

CHAPTER II

THE ROLE OF CORRECTIONS IN CRIME PREVENTION

The contemporary emphasis is on prevention of crime. The importance of the individual is not denied, but prevention is, indeed, better than cure. Further, sociocultural contributions to crime patterns have been recognized. This broader approach tells students that they are to become not merely correctionalists, but professionals committed ultimately to prevention. They can achieve this goal directly through restorative casework efforts; through constant, penetrating evaluation of their endeavors; by supporting their profession's unyielding research; and above all, by mobilizing their communities as support staff in recognizing and removing the social conditions which breed crime.¹

When one begins to consider the role of corrections in crime prevention there are several questions that should be answered at the outset: Does corrections belong in pure preventing activities or should correctional systems continue to attempt preventing the re-occurrence of criminal activity; are correctional systems equipped to become prevention partners or is the prevention function better left to other participants of the criminal justice system; what can corrections bring to the prevention effort beside the threat of punishment; and, last, what kind of programs are correctional systems involved in, what programs should corrections

1. Louis P. Carney, Introduction to Correctional Science (New York: McGraw-Hill Inc., 1974), pp. 17-18.

become involved in, and what are the attitudes of correctional and criminal justice personnel toward such a role?

In attempting to answer the question relating to whether or not correctional systems belong working in the area of pure prevention, the literature in the field of penology and criminal justice provides almost no clues. Most authors, and editors in the field, view prevention as being a police role, with the task of corrections being prevention through incarceration and, hopefully, rehabilitation.

Responses to this author from various state correctional officials would indicate that the correctional task does, in fact, continue to be mainly comprised of prevention through detention and rehabilitation. Dr. Ronald J. Waldron, Chief of the Research Branch for the Texas Department of Corrections' Research and Development Division, began his response by defining crime prevention as "any action taken to deter the occurrence of a criminal act." Dr. Waldron's philosophy of correctional prevention, which is consistent with the concept of prevention through detention and rehabilitation, is that "Since correctional programs are aimed at changing criminal behavior to socially acceptable behavior, and thereby preventing crime; ergo, correctional programs are crime prevention programs." Dr. Waldron also feels that there is no need to add corrections as a partner in crime prevention since "corrections has always been

involved in crime prevention. It is the other agencies that are now joining corrections in crime prevention." Dr.

Waldron then continued to state the following:

New correctional programs directed at prevention of criminal behavior include those programs that fall under the rubric of "community corrections." These include work-furlough and work-release programs and community service programs (job placement).²

That Dr. Waldron is not alone in his thinking is illustrated by the following responses to this author's communications.

Sara Passamore, Public Information and Relations Specialist for Georgia's Department of Corrections/Offender Rehabilitation stated that "Of course, through our rehabilitation programs, we are hopeful that offenders being discharged or paroled from prison will not commit additional crimes thus reducing crime rate."³

Floyd E. Powell, Associate Superintendent, Jail Inspection Services and Law Enforcement Liaison for the Department of Social and Health Services of the State of Washington: "All programs within the corrections division are designed to assist an offender in helping himself overcome whatever weakness or deficiencies have led to his

2. Letter from Dr. Ronald J. Waldron, Chief, Research Branch, Texas Department of Corrections, Huntsville, Texas, March 4, 1974.

3. Letter from Sara Passamore, Public Information and Relations Specialist, Georgia Department of Corrections/Offender Rehabilitation, Atlanta, March 5, 1974.

inability to function acceptably with his fellow man in a free society."⁴

Elayn Hunt, Director, Department of Corrections for the State of Louisiana: "Work release is the best program which we have for returning offenders successfully to the community which is crime prevention."⁵

Stewart H. Judkins, Public Information Director, Department of Correction for the the State of Tennessee: "Our approach to crime prevention has been one of rehabilitation of the offender. We feel that by changing the behavior of the resident toward something more socially acceptable is perhaps the best long-run program of crime prevention." Mr. Judkins then went on to state that these rehabilitative efforts are having at least some effect. Our recidivism rates have dropped from 65% in 1969 to approximately 30% for the current year."⁶

William D. Leeke, Director, Department of Corrections for the State of South Carolina: "Although the department of corrections confines offenders, its objectives are to

4. Letter from Floyd E. Powell, Associate Superintendent, Jail Inspection Services and Law Enforcement Liaison, Washington Department of Social and Health Services, Olympia, March 6, 1974.

5. Letter from Elayn Hunt, Director, Louisiana Department of Corrections, Baton Rouge, March 6, 1974.

6. Letter from Stewart H. Judkins, Public Information Director, Tennessee Department of Corrections, Nashville, March 7, 1974.

provide them with rehabilitation services and to ultimately return them to society as productive law-abiding citizens. By achieving these objectives, corrections reduces recidivism, deters crime, and is, in fact, a unit of the 'Prevention Team.'"⁷

Joseph D. Rowan, Director, Division of Youth Services for the State of Florida: "Briefly, our primary role in crime and delinquency prevention is to provide measures of guidance and rehabilitation that will serve to halt or reduce such future behavior--to make the current offense the last offense."⁸

Robert S. Colby, Public Information Officer, Department of Corrections, State of Illinois: "It is Director Sielaff's intent to insure that every person under jurisdiction of the Department of Corrections is humanely and fairly treated. By so doing, the offender can build up confidence in our staff and most importantly, in himself. When he attains that level of rehabilitation, he is almost sure of succeeding in the free society and becoming a contributing member."⁹

7. Letter from William D. Leeke, Director, South Carolina Department of Corrections, Columbia, March 8, 1974.

8. Letter from Joseph D. Rowan, Director, Florida Division of Youth Services, Tallahassee, March 5, 1974.

9. Letter from Robert S. Colby, Illinois Department of Corrections Public Information Officer, Springfield, February 27, 1974.

Since it is not the intention of this thesis to examine rehabilitation programs leading to crime prevention, this area will be examined only briefly here. Suffice it to say that rehabilitation programs, in most state correctional systems, take the form of such concepts as the work/study release program that is to be found, for example, in West Virginia.

Financed through a Law Enforcement Assistance Administration grant, the first center for work study release was opened in Charleston, West Virginia, on October 16, 1972. This was not the first national program as there are many which preceded it in other states. The West Virginia project has, as its basic intention, the "building or rebuilding solid ties between offender and community, integrating or reintegrating the offender into community life--restoring family ties, obtaining employment and education and generally helping the offender return to the community."¹⁰

Another rehabilitation program offered by most of the correctional systems responding to this author's inquiries is in the area of educational programs as found in Wyoming, for example. These programs are designed to give the individual inmate exposure to such areas as academic and

10. West Virginia, Annual Report (Charleston: Commissioner of Public Institutions, 1973), p. 160.

vocational education. The goal of the Wyoming program is stated as follows:

The goal of the programs basically is to train the students to become proficient enough to be confident and capable apprentices, to thoroughly acquaint them with a trade, its techniques and related business variables, and to give the students the benefit of competent qualified shop and classroom instructors.¹¹

Other methods of rehabilitation, and therefore prevention after the fact type of programs, can be found in the areas of counseling and psychological assistance projects. That these programs have been somewhat successful is obviated by the fact that recidivism rates are not at 100% nationally, if one can take any comfort from that fact.

Incarcerating the individual offender doubtless prevents that individual from further commission of criminal acts against the outside community. Incarceration may not, in fact, prevent criminal activity since that activity appears to continue even within the confines of the prison walls. Robert M. Carter, Daniel Glaser, and Leslie T. Wilkins, in their introduction to Correctional Institutions, have stated that ". . . while persons confined commit some crimes against each other and against prison employees, they

11. Wyoming, Biennial Report (Cheyenne: Board of Charities and Reform, 1972), p. 23.

are largely prevented from preying on the outside community."¹² This seems to be the basic reason, or at least one of the basic reasons, for prevention through incarceration, and Johan Galtung, writing in Prison Within Society, makes the following statement with regard to that reason:

Incarceration in an efficient prison obviously concentrates the future violations of the convicted violator to a small area--the prison--because of the prison walls. This does not prevent the inmates from illegal acts, but the very high rate of criminal acts within the walls is not so immediately dysfunctional to the society as a whole because of the very low degree of visibility for members of the society outside the prison.¹³

To complain about the fact that prison officials are not even adept at preventing crime within their own institutions one must take into account that a prison is also a community, albeit temporary for most residents, and in the area of crime there is no reason for it to be totally different from other communities and social systems. When man devises a community of "criminals" he must accept the consequences of that development. The thought, then, appears to be one of concern for some segments of society, as to crime prevention, and neglect for others. In short, correctional personnel and practitioners seem to concern

12. Robert M. Carter, Daniel Glaser, and Leslie T. Wilkins, eds., Correctional Institutions (Philadelphia: J.B. Lippincott Co., 1972), p. 5.

13. Johan Galtung, "The Social Functions of a Prison," in Prison Within Society, ed. by Lawrence E. Hazelrigg (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1968), p. 29).

themselves about preventing crime from touching the world outside of the institution walls, but do not seem to care about those who are members of the confined society. This discourse does not, of course, answer the initial question posed at the beginning of this chapter. It may, in fact, pose a more serious question: Can a system prevent crime among the free citizens of a state when it cannot prevent its occurrence in a controlled system? Regardless of how one answers this question, there still exists a need to try. After all, the problem of police criminals, also referred to as "corrupt policing," has not prevented police departments from becoming involved in crime prevention activities.

The answer to the question initially posed apparently cannot be found in the professional literature concerning corrections and criminology. Dr. George Killinger, Director of the Institute of Contemporary Corrections and the Behavioral Sciences at Sam Houston University, advised this author that he knew of very little work that had been done in this area. In regards to the role of corrections in crime prevention, Dr. Killinger stated that:

This is a fascinating subject and one that has certainly been neglected by all of us in corrections. We should be in a better position to study in retrospect the dynamics of delinquent behavior than anyone else, yet we have done little in this area. . . .

. . . correctional administrators could certainly have learned a lot by at least interviewing prisoners and getting some introspective or

subjective comments from prisoners which could help us plan programs for the future.¹⁴

The reason that "little has been done in this area" may well be explained by the following statement made by Paul W. Keve, Director of the Division of Adult Corrections in Delaware:

We supposedly have some expertise that could be put to work in the broader effort of crime prevention, and I agree that we should be doing something of the kind. The reason we do not is usually the political/economic reason of being given no budgets for outreach programs, and being kept so busy just keeping our primary responsibilities in hand that we have no time, energy or funds for anything else. Usually when you find a corrections agency stepping outside its primary role to do prevention work it is likely to be a juvenile probation agency that has neighborhood based programs going on that do not try to differentiate between official clients and others who are just kids of families who need a similar kind of help. While this is happening, it is not as common as it should be.¹⁵

It appears, from the above statement, that the concept of involving corrections in crime prevention before the act occurs may become a problem because of the lack of funds generally available for correctional agencies. This problem however might be somewhat overcome through the utilization of prevention funds from the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration through the various state criminal justice

14. Letter from Dr. George Killinger, Director, Institute of Contemporary Corrections and the Behavioral Sciences, Sam Houston State University, Huntsville, Texas, March, 1974.

15. Letter from Paul W. Keve, Director, Delaware Division of Adult Corrections, Smyrna, February 26, 1974. !

agencies. These moneys are now, in the main, being expended on mechanical prevention programs and, realizing the expanded attention to crime prevention and corrections, it is somewhat doubtful that requests for prevention funds by state correctional agencies would meet with much disapproval. While the economics of correctional systems may now dictate non-participation in the prevention effort, it appears that it is the task of correctional administrators to actively seek funding for prevention programs.

Perhaps, however, the problem of involving corrections in pure prevention work is more basic than the considerations of money, time, and energy. Dr. Marjorie J. Hill, Coordinator of the Research Division of the Alaska Division of Corrections, in a letter to this author, stated the following:

As regards the role of corrections in prevention programs, our general philosophy has been that the community is responsible for prevention, and that until we learn how to do what we're charged with doing, prevention should not be our major focus.¹⁶

There are, of course, several points that should be made regarding Dr. Hill's statement. Current thought concerning correctional policies indicates a need for returning to the community in the form of community based correctional centers. To say that "our general philosophy has been that

16. Letter from Dr. Marjorie J. Hill, Coordinator of Research, Alaska Division of Corrections, Anchorage, March 6, 1974.

the community is responsible for prevention," considering current practices, would indicate that as part of the community, corrections should begin to share part of the responsibility for prevention.

The second point to be made regarding Dr. Hill's statement is that prevention through incarceration and rehabilitation is, in fact, a major focus of correctional institutions, and to draw a line separating prevention concepts is beyond the realm of reality. Perhaps Dr. Hill's statement that, "until we learn how to do what we're charged with doing," sheds some light on the reasoning used to describe her attitudes concerning prevention as a major focus.

Interestingly enough, following the statement described earlier, Dr. Hill goes on to say that "We do have one specifically prevention-oriented program . . . [this program is described elsewhere in this thesis]. Further, a good many of us [correctional personnel] are involved in community efforts at crime prevention."¹⁷ Apparently Dr. Hill, or at least someone within the correctional system is not completely sold on the idea of leaving the responsibility for prevention solely to the community.

Aside from Dr. Hill's somewhat discouraging words, and to return to the original question of this chapter, the

17. Ibid.

response from the various administrators would seem to indicate that corrections should begin to show an interest in prevention prior to the criminal act. Edwin G. Kellner, Director of the Montana Department of Institutions, states that "I regret to say that at this time Montana has no formalized program through which corrections exerts an effort in the prevention or recurrence of crime. I feel that approach has real merit and hope we can work in that direction."¹⁸ T. P. Jones, the Coordinator of Planning, Research, and Evaluation for the Florida Division of Corrections, feels that prevention prior to occurrence of crime "is really where it's at. By drawing information from the various disciplines and determining where, in society, to inject it, whether in the home, the school, the church, or wherever, progress may be made in this direction."¹⁹

Two other states, Arizona and Nebraska, responded to this author's request by sending detailed information regarding programs that their respective states are currently involved in. In addition to this information, which will be set forth later in this presentation, Harv Grady, the Supervisor of the Arizona Bureau of Preventive Services stated some of his views relative to the role of corrections

18. Letter from Edwin G. Kellner, Director, Montana Department of Institutions, Helena, March 4, 1974.

19. Letter from T. P. Jones, Coordinator of Planning, Research and Evaluation, Florida Division of Corrections, March 6, 1974.

in prevention in a letter to this author. While Mr. Grady's statement is rather lengthy, it is the opinion of this author that his views are so important as to defy summarization. Herewith then, is the contents of Mr. Grady's letter as it pertains to the role of corrections in crime prevention.

I feel that the concept of a correctional continuum which ranges from parental control to state institutions is a healthy aim for corrections, because it brings the correctional agency back into the mainstream of the community as a consultant/trainer for persons interested in improving social controls, cross generational communication, programs for families and youth, etc. In this role the correctional agency helps the community "get itself together" to prevent crime and delinquency; thus it identifies with the mainstream and is no longer isolated to the % of the population who are public offenders. . . .

State correctional agencies should provide a crime and delinquency prevention service which does these functions: (1) technical assistance to communities and local agencies to develop and improve prevention and community based correctional programs; (2) uniform program evaluation and data collection to assist local programs; (3) funding of local programs; and (4) training of local community leaders and program persons.

Because the "correctional continuum" concept stresses unity and flexibility of services, a natural first step toward prevention should be taken by all correctional agencies--extending services to the entire family of offenders. Without enabling legislation, this means that a probation officer or parole agent should work to obtain the voluntary cooperation of the offender's family. For example, he could help obtain a Big Brother or a tutor, etc. for the sons of a man in prison, or for the younger siblings of a juvenile offender. This approach has several advantages: (1) it delivers prevention to a large segment of the delinquency-risk population without duplication of services; (2) the correctional worker is seen more as a "helper"; and (3) correctional

manpower can be expanded to serve this extra "prevention" caseload, if the legislature buys the concept.²⁰

As a conclusion to this chapter on the role of corrections in crime prevention, as viewed by various state correctional personnel and practitioners, it should be obvious to the reader that corrections is still most heavily involved in correctional prevention through incarceration and rehabilitation. To say, however, that this trend will continue without the addition of programs designed to prevent criminal activity prior to occurrence would be quite less than truthful, for many of the responses to this author's inquiries would seem to indicate otherwise. As the chapter to follow will show, there are heartening signs that correctional agencies are beginning to exert their influence in the area of pure crime prevention.

20. Letter from Harv Grady, Arizona Bureau of Preventive Services Supervisor, Phoenix, March 7, 1974.

CHAPTER III

CORRECTIONAL PROGRAMS FOR CRIME PREVENTION

One of the questions posed at the beginning of the preceding chapter had to do with what programs correctional systems are now involved in which are intended to prevent crime prior to its occurrence. Once again, the professional literature in the field of corrections is less than replete with such information. Perhaps the reason for the neglect in this area has been reflected by the statement, quoted earlier, of Dr. Marjorie Hill of the Division of Corrections, Department of Health and Social Services for the State of Alaska. It may well be that correctional personnel and administrators must first learn to do what they are charged with doing. Regardless of that philosophy however, it would seem beneficial to begin search procedures in the area of crime prevention programs should the need for such programs surface in the future. Perhaps also, in view of the definitions of crime prevention stated in Chapter I, it is practically impossible for corrections to become involved due to its place in the correctional cycle. If one, however, views the correctional cycle as a continuum, then placement in that cycle becomes harder to define. This concept

indicates that no part of the cycle can be viewed as the first or the last function.

It is the contention of this author that while the police function is the first step in the criminal justice process, it is not necessarily mandated to perform preventive functions on the basis of its position. Prevention, in the correctional cycle context stated previously, becomes the province of each function in the cycle, and it behooves those involved in each of these functions to become a contributor to the total effort.

That the idea of correctional involvement in crime prevention before the act has found root in some state correctional systems is evident, if responses to this author's letters are any indication. The programs that are to be described in this chapter are such that implementation could be accomplished with what might be described as a minimum of effort and, in view of the amounts of money being spent on detection, prosecution, and confinement, a minimum of financial outlay. A further point that should be made here is that the programs are not presented in any particular order that might indicate preference on the part of this author.

Georgia

The first program to be presented here is one that deals with what may be one of the most important

considerations for the incarcerated offender: his or her family. The Social Services Program of the Georgia Department of Offender Rehabilitation, described as the "first of its kind in the nation," is based upon a concept of improving the environment from which the offender came. "Whatever the particular reasons for an individual's getting into trouble with the legal/justice system, it definitely began in his home, his neighborhood, or his town."¹ On the surface the program appears to address the concept of working in the community to prevent further criminal activity on the part of the offender following his release. Upon further examination, however, the program provides a crime prevention service for the offender's family.

On contacting the family of an offender, the worker gathers necessary information to understand the present family situation and the incarcerant's relationship to it. He or she will work out a plan with the family to determine services or other needs required by the family during the offender's imprisonment. The worker functions as an aide in securing for that family whatever help they need in dealing with the absence of the incarcerant. This aid could be economic, social, or emotional. . . . The worker offers help to the family members in achieving their stated goals which could involve employment, housing, credit, or medical services. It may also include counseling with brothers, sisters, or children of the offender who are beginning to demonstrate behavioral problems.²

1. Georgia, Social Services Department of Offender Rehabilitation (Atlanta: Department of Offender Rehabilitation, 1973).

2. Ibid.

It should be obvious from the above that this Social Services unit is in fact performing a prevention function. In addition, it would seem that the program could be expanded to provide their service to a broader clientele. The experience and other data developed by program personnel, following some period of time since this program is only about six months old, could well be used as a basis from which the program extension could take place.

Nebraska

One of the major programs conducted by a state correctional system is to be found in the Youth Resources Program in the State of Nebraska. Funded through the Parole Administration of the Nebraska Department of Corrections, the Youth Resources Program began operations in July of 1973.

The Youth Resources Program represents an innovative effort in delinquency prevention and diversion of youth from the criminal justice system. Supervised by the Department of Corrections, the program attempts to help a community discover and coordinate existing resources which can be brought to focus on youth who are in need of experiences in their lives.³

The general philosophy of the program is based upon the concept of developing good relationships between youth and adult figures.

3. Nebraska, Youth Resources Program (Lincoln: Department of Corrections, 1974).

One of the characteristics commonly identified in "delinquent" youth (as well as in other asocial groups) is lack of positive, significant relationships with an adult figure. In other words, no adult has ever gained a position of respect whereby he could become a significant person in the youth's life.

This lack of significant adult relationships leaves the youth without a model or set of guidelines for evaluating his growth as a person preparing for the adult world. The youth may eventually feel alienated, unwanted, worthless, inferior, and his behavior may reflect these beliefs about himself--sometimes in illegal ways. In effect, he acts out his feelings and beliefs that he has no control over what happens to him and that no one cares.⁴

Working with the above philosophy, the Youth Resources Program locates youths who are experiencing these feelings of alienation, inferiority, etc., and injects "accepting and willing adults who would serve as 'volunteer counselor-friends' to the youth."⁵ The main objective of the volunteer is to create a bond of friendship that will develop into a significant relationship and allow for the expression and feedback between friends, and the gaining of recognition by the youth as to his unique talents and capabilities "upon which he can capitalize in developing more socially acceptable roles."⁶

Volunteers for the Youth Resources Program are recruited from within the community served by the particular

4. Ibid.

5. Ibid.

6. Ibid.

resource coordinator. This volunteer "corps" is made up of adults as well as mature college and high school students. Many of the volunteers are recruited through referrals from civic organizations, community leaders, and the like. They are then selected after an interview with the coordinator on the basis of their ability to work with the youth of the community on a one-to-one basis.

The Youth Resources Coordinator mentioned above is given the responsibility of contacting and maintaining communication with community referral sources, recruiting and training volunteers, aiding in identification of any youth in need of the service, developing the volunteer-youth matches and supervising these match-ups in terms of encouragement, evaluating the progress of the match-ups, and serves as a community resource for those who may be in need of his particular expertise.

As stated above, one of the functions of the Youth Resources Coordinator is to identify the youth that will become involved in the program. The particular type of youth sought is described as follows, along with the means of referral.

Youth who are sending out signals that they are experiencing difficulty in school, or with peer or family relationships, will be sought out through referral sources. The primary referral sources will be the schools, community, law enforcement officials, and other agencies who have frequent contact with youth. Poor school performance, previous police contact, and negative family situations are some of the criteria which will be

used in identifying youth who may be in need of the positive intervention which the volunteer can hopefully provide.⁷

The initial beginnings of the Youth Resources Programs was with four coordinators who had, as a stated project goal, the following:

At least 60% of the youth participating in the project will not be adjudicated for any reason while they are participating; and at least 50% will have no negative police contacts for any reason while participating.⁸

The project, funded initially for six months with the possibility of a six month extension, seeks to attain the above goals through the use of two devices: improved school situations and improved self concepts. Both of these devices are evaluated. The school situation is measured by whether participants whose grades are below average show some improvement in academic performance, school attendance, and improved rapport with school personnel "as measured by a reporting system established for school personnel."⁹

The measurement of improved self concept is accomplished through the use of the "Tennessee Self Concept Scale" which is administered after the participant has been involved in the program for a full six months.

7. Ibid.

8. Nebraska, Evaluation Design for the Nebraska Youth Resources Program (Lincoln: Department of Corrections, 1973).

9. Ibid.

The success or failure of the Youth Resources Program has yet to be completely evaluated due to its being less than a year old. In a conversation that this author had with Larry G. Johnson, the administrator of the program, he indicated that the four communities in Nebraska which were participating in the project were pleased with its progress, and that its continuance and expansion into other communities appears to be a certainty. Mr. Johnson stated to this author that one of the factors that seems to be working in the program's favor is that it does not give the impression of coming from any particular authority. It is a very low-keyed service that does not want to become known as any one service's "program." Larry Johnson is a former school teacher who stated what may well explain the success of the program to this point: "We never seem to allow kids to give anything. We are always giving to them until they are older, and then we expect them to give, and they cannot."¹⁰

That other cities in Nebraska are currently seeking establishment of the Youth Resources Program at the present time cannot, in the final analysis, be considered as speaking to the efficacy of the project. It does, however, indicate some degree of acceptance of a correctional system

10. Larry S. Johnson, Director of Nebraska Youth Resources Program, private interview in McCook, Nebraska, April 2, 1974.

as a crime prevention resource, and it should show that a community interested in crime prevention should have several alternatives available and not only appeal to one particular source.

Arizona

The problem of crime and its prevention has long been a consideration of individuals concerned, in one way or another, with the criminal justice system in America. Of all the questions that have been asked about preventing crime, the one most predominant has centered around the problem of where prevention should begin, and the answer appears to be that prevention of criminal activity should begin with the youth of America.

America's best hope for reducing crime is to reduce juvenile delinquency and youth crime. In 1965 a majority of all arrests for major crimes against property were of people under 21, as were a substantial minority of arrests for major crimes against the person. The recidivism rates for young offenders are higher than for those of any other age group. A substantial change in any of these figures would make a substantial change in the total crime figures for the nation.¹¹

That this philosophy has found acceptance throughout the United States is attested to by the very fact that correctional prevention programs are mostly aimed at the

11. Robert W. Winslow, Juvenile Delinquency in a Free Society (Encino, Calif.: Dickenson Publishing Co., 1973), p. 6.

young citizens. Nebraska's program is one example, and Arizona provides another.

The Arizona Bureau of Preventive Services, created in September of 1969, and operating within the State Department of Corrections, gives the prevention of juvenile delinquency its top priority. This Bureau of Preventive Services recognized at the outset that it could not offer its services directly "to offenders and potential offenders. Rather, its small staff was devoted to assisting communities to activate their own crime prevention programs."¹² The goal of the development of local prevention planning is to "develop working linkages among programs involved in providing services to families and youth, through increased communication, cooperation and coordination of services."¹³ The role that the Bureau of Preventive Services plays, then, is that of a planning agency as well as acting as a catalyst for prevention activities. In its planning role, the bureau identifies needs and devises strategies for meeting these needs.

In the area of program development, Arizona's Bureau of Preventive Services has provided much technical assistance to communities. In Nogales, Arizona, for example,

12. Arizona Bureau of Preventive Services, Arizona Youth Atlas (Phoenix: Department of Corrections, 1971), p. 5.

13. Ibid., p. 9.

there existed a need for recreational programs to offset the attraction of illegal activities that occur across the border in Mexico. The Bureau, in this particular instance, assisted in obtaining federal funds to allow the City of Nogales to staff and equip a teen center. The popularity of this youth center in Nogales resulted in the establishment of teen centers in Tubac and Patagonia, Arizona.

More recently, the Bureau was involved in the planning of the Crittenton Outreach Preventive Services Programs. As a result, a private social agency, Florence Crittenton Services, changed in approach from providing help to unwed pregnant delinquent girls to providing a preventive service for children in four elementary schools in the inner city of Phoenix. The Crittenton Center's new functions will include: (1) outreach counselors for children in the early stages of social maladjustment; (2) alternative temporary classes for children whose behavior or poverty-engendered needs cannot be handled in the regular classrooms; and (3) short-term residential care along with family counseling to resolve family crises and keep children with their families. This program receives referrals from families, schools, police, housing projects, etc., and sees that help is given when it is needed. Thus, it becomes a model "service system" to be adopted in other communities.¹⁴

In addition to the preventive programs stated above, the Arizona Bureau of Preventive Services is also involved in diversionary strategies aimed at finding and utilizing alternatives to involvement in the criminal justice system. The Bureau is also involved in the developmental strategies whose goals are "to devise workable strategies for a network

14. Ibid., pp. 13-14.

of services to develop the potential of the home, school, community, and employer in the positive development of youth."¹⁵

If there is a correctional prevention program among those submitted to this author that appears well rounded from the standpoint of attempting to cover all youth crime prevention bases, Arizona's Bureau of Preventive Services certainly would qualify.

Illinois

While Illinois' Department of Corrections, which became operational in January, 1970, appears most interested in prevention through rehabilitation, its treatment program lists as one of its highlights "delinquency prevention programs which include the services of both professional and para-professional staff who assist local communities in organizing for this vital effort."¹⁶ Called Juvenile Field Services, the Office of Field Services is described as follows, along with a description of its basic functions:

The Office of Field Services is responsible for providing community-based programs and services to juveniles through the Community Services Unit, The Special Services Unit, and Family and Youth Counseling Services. Working closely with local citizens, staff assists in organizing community

15. Ibid., p. 16.

16. Illinois, Illinois Corrections Moves Forward (Springfield: Department of Corrections, n.d.), p. 4.

efforts to combat juvenile delinquency and to provide parole services to youths as they are returned to the community. The Community Services Unit provides both professional and para-professional auxiliary services to communities in the state by consultation, public education, surveys, training conferences, and close liaison with community organizations, schools, juvenile courts, police departments, and private social agencies. Other state and federal programs are assisted by department specialists with skills and experience in community organization techniques.¹⁷

This particular program is rather closely in line with such programs as those in Nebraska and Arizona. The basic thrust, and one that seems most feasible for other states to follow, at least in the area of juvenile delinquency prevention, is to provide technical assistance to communities so that they may develop preventive functions of their own.

The assistance provided by state correctional agencies should ordinarily be covered in a later chapter in this work dealing with proposals for correctional involvement. However, due to the material already presented, information relevant to this area will be considered here to provide the reader with some continuity of thought in this particular area.

Technical assistance, a term that suggests a form of action on the part of some agency or individual, implies that the individual or agency has some basic tools or

17. Ibid., p. 15.

information to offer those in need of that assistance. The question that immediately comes to mind when discussing such assistance concerns the reasons why an agency or individual has the expertise to offer such assistance.

Correctional system's basis for expertise begins to express itself through its being charged with the responsibility of handling large numbers of people. At this point, the evidence that corrections is somewhat less than successful in its handling of the individuals given over to its custody is not a major consideration of this work since this author is not here concerned with the success of corrections in its handling of numbers of people in institutions. The argument that failure in one area may dictate failure in subsequent areas of endeavor has been taken into account here and must be discarded in favor of posing the idea of what can be done instead of what has not been done. In addition, regardless of what recidivism statistics may show, correctional administrators would argue that they are successful in handling their charges, and any failures must be placed at the doorstep of the entire societal structure. This viewpoint is expressed in the following statement of Gus Harrison, Director of the Michigan Department of Corrections. In response to a question concerning his success in rehabilitating prisoners, Mr. Harrison stated the following:

The public would like to see us rehabilitate more prisoners. I would like to see this done too. Unfortunately, as I said before, we don't know enough about changing these people so they won't come back to prison. Part of the problem lies in the community. As long as we have social conditions which encourage crime, I think we are fighting somewhat of a lost cause. I think the finest prison system in the world will always have limited success. For one thing, many of the people whom we receive are too fixed in their ways, and it is too late to change many of them. They have spent a lifetime with the wrong ideas, wrong habits, inadequate direction. We are dealing with thousands of different types of people with individual problems and we are confronted with a most complex and difficult assignment. The best advice I have to offer is to keep people from coming to prison, and this means do something about the conditions where crime thrives.¹⁸

Another individual deeply involved in corrections, Dr. Edith E. Flynn, Associate Director of the National Clearinghouse for Criminal Justice Planning and Architecture at the University of Illinois, stated during a workshop at the National Symposium on Corrections that "communities must assume responsibility for the problems they create."¹⁹ Dr. Flynn's statement was made in regards to one of the reasons for community based corrections but it goes to the heart of the situation presented earlier, that the community, or social structure, must accept a large part of the blame for failure.

18. Gus Harrison, "Exploding Some Myths," Challenge Magazine, September, 1969, p. 13.

19. Edith E. Flynn, "Corrections," Workshop at the National Symposium on Corrections, University of Nebraska at Omaha, April 3, 1974.

The second major line of development in corrections is an increasing recognition on the part of practitioner and student alike that the etiology of crime is deeply embedded in the social structure of our society and that, therefore, the task of crime control cannot remain in the exclusive domain of the criminal justice system.²⁰

To continue on the subject first posed, that of the basis for correctional systems' expertise which results in its providing technical assistance, this author would suggest that the handling of large numbers of offenders provides an avenue for obtaining information relative to causation. Armed with such information, it would seem that correctional agencies would certainly be in a position to suggest programs that might begin to address the problems that cause some criminal activity.

Gearing institutional programs to the needs of the individual inmate requires an intensive insight into the needs of each individual. Recognizing those needs is the job of the Classification Committee. Testing such matters as aptitudes, interest, records, child development histories, family histories, educational background, physical and mental or emotional disabilities or handicaps all constitute a part of the job of the Classification Committee. The Committee is made up of a representative from treatment staff, the security staff and is chaired by the Superintendent, all of whom work closely with the professional staff from the Division of Vocational Rehabilitation.²¹

20. Frederic D. Moyer and Edith E. Flynn, eds., Correctional Environments (Champaign: University of Illinois, 1971), p. 6.

21. Arkansas Department of Corrections, Annual Progress Report (Little Rock: Department of Corrections, 1973).

Another example of a means to gain information relative to causative factors can be found in the Virginia correctional system:

A qualified Classification Committee . . . will make a comprehensive assessment on the basis of the inmate's behavioral history, biographical information including medical history and habit patterns, abilities, intellect, educational achievement, interests, personality factors, and observation of current behavior. Assessment of these should suggest or prescribe the treatment-management procedures most effective in bringing about a beneficial change in the inmate's behavior.²²

That the information relative to the background of offenders is, or can be, obtainable through the classification process is evident. It is also evident that such information can be and is disseminated to certain individuals and groups since there is a vast number of criminological studies available in which causative factors of crime were gleaned from inmate records. The problem however seems that the information which comes about through the classification process is not disseminated widely enough, which results in agencies not having basic causative information that could be used to design useful preventive programs. One vehicle which might prove useful would be of the type found in the SEARCH project:

. . . project SEARCH, a prototype computerized criminal justice information system which

22. Commonwealth of Virginia, Blueprint for Action in Virginia Corrections (Norfolk: Department of Welfare and Institutions, 1974).

facilitates interstate exchange of offender history files. This system improves not only current law enforcement processes in ten participant states, but it should also facilitate a much needed systematic tracing of the records of offenders, so that the effectiveness of sentencing policies and treatment programs may at least be measured and evaluated in statistically significant ways.²³

Another system that might also be considered for use in the manner described above is the Virginia Juvenile Justice Information System (VAJJIS).

Ultimate goals of VAJJIS are to provide a methodology for more effective planning for case management; data for evaluation of delinquency prevention services; a method of gauging the success of each child; "interface" of Youth Services statistics with data gathered by the Divisions of General Welfare and Adult Corrections; and a means for determining which programs for youth represent the wisest investment of State and local funds.²⁴

A vehicle of the types mentioned above would, of course, provide prevention programs across the United States with much needed information. Until such information systems become totally operative however, the basic information remains in the hands of personnel working within the various state correctional systems. For this reason, it is the contention of this author that correctional systems are certainly in possession of the basic expertise, as to causation, that can render their services invaluable in the

23. Moyer and Flynn, Correctional Environments, p. 5.

24. Commonwealth of Virginia, Annual Report (Norfolk: Department of Welfare and Institutions, 1972).

area of assistance to communities desirous of forming prevention programs. Certainly this is not to imply exclusion of the courts and police from participation in prevention functions. What it does imply, however, is that the expertise found within correctional agencies should be utilized in the form of assistance and advice for communities, and not ignored to the extent that it has in the past. This relationship between a state function and local governments has been succinctly stated by Edwin F. Zuern, the Director of Corrections Planning and Research for the State of North Dakota, in the following:

It is my observation that if careful research and observations are made by corrections people that they could provide valid information as to the causes of crime. With this information made available to the communities and their social service and law enforcement agencies, they should be in a better position to devise programs and plans for crime prevention. Not only should such data gathered by correctional agencies be limited to the above noted agencies--all local institutions and agencies must be made aware that they can either assist in preventing crime or be an apathetic uninvolved or only narrowly involved with the citizens and children of the community. There are experiences in special and remedial education which particularly the juvenile correctional institutions have been involved in which could serve as an example and guide to the public schools; or even more important, the problems presented by the juvenile delinquent to these correctional facilities can often serve as an indictment of the failures being perpetuated by the public schools.²⁵

25. Letter from Edwin F. Zuern, Director, Corrections Planning and Research, State of North Dakota, Bismarck, February 27, 1974.

Alaska

To continue this presentation, in the area of specific prevention programs engaged in by correctional systems, and to present another which focuses on juvenile prevention, the State of Alaska through its Division of Corrections Probation-Parole Field Services administers the Totem Center in Juneau, Alaska.

Launched by a Federal HEW grant in 1970, the Juneau Totem Center serves as a delinquency prevention "drop in" center for the community. The program is supervised by a Corrections Probation-Parole Officer and is maintained by a Youth Counselor, a Probation Aid, and community volunteers. Crisis prevention, drug abuse, and personal counseling are provided by the Totem Center staff along with various educational and recreational programs. Presently under the Division of Corrections administration, the Totem Center is open for all children six days each week from 1 p.m. until midnight. The center contains a lounge, television, ping-pong table and pool table to serve as incentives for participation in Totem Center programs.²⁶

This particular program is unique as compared to those of Nebraska and Arizona in that Nebraska runs no such centers, and Arizona leaves the staffing of such centers to community personnel. The concept of teen centers is certainly not new; what is new, however, is the use of correctional personnel as staff for such facilities who provide counseling for troubled youth.

26. Alaska, Department of Corrections, Corrections, n.d.

Another program that deserves some mention, and is carried on by the Division of Corrections in Alaska, is the Misdemeanant Probation Project.

The Misdemeanant Probation Project is a one-year, LEAA and state funded, renewable demonstration project. Begun in the Autumn of 1973, the project hopes to indicate whether or not probation services for selected misdemeanants can reduce repeat offenses and prevent clients from possibly becoming involved in more serious crimes.

Probation counseling and supervision for Misdemeanant Probation Project clients are similar to services provided for offenders who have committed more serious offenses. Some offenses eligible for Misdemeanant Probation services include petty larceny, possession of marijuana, simple assault, serious driving offenses, and others.

Misdemeanant Probation Project offices are located in Anchorage, Fairbanks, Juneau, and Ketchikan. They are staffed by a statewide total of seven specially trained Probation-Parole Officers.

Clients are randomly assigned to the program by the courts. Ongoing evaluation of the project is designed to compare persons in the control group (unsupervised court probation) and the experimental group (supervised Misdemeanant Probation Project clients).²⁷

It is, of course, obvious by the very term that Misdemeanant Probation is directed toward individuals who, as clients, have already been involved in some form of deviant behavior. The uniqueness of the program rests in the fact that misdemeanants are not considered "criminals" by the majority of the citizenry of the United States.

27. Ibid.

This may well be a strange phenomenon when one considers that there is a fine line, or at least only economic considerations, between some particular offenses (misdemeanor and felony larceny, for example). Regardless of that fact it is not outside the realm of reality to accept the fact that prevention can still occur after the commission of a misdemeanor. Alaska's efforts in this area are commendable, as are those of other states involved in such endeavors. They indicate a concern for individuals who compose the bulk of involvement in the criminal justice system and such efforts may prove of some benefit in the attempt to keep citizens from involvement in future major criminal activity.

Traditionally, the major emphasis in adult probation and parole has been with those adults who committed felonies. More recently, it has been recognized by correctional experts that if proper guidance is provided when a misdemeanor is committed it is highly probable that the misdemeanant will not go on to commit a felony.)

With this in mind Adult Probation and Parole has expanded its programs to provide misdemeanant services to the municipal courts in Salt Lake City, Ogden, Logan, Farmington, Provo, Price, and Roosevelt. Through supervision and appropriate referrals to community agencies, it is intended that these offenders can be assisted before they become involved in more serious crimes.²⁸

28. Utah, Progress Report (Salt Lake City: Division of Corrections, 1973).

Georgia, Florida, Iowa, Texas,
Virginia, and Wyoming

One of the preventive programs which seems to be in use by many American correctional systems can be found within the systems of Georgia, Florida, Texas, Virginia, and Wyoming. At Southampton Correctional Farm in Virginia, "Southampton's inmate speaking group appears before interested educational, religious, and civic groups. Upon request, staff members also fill such speaking engagements."²⁹

At the State penitentiary in Rawlins, Wyoming, "The drug group travels, upon request, to various schools to speak with students about the problems and implications of drug use."³⁰

In Florida, T. P. Jones, the Coordinator of Planning, Research & Evaluation for the Florida Division of Corrections, informed this author that "One of the things that we are doing in Florida is to have groups of inmates speak to civic clubs, churches, and school assemblies in a preventive effort."³¹

29. Commonwealth of Virginia, Southampton Correctional Fact Sheet (Norfolk: Department of Welfare and Institutions, n.d.).

30. Wyoming, Biennial Report.

31. Letter from T. P. Jones, Coordinator of Planning, Research & Evaluation, Florida Division of Corrections, February 28, 1974.

If one is looking for a comparatively inexpensive method of correctional involvement in crime prevention, activities such as those mentioned above provide one answer. Such programs provide living examples to individuals of the price that is exacted as a result of criminal behavior. These programs, however, can only be as effective as correctional personnel allow them to be. If the speakers are not allowed some freedom to describe the prevailing conditions in the various penal complexes, the impact of the presentation is blunted to a great extent. What is certainly not needed are inmate speaking groups who, fearing reprisal, tell of correctional conditions as "not being too bad," such as this author heard an adult inmate from Buena Vista, Colorado, say to a gathering of students. Privately, and to this author, he decried the conditions of his imprisonment but refused to air these to a group for fear of sanctions by the personnel at that institution.

Two other states that have some involvement in this area are Texas and Georgia. Texas' program is called "Operation Kick-It," which deals with the drug problem.

Funded by the Criminal Justice Council, this public service program provides for two inmate panels which travel throughout the state and talk to various groups and organizations about the dangers involved in the use of drugs. Since its inception in May, 1970, "Kick-It" panels have appeared before

more than 300,000 people and traveled in excess of 70,000 miles.³²

In Georgia, "Fifteen local high schools heard the "Operation Get Smart" program concerning drug abuse. Wayne C. I. inmates also had speaking engagements in local churches and were available for questions after the program."³³

Another example of a relatively inexpensive program is found in states allowing tours of correctional complexes. At the State Penitentiary in Fort Madison, Iowa,

Tours are conducted for high school groups, college classes, church groups, and civic organizations. They are conducted by staff members, and the groups are given an orientation to the goals and philosophies and guidelines of the Bureau of Adult Corrections. Programs are explained by inmate panels and staff personnel.³⁴

There is one major problem with using these tours as preventive devices, however, and that is the way in which the tours are conducted. Generally, tours are conducted in a manner designed to show the touring groups only those sections of the complex which will put the institution in a favorable light. In any event, tours of facilities provide an excellent opportunity for correctional personnel to engage in preventive activities. Improvements in this

32. Texas, Department of Corrections (Dallas: Department of Corrections, 1971).

33. Georgia, Social Services.

34. Iowa, Iowa State Penitentiary Brochure (Des Moines: Department of Corrections, 1973).

general area of prison tours could include several things that will be discussed in a later chapter in this work.

California

California's major thrust, as far as correctional involvement in prevention is concerned, lies in the area of prevention through rehabilitation. This is at least this author's impression from the information received from Philip D. Guthrie, Assistant Director of Public Information for the California Department of Corrections. However, a Parade Magazine article of April 22, 1973, told of a California project that has to be viewed as a major step toward crime prevention. The article is quoted here in full so that the potential for such a program can be fully realized.

California these days is breeding a new type of super-realistic TV star. Typical member of this elite is a convict at San Quentin, one of the nation's most publicized state penitentiaries.

Approximately 20 of San Quentin's inmates are writing, producing, and acting in a series of public service TV commercials.

These spots, telecast throughout the state, clue the youngsters in on the evils of drugs and crime. In frank street jargon, the inmates warn the kids on the outside to cool it.

Herewith a sample of a "con-written" spiel:
"Look, I'm not the man. I'm a con in San Quentin, and I want to rap about drugs. If you're using 'em illegally, the cops don't care if they bust you freakin' off in the streets or kickin' the door to your pad to make the arrest. You're going to jail, and chances are you'll wind up here in the joint with me. And once you've got the ex-con jacket,

you're marked for life. Neither society nor the law forgives and forgets."

And then peering directly into the video camera, the prisoner continues. "So the next time you tie off, don't think about how good you'll feel for a couple of hours. Think about how much time you're going to do. And one more thing. If I ever hear of a pusher selling stuff to my kid or someone I love, he'd best hope the law catches him before I do. And that's no wolf-ticket, baby. That's the word."

Dr. Stuary Hyde, 49, head of the Communications Department at San Francisco State University, is the man who pioneered the "con-commercials."

"In 1970," he explains, "I got the idea that a course in practical communications--radio and TV announcing--might prove a good thing for the men behind bars. I went out to San Quentin, and they let me teach two classes a night, with a broken-down tape recorder for equipment. About 50 men signed up. Then I changed the course to one class which lasted four hours a night. The inmates really became enthused. To them this was something which had practical applications, a skill they could use when they got out."

"This past January," Dr. Hyde narrates, "I brought into San Quentin the heavy equipment TV truck we use at the university, and we began videotaping the spots written by the inmates."

"We addressed the first set of spots to prospective employers urging them to hire ex-cons. The men pointed out that so many convicts returned to jail because no one on the outside would give them employment, would take a chance on them as reformed human beings."

"The second series of spots was addressed to youngsters, and concerned drug abuse. They were simple, honest, and effective spots, and when we invited TV station managers to view them, practically all decided to use them on their stations as public service spots."

"The commercials are free of charge to the stations, and for the inmates at San Quentin,

working on them constitutes the best therapy I know."³⁵

To say that this type of endeavor is progressive would be a gross understatement. It represents not only a prevention activity, but a prevention activity that is participated in by community and institution. In addition to the pure prevention aspect of this program, it represents a rehabilitative prevention program in that the inmates are receiving training in a useful field and are presenting one of the problem areas for released offenders: employment. Granted, this may be an expensive undertaking, but, it would seem that the possible rewards far outweigh the outlay of money.

Several questions were presented at the beginning of this chapter, and it is well to restate those questions here, along with some observations in view of the material presented. The observations that are to be stated here are based on responses from twenty-nine of fifty state correctional systems queried, as well as a reply from the Federal Bureau of Prisons. In addition, such scholars in the field of corrections as Dr. George Killinger, Director of the Institute of Contemporary Corrections; Dr. Edith Flynn, Associate Director of the National Clearinghouse for Criminal Justice Planning and Architecture; and Saleem A.

35. Lloyd Shearer, ed., "Intelligence Report: Cons & Commercials," Parade Magazine, April 22, 1973, p. 6.

Shah, Chief of the Center for Studies of Crime and Delinquency of the National Institute of Mental Health; saw fit to answer this author's correspondence. This author is extremely indebted to all of these individuals who did respond.

To return to the problem of answering the questions posed at the beginning of this chapter, the author would begin with that question relating to whether or not corrections should become involved in "pure" prevention activities. The responses received by this author would seem to indicate some interest in this area. Two late responses received by this author relate directly to this question. The first response is from Ray Belnap, Administrator of the Corrections Division of the Department of Social Services and Housing for the State of Hawaii. The second is from Caryl Steyer of Midland Lutheran College in Fremont, Nebraska, a colleague of this author and a fellow member of the Nebraska Association of Criminal Justice Educators. Mr. Belnap, in his reply, stated the following:

Crime prevention, of course, must begin early in life, which is the early detection of behavioral problems in children. The schools, in the classrooms, would be in a vital position to detect young children exhibiting emotional/behavioral problems and should be able to refer these children to the appropriate helping agencies, with continuous follow-up. Unfortunately, this is not always the case.

The corrections administrator's role could be one of consultation/advisory nature in assisting

the primary service agencies dealing with deviant children. This is my opinion regarding crime prevention.³⁶

Mr. Steyer:

I certainly believe that corrections has a place in crime prevention in view of your definition of prevention. If it does not, we are certainly missing the boat in our correction program and doing only that thing that some people perceive of as corrections and that is the performance of a custodial function. [The definition provided to Mr. Steyer is found on page 1 of this work.]³⁷

There is then, at least in this author's mind, some interest in the involvement of corrections in pure crime prevention programs. As was noted earlier, some states are taking steps in this direction and are already actively involved in crime prevention programs in one form or another, Nebraska, Arizona, and California being perhaps the most noteworthy examples.

The statement of Dr. Ronald C. Waldron, Chief of the Research Branch of the Texas Department of Corrections, indicating that ". . . corrections has always been involved in crime prevention. It is the other agencies of criminal justice that are now joining corrections in crime prevention,"³⁸ may, to some extent, address the second question

36. Letter from Ray Belnap, Corrections Division Administrator, Department of Social Services and Housing, Honolulu, Hawaii, April 9, 1974.

37. Letter from Caryl Steyer, Midland Lutheran College, Fremont, Nebraska, April 11, 1974.

38. Letter from Ronald C. Waldron.

of whether correctional systems are equipped or even if they can become partners in prevention. From Dr. Waldron's statement, one would think that the partnership already exists between corrections and other agencies within the criminal justice system. This is, of course, not altogether true, since the system has yet to see total interface relative to information sharing amongst the participants in criminal justice. One of the problems that may be cited as the reason for this lack of total interface and subsequent cooperation may well be because correctional systems have faced such severe financial difficulties in the past that have dictated a great degree of reluctance to become involved in any activity outside of those programs directly bearing on the problems of custody and rehabilitation. Even since the beginnings of the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, the correctional systems in American have seemed to be the "bastard child" insofar as financial assistance is concerned. It appears that this financial consideration may be becoming somewhat more available and the assistance necessary to equip corrections for the task of crime prevention is becoming a reality.

Under the able leadership of the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, direct expenditures for corrections increased from \$2 million in 1969 to \$59 million in 1970 and to \$178 million for the fiscal year of 1971, and in 1972 approximately a quarter billion dollars in federal funding is being

slated for the improvement of state, county, and local corrections programs.³⁹

The funding for "equipping" correctional systems is apparently becoming available. This funding should allow corrections to inject its expertise, in the area of research statistics on causative factors, into the crime prevention process, which answers the third question at the beginning of this chapter concerning what corrections can contribute to crime prevention.

Earlier in this chapter, this author wrote a rather lengthy explanation of the uses of statistical information relative to ascertaining possible causative factors. Further refinement of this information, coupled with personnel who are exposed to offenders on a day-to-day basis, forms the elements for what this author refers to as "expertise." Utilizing such expertise in the crime prevention effort simply makes good sense.

The crime prevention programs that correctional systems in the responding states are involved in have been presented. It should not be assumed that these are the only programs currently being conducted, since some 21 states did not respond to this author's correspondence. What is significant is that out of the 29 state correctional systems replying to this author's letters, 18 states, or 62%,

39. Moyer and Flynn, Correctional Environments, p. 5.

indicated that they either had some type of program or were at least interested in the concept of involving corrections in pure prevention activities. All that remains now is to make some suggestions that might be useful for involving more correctional systems in crime prevention before the act.

CHAPTER IV

SUGGESTED PROGRAMS FOR CORRECTIONAL CRIME PREVENTION

Anyone who finds himself in the role of a student attempting to inject his thoughts into a field replete with practitioners who are concerned with day-to-day problems, that are of a very real nature, should be well aware of the difficulties he or she will encounter. One is immediately assailed with such charges as idealism or day dreaming for no good purpose. Usually these charges are lodged against a program that may be a totally new concept in a field that has either become too rigid or is simply resistant to change for reasons that cannot be attributed to organizational priorities.

This author has taken the possibility of day dreaming and idealism charges into account in preparing this chapter on suggestions for correctional crime prevention programs. The programs to follow are, for the reasons just stated, and with the possible exception of the Sidewalk Prevention Program, outgrowths of programs which, even though they are not pure prevention oriented, have found some acceptance within the correctional field.

The reasoning behind the attempt to expand on programs that are now in existence are many, most of which

should be all too obvious to the student in any field which involves administration to any extent. Probably the most obvious reason is that it is usually better to utilize proven concepts as a base for project development. This may, in most cases, allow for a greater degree of acceptance of, at the very least, a lower degree of resistance from staff and administrators. A second reason is that existent programs should provide some fiscal examples upon which to base projected costs for a new expansion program. At the same time, implementation should only require adding staff to the existing program; it should not require a large outlay of funds as is the case with a totally new program. These are by no means all of the reasons that can be found for expanding existing programs. They are, however, some basic considerations that may provide a basis for understanding this author's thoughts in this area.

The first suggested program to be presented here utilizes the concept of paraprofessionals to its utmost. Certainly not a new concept, the use of paraprofessionals has, however, really come to the fore of late in correctional circles. A brief definition of paraprofessionals, followed by some reasoning behind their use in crime prevention is in order here so that the reader fully understands the concept as applied to the program to be presented.

Briefly, paraprofessionals are individuals who do not have academic credentials but do have insights, skills, and abilities which are invaluable in

support of the professionals. For example, a ghetto dweller might help a professional social worker to understand the ghetto culture by opening lines of communication that would ordinarily be closed to him.¹

The above definition adequately describes the term "paraprofessional." Their use in corrections, and more specifically their use in crime prevention, is indicated in the following statement:

Dr. Glaser's research in the federal prison system led him to conclude that over 90 percent of men released from prison seek non-criminal careers "for a month or more." Employing ex-prisoners in public service may serve two purposes: tapping a reservoir of insight and stretching that "month or more" into a long term commitment . . . the offender may be useful because of his experience in lawbreaking. More than a decade ago a leading authority in the sociology of prisons acknowledged that prisoners have a remarkable ability to analyze criminal behavior. Schrag (Clarence Schrag) said that investigations "suggest that the inmates are at least as efficient in assessing the probable behavior of their fellows as are the officials who utilize formal classification procedures."²

In light of the preceding information regarding paraprofessionals, the following is the core of what this author has chosen to call a "Sidewalk Prevention Program," utilizing paraprofessionals.

The primary objective of the Sidewalk Prevention Program is to make an inroad into the prevention of crime, particularly as it occurs on the streets of our cities. To

1. Carney, Introduction to Correctional Science, p. 280.

2. Ibid., p. 363.

assume that all crime and criminals are the products of street conditions, and that all crime occurs in the streets, is obviously naive in the extreme. It must, however, be remembered that this is a proposal and, as such, only a beginning. The author is well aware that crime is a problem at all levels of society. However, since street crime is the most visual and attracts the most attention, it is the focal point for this particular program.

To begin the process of crime prevention on the streets in any community it is necessary, in this author's opinion, to begin working in that community as one of its members. It is not simply a process of enlisting the aid of individuals living within the community through volunteerism since those who have been a part of the system prevalent in a particular town tend to magnify the conditions pertinent to their own particular lives and overlook how these conditions affect others in the community. Volunteers are a necessary part of any community based program, but their activities must be channeled in areas which they will be most useful; pressuring elected representatives, involvement in the judicial process, etc. In most cases, individuals now living within the community can not relate to those who have been involved in criminal activities and have been imprisoned for their involvement. In short, the concept of punishment is simply not understood by the average citizen of the community. The type of

individual who is familiar with penal punishment must come from within the correctional system as one of the "kept."

As was noted earlier in this chapter, corrections is on the threshold of involving past offenders in the justice process. It is the opinion of this author that corrections must end tokenism in this area, and begin a program of "totalism" that will give the criminal justice system the advantages of "criminal" insights into causality. Society must stop asking the police about crime and its causes in total, and begin to ask the "criminal." The program of Sidewalk Prevention is a start toward utilizing insights of those who have been caught; this program is an attempt to make those individuals a part of the correctional system, as well as a part of the community.

Implementation of the Sidewalk Prevention Program begins by selecting two or three individuals who are in the release process, or in the last six months of their period of confinement, and who have demonstrated via an interview process an interest in becoming involved in the correctional system as a paraprofessional. The individuals should be selected by the correctional administrator after a careful screening of their backgrounds. By correctional administrator is meant the individual who will be the project director of this program. The background screening will include gaining information relative to the inmate's educational background both in and out of the institution,

the inmate's attitude toward the system, and in this area one should not seek only those individuals who necessarily adopt the views of the project director in totality. This is, after all, a program that requires a degree of autonomy on the part of the paraprofessional in his daily activities. Another area for investigation relates to the degree of socialization attained by the prospective paraprofessional. The individual must also be able to adequately relate to people in all walks of life due to the type of contacts he will be making in the program. One of the most important considerations, as far as societal protection is concerned, is the offense for which the selected individuals were convicted. These people will become the center of a large amount of attention due to the uniqueness of the program, and administrators can ill afford to have the program fail in its initial phase because people who have been placed in it are unacceptable to the community. This consideration may well be a minor one in the future, but for the present administrators must be extremely careful in the selection process.

Once the individuals have been selected, and while they are still within the confines of the institution, the project director will begin an intensive orientation process dealing with the community they are about to enter. They will be advised about the services available within the community (police, welfare, medical, etc.), the physical

makeup of the community (structures, population, etc.), and the ethnic makeup of the community. In addition to this type of indoctrination the inmate will be required to attend academic classes dealing with psychology, sociology, and other relevant areas. Unless the individuals who are going into this program have taken educational courses in the area of corrections and criminal justice, there should not be a requirement of a high degree of proficiency in this area. These individuals should, however, be apprised of local ordinances and state statutes relative to criminal acts within the community.

Once the orientation process has been completed and the individuals have been released, they should be placed in the selected community. They should be allowed to choose their places of residence, that is the project director should not require that they live within any housing or projects supported by the correctional system. These individuals should be given an adequate salary per year to start, with an allowance for any transportation expenses or any incidental expenses they incur relative to the project. It should also be noted here that these positions should be of a career nature within the corrections department.

Once placement within the community has occurred, the job of prevention begins. Accurate guidelines for performing in the capacity of a prevention counselor or agent cannot be set down on paper. Some assistance along these

lines can be rendered by the project director during the indoctrination process and in concert with the individuals to be involved in the project. In most cases, however, the methods used in the performance of the prevention counselor will depend upon that particular individual and the exigencies of the particular case he is working on. It must be kept in mind that this counselor has been selected because a process of causation was evident to him and to the members of the correctional system, and only he is sure of what might have been done to prevent the personal activities that led to his imprisonment. This is, in addition, a face-to-face program, and the counselor has been placed in the community to contact individuals who show the initial signs of criminal involvement or illustrate a proclivity toward such involvement. How the counselor goes about accomplishing this contact is entirely up to him. He may seek assistance from the criminal justice functions, schools, religious institutions, families, social functions, etc., for information about those who are in need of his aid. He may, on the other hand, utilize none of these resources and depend on his own instincts to find potential offenders. This matter should be left entirely up to him after he has been advised of some standard referral methods.

Following the referral of individuals to the prevention counselor, or after the contact by other methods of people who have demonstrated by their activities, attitudes,

etc., that they may well be headed toward involvement in illegitimate activities, the counselor will begin the process of guidance that he considers necessary for each individual case. As was stated previously, correctional administrators can provide the insights of professional experience, but they cannot provide the insights into deterrence that the counselor possesses by virtue of the fact that he has been there. He must determine the course of action that is necessary in each particular case, and whether or not to seek assistance from correctional personnel or the project director. The services and facilities of the correctional system should be available to him to use in any way he feels necessary. As an example, he may decide to use the facilities of diagnostic and testing centers. With the consent of the particular individual the counselor is working with, the project director should be able to place the person within the center, or as an "out client," and perform testing and diagnostic functions with him or her, in an attempt to aid the individual in determining his strong points as well as his or her deficiencies or potentialities. There are other examples that could be given here, but it is enough that the reader understands that the correctional system should perform a supportive role for the prevention counselor.

In line with the professional assistance aspect of the prevention project, the counselor must be well informed

as to the services available through governmental services other than the correctional system. Utilization of these services as a prevention tool has been overlooked in the past. In many cases their functions are unknown to individuals within the community, and when they are known, the individual, because of pride or honest misunderstanding, is not aware of how to go about enlisting their aid. In this area the prevention counselor's assistance can prove invaluable, for it is here that the counselor functions as a guide for the individual through the world of social assistance.

This concludes the presentation of the Sidewalk Prevention Program, the essence of which lies in placing an ex-offender into the community in the capacity of preventive agent and social assistant.

There are, of course, some problems that must be corrected before a program such as the one just described could be implemented. The main concern of correctional personnel with whom this program has been discussed is one of evaluative measures. To be sure, evaluation should occur with any program if personnel involved are to justify its continued existence. For this program, the probable main evaluator would be the number of clients served and the activities the clientele were involved in both during and after their participation in the project. These evaluators

could be stated in the manner used for the Nebraska Youth Resources Program Evaluation Design:

1. Number of clients adjudicated while participating in the project as a percentage of total participants;
2. Number of clients who have negative police contacts while participating in the project as a percentage of total participants;
3. Self concept of clients as measured by the "Tennessee Self Concept Scale."³

These evaluators are not to be considered as hard requirements. It is always best to allow the individual correctional system the opportunity to institute evaluators that the personnel working with the program feel are adequate measures of success.

One of the most potentially meaningful aspects of the Sidewalk Prevention Program is the supportive role it can play in the life of a potential offender. This supportive function has found expression in such programs as Delancey Street in San Francisco. This program, as many well know, is an attempt to assist ex-convicts in getting their lives straightened out before they once again assume their roles in society.

Two of Delancey Street's members addressed the National Symposium on Corrections at the University of Nebraska Omaha campus in April of 1974, and stressed the

3. Nebraska, Evaluation Design for Youth Resources Program.

importance of Delancey Street's supportive role with the ex-offender. In this respect, the program acts as a family to the ex-offender and gives him or her supportive services both psychological and financial. Although it is not the intention of the Sidewalk Prevention Program to provide financial support to the client, it is most definitely intended to give the potential offender psychological support. Not only in the area of crisis intervention, but on a continuing basis, the Sidewalk Prevention Program is designed to provide whatever support is deemed necessary to help keep the client out of the justice system.

Shock Prevention

One form of prevention that might be utilized as a sort of last effort to deal with potential offenders who are not receptive to prevention techniques such as those found in Nebraska and Arizona is a "Shock Prevention Program." The basis of such a program can be found in projects such as Kentucky's Shock Probation Program:

Shock probation was implemented in Kentucky in 1972 to deal with borderline cases. Offenders not originally qualified for probation are sent to a correctional institution where they are classified in a reception center, given medical tests, and informed of institution rules. The idea is that, within a minimum 30 day period, the shock of a taste of prison life will be enough to make the offender "go straight." Shock probation is a second chance granted by the community through judges to convicted offenders. A person on shock probation is treated like anyone on regular

probation, and placed under the supervision of a probation and parole officer.⁴

It takes only a small amount of imagination to see how a program such as Kentucky's could be altered to include potential offenders.

Such a program would, of course, because of constitutional considerations, require the consent of both the institution and the client, or the client's parent in the case of juveniles. Part of the problem to be found in preventive work, in this author's opinion, seems to be based on the fact that prison, and its ways of life, are all too far removed from society. Most who are either tempted or who are about to embark on a path toward criminality may well be ignorant about the type of life that awaits them in a correctional institution. A Shock Prevention Program may well awaken the potential offender to the hardships found in many prisons across the United States.

Implementation of a program such as that stated above requires a very great degree of assistance from the state correctional system and for that reason should be a function of that system. There are drawbacks to such a suggestion that this author is well aware of. Such arguments as placing a non-offender into an offenders environment and incarceration without conviction are only two of

4. Kentucky, Community Services (Lexington: Bureau of Corrections, 1973).

the many problem areas that would need further exploration. By way of clarification however, this is not in fact incarceration since the program would be run on a volunteer basis. The problem of exposing non-offenders to the offender population can be answered by using a segregation approach and only allowing exposure to the inmate population through a board that would conduct conferences and tours with those involved in the program.

That this type of program is a somewhat radical approach to crime prevention is all too obvious to this author. It is believed, however, that the suggested program is based on a project that has achieved some degree of success in Kentucky, and that there may well be a time when a radical approach is necessary. The success achieved by Kentucky can be seen in the following:

Kentucky's new shock probation statute has been in effect a little over eighteen months. During that period 267 individuals have been released from Bureau of Corrections institutions on shock probation. The following statistical information gives us some idea of the present status of the program. For example, of 267 people who have been released, only 15, or 5.5%, have been returned to an institution so far. However, only three of these individuals, or 1%, have been returned as a result of a new conviction.⁵

Another possible area that might be considered for such a shock program may be that of misdemeanor violators. Misdemeanant probation is already a reality, as was stated

5. Kentucky, Shock Probation Program (Lexington: Department of Corrections Information Center, 1974).

earlier in this work, and it would seem a rather small task to extend this situation to a shock probation program.

The above two programs are mere examples of the possibilities that about for correctional prevention projects. The possibilities that are available require only a small degree of imagination and thought. The use of inmates to man an operation "crime line" is another opportunity for corrections to become involved in crime prevention. Manned by ex-offenders, or those who are presently incarcerated, a "crime line" operation could receive calls from anyone contemplating involvement in a criminal offense for a variety of reasons: no money at a time of need, illnesses, etc. In addition to these types of calls, the individuals involved in such a project could also take calls from informant sources concerning the involvement of individuals in future offenses and in this instance a crisis intervention service could be performed.

Another area that should be explored in relation to inmates speaking to school groups and conducting tours of correctional institutions is the use of movies and other visual presentations that illustrate the type of environment an offender faces.

The last suggestion that this author would make concerns the difficulties found in doing research into correctional activities. It has been stated earlier that various academicians and students of criminal justice have

decried their inability to obtain information relative to research projects. For this reason it might be feasible for every correctional system to retain a research information specialist that would disseminate information to individuals conducting studies concerning corrections. Such information should be disseminated with the understanding that any material written using statistics or information furnished by the department of corrections would be forwarded to the system involved. It is the opinion of this author that such assistance, and the resultant written material, would be of immense value to the entire correctional field.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION

As one begins to think about writing a conclusion to a project such as this, he or she must surely begin to wrack their brains for some evidence to prove the claim or claims made in the thesis statement. Hopefully, this will not be the case here.

The thesis statement for this work is rather simply stated as the role of corrections in pure crime prevention. The question relating to this statement is equally basic: Does corrections have a place in pure prevention? Associative questions pertaining to the one just stated have been presented at the beginning of Chapter II, but will be restated here so that the reader fully understands the reasoning behind the answers and this conclusion.

The first question is as posed above, and the information received from the sources cited in this work would certainly indicate that corrections does indeed have a role to play in pure crime prevention. The evidence presented in Chapter II would support such a view.

The next two questions are really interrelated, as they pertain to whether or not corrections is equipped to become a prevention partner with the other agencies involved

in criminal justice, and what corrections can bring to the preventive effort. The correctional "equipment" lies in the area of its being a repository of causative data, and therein lies the expertise that corrections can bring to the prevention effort. Add to this the fact that correctional personnel are used to dealing with large numbers of people, individuals if you will, and must gain some knowledge of human behavior through such contacts.

The programs that correctional systems are involved in, at least insofar as this author could ascertain through correspondence, have been presented in Chapter III. The types of suggested programs have been presented in the chapter preceding this conclusion.

The question pertaining to the attitudes of correctional and criminal justice personnel toward a pure prevention role for corrections is probably the most difficult to answer. To say that there is overwhelming evidence to support such a role for corrections would be something of an overstatement. There is, however, some basic acceptance of such a role as is evidenced by the number of states responding to this author's communications that indicated either an interest in the concept or were currently involved in some type of prevention program.

Another indication that there may be some acceptance of such a role for corrections may be found in the responses to this author's informal questionnaire by criminal justice

students at the University of Nebraska at Omaha. The first questioning pertaining to this general area asked the students to indicate whether they agreed or disagreed with the statement that "the only prevention function that can be carried on by corrections is that of preventing the recurrence of criminal activity."¹ Of 136 responding to this question 83 or 60% disagreed with the statement, indicating that they saw some other function being performed by corrections.

The second question asked the students was if they saw "corrections as being able to provide a crime prevention function in line with the above definition?"² Of 121 students who responded to this question 64 or 53% responded with a "yes" answer. It is all too evident to this author that the questionnaire was very informal. It was formulated in an attempt to take advantage of a situation that had presented itself toward the completion of the research for this presentation. Regardless of the informality the document did produce some results which this author finds to be somewhat significant in that these results indicated some interest on the part of prospective practitioners in the criminal justice system for a correctional role in pure crime prevention.

1. See Appendix A.

2. Ibid.

There is, of course, some misunderstanding among students and, surprisingly enough, practitioners, concerning definitions of crime prevention. The letter circulated by this author to correctional personnel³ did not attempt to alleviate any of these misunderstandings. It was intended to allow for some self-definition of the concept for two basic reasons: (1) to allow each respondent to state his views on correctional prevention, and (2) to elicit possible information that could form the basis for the chapter on suggested prevention projects.

Surprisingly, it was with some degree of foresight that the letter mentioned above and set forth in Appendix B did not require a simple yes or no answer. If only a simple reply would have sufficed, the replies very well may have been even fewer in number or, worse yet, there would have been replies without details or supportive material.

In conclusion, the following is taken from a speech by Dr. William R. Conte, Director of Institutions for the State of Washington at a Discussion-In-Depth meeting in Seattle on December 10, 1969. The statement represents a portion of Dr. Conte's philosophy of corrections and adequately speaks to this thesis as well as this author's own feelings:

3. See Appendix B.

. . . offensive behavior is a broad and serious social problem of our time. It deserves the concentrated attention of everyone. While our departmental responsibility lies in correcting the unfortunate behavior of clients, a personal and collective responsibility of equal magnitude so rests in the search for solutions to those basic problems which have given rise to the criminal act. Thus, participation in research, together with increasing involvement of our staff in organization, education, group and family life programs, law and justice endeavors, etc., is mandatory. Certainly the broad social problems facing us today deserve no less than total commitment from all of us.⁴

4. William R. Conte, M.D., "A Philosophy of Corrections," Discussion-In-Depth Meeting, Seattle, Washington, December 10, 1969.

APPENDIX A

QUESTIONNAIRE: CRIME PREVENTION

"Crime prevention is any organized activity aimed at keeping unlawful behavior from occurring originally or keeping such behavior to a minimum and thus avoiding police intervention; or any organized activity aimed at deterring unlawful behavior.

This definition would include programs for both juveniles and adults. It would also include programs aimed at removing the desire on the part of an individual to commit an unlawful act or reducing the opportunity to break the law. Prevention activity would cease to exist at the point of police intervention for an alleged law violation.¹

1. Given the above definition of crime prevention, do you see the police as adequately functioning toward that goal?

The court system?

The correctional system?

2. In your opinion, do the police provide the best delivery system for crime prevention services?
3. Police are the most logical service to provide prevention services because they are in constant contact with the potential offender. Do you agree or disagree?
4. Court systems, because of their position in the correctional cycle (Police-Courts-Corrections), cannot function as a preventive agency. Agree or disagree?

1. Pursuit et al., Police Programs for Preventing Crime and Delinquency, p. xi.

5. The only prevention function that can be carried on by corrections is that of preventing the re-occurrence of criminal activity. Agree or disagree?
6. Do you see corrections as being able to provide a crime prevention function in line with the above definition?

APPENDIX B

SAMPLE LETTER

Director, American Correctional Association
4321 Hartwick Road
Suite L-208
College Park, Maryland 20740

Dear Sir:

I am currently doing research to complete a masters thesis in Corrections Administration at The University of Arizona. In this respect I am interested in information pertaining to the role corrections might play in crime prevention.

It has been my opinion for some time that our criminal justice system has overlooked the contributions that correctional personnel might make in the prevention effort. It is my hope that my thesis will shed further light on corrections as a prevention partner. For these reasons I would be most appreciative of your comments regarding the prevention role of corrections as well as any information you might have concerning specific programs in this area.

Sincerely,

Allen J. Reynolds

REFERENCES

Books

- Carney, Louis P. Introduction to Correctional Science. New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc., 1974.
- Carter, Robert M., Glaser, Daniel, and Wilkins, Leslie T. (eds.). Correctional Institutions. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Co., 1972.
- Johnson, Elmer Hubert. Crime, Correction, and Society. Rev. ed. Homewood, Ill.: The Dorsey Press, 1968.
- Moyer, Fredric D., and Flynn, Edith E. (eds.). Correctional Environments. Champagne: University of Illinois, 1971.
- Newman, Oscar E. Defensible Space. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1972.
- Pursuit, Dan G., Gerletti, John D., Brown, Robert M., Jr., and Ward, Steven M. (eds.). Police Programs for Preventing Crime and Delinquency. Springfield, Ill.: Charles C. Thomas, 1972.
- Sutherland, Edwin H., and Cressey, Donald R. Criminology. 8th ed. New York: J. B. Lippincott Co., 1970.
- Winslow, Robert W. Juvenile Delinquency in a Free Society. Encino, Calif.: Dickenson Publishing Co., 1973.

Articles

- Bellow, Gary. "Prevention Through the Judicial Process." Delinquency Prevention: Theory and Practice. Edited by William E. Amos and Charles F. Wellford. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1967.
- Brandstatter, A. F., and Brennan, James J. "Prevention Through the Police." Delinquency Prevention: Theory and Practice. Edited by William E. Amos and Charles F. Wellford. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1967.

Galtung, Johan. "The Social Functions of a Prison." Prison Within Society. Edited by Lawrence E. Hazelrigg. Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1968.

Lejins, Peter P. "The Field of Prevention." Delinquency Prevention: Theory and Practice. Edited by William E. Amos and Charles F. Wellford. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1967.

Magazines

Harrison, Gus. "Exploding Some Myths," Challenge Magazine, September, 1969, p. 13.

Shearer, Lloyd (ed.). "Intelligence Report: Cons & Commercials," Parade Magazine, April 22, 1973, p. 6.

"Texas Justice," Playboy Magazine, September, 1972, p. 56.

Meetings and Workshops

Conte, William R., M. D. "A Philosophy of Corrections." Discussion-In-Depth Meeting. Seattle, Washington, December 10, 1969.

Flynn, Edith E. "Corrections." Workshop at the National Symposium on Corrections. University of Nebraska at Omaha, April 3, 1974.

Interviews

Johnson, Larry S. Director of Nebraska Youth Resources Program. Private interview in McCook, Nebraska, April 2, 1974.

Reports, Bulletins, and Pamphlets

Alaska Department of Corrections. Corrections, n.d.

Arizona Bureau of Preventive Services. Arizona Youth Atlas. Phoenix: Department of Corrections, 1971.

Arkansas Department of Corrections. Annual Progress Report. Little Rock: Department of Corrections, 1973.

- Commonwealth of Virginia. Annual Report. Norfolk: Department of Welfare and Institutions, 1972.
- Commonwealth of Virginia. Blueprint for Action in Virginia Corrections. Norfolk: Department of Welfare and Institutions, 1974.
- Commonwealth of Virginia. Southampton Correctional Fact Sheet. Norfolk: Department of Welfare and Institutions, n.d.
- Georgia. Social Services. Atlanta: Department of Offender Rehabilitation, 1973, n.p.
- Illinois. Illinois Corrections Moves Forward. Springfield: Department of Corrections, n.d.
- Iowa. Iowa State Penitentiary Brochure. Des Moines: Department of Corrections, 1973.
- Kentucky. Community Services. Lexington: Bureau of Corrections, 1973.
- Kentucky. Shock Probation Program. Lexington: Department of Corrections Information Center, 1974.
- Nebraska. Evaluation Design for the Nebraska Youth Resources Program. Lincoln: Department of Corrections, 1973.
- Nebraska. Youth Resources Program. Lincoln: Department of Corrections, 1974.
- Texas. Department of Corrections. Dallas: Department of Corrections, 1971.
- Utah. Progress Report. Salt Lake City: Division of Corrections, 1973.
- West Virginia. Annual Report. Charleston: Commissioner of Public Institutions, 1973.
- Wyoming. Biennial Report. Cheyenne: Board of Charities and Reform, 1972.

Letters

- Belnap, Ray. Corrections Division Administrator, Department of Social Services and Housing. Honolulu, Hawaii, April 9, 1974.
- Colby, Robert S. Illinois Department of Corrections Public Information Officer. Springfield, February 27, 1974.
- Grady, Harv. Arizona Bureau of Preventive Services Supervisor. Phoenix, March 7, 1974.
- Hill, Marjorie J. Coordinator of Research, Alaska Division of Corrections. Anchorage, March 6, 1974.
- Hunt, Elayn. Director, Louisiana Department of Corrections. Baton Rouge, March 6, 1974.
- Jones, T. P. Coordinator of Planning, Research & Evaluation, Florida Division of Corrections. February 28, 1974; March 6, 1974.
- Judkins, Stewart H. Public Information Director, Tennessee Department of Corrections. Nashville, March 7, 1974.
- Kellner, Edwin G. Director, Montana Department of Institutions. Helena, March 4, 1974.
- Keve, Paul W. Director, Delaware Division of Adult Corrections. Smyrna, February 26, 1974.
- Killinger, George. Director, Institute of Contemporary Corrections and the Behavioral Sciences, Sam Houston State University. Huntsville, Texas, March 1, 1974.
- Leeke, William D. Director, South Carolina Department of Corrections. Columbia, March 8, 1974.
- Passamore, Sara. Public Information and Relations Specialist, Georgia Department of Corrections/Offender Rehabilitation. Atlanta, March 5, 1974.
- Powell, Floyd E. Associate Superintendent, Jail Inspection Services and Law Enforcement Liaison, Washington Department of Social & Health Services. Olympia, March 6, 1974.

Rowan, Joseph D. Director, Florida Division of Youth Services. Tallahassee, March 5, 1974.

Steyer, Caryl. Midland Lutheran College. Fremont, Nebraska, April 11, 1974.

Waldron, Ronald J. Chief, Research Branch, Texas Department of Corrections. Huntsville, March 4, 1974.

Zuern, Edwin F. Director, Corrections Planning and Research, State of North Dakota. Bismarck, February 27, 1974.

83

0032 8