

# 304

FINAL REPORT  
FOR THE  
PLANNING - DEVELOPMENT AND FIRST YEAR OPERATIONS PHASE  
OF THE  
ERIE COUNTY STAFF TRAINING AND INMATE REHABILITATION PROJECT

JUNE 27, 1969

*Donald R. Brutvan*

Donald R. Brutvan, Project Director  
Acting Dean  
Division of Continuing Education  
State University of New York at Buffalo  
Buffalo, New York 14214

511003A

## T A B L E O F C O N T E N T S

	<u>Page</u>
I. Project Background and Goals	1
II. Design of the Project	1
A. Curriculum Development	1
B. Program Evaluation	3
C. Visitations and Consultations	3
D. Advisory Committee	4
III. Development of the Project	5
A. Curriculum Development	5
B. Course Evaluation	6
C. Visitations and Consultations	7
D. Advisory Committee	12
IV. Project Evaluation	14
V. Recommendations	16

## A D D E N D U M

### Report Attachments

Background and Attitudes of Keepers - Erie County Penitentiary (Study of Keepers and Evaluation)	17
Advisory Committee Membership and Officers	44
Advisory Committee Objectives	45
List of Citizens Who Have Written Supporting Letters	46
Books for Correction Officers Library	49

I. Project Background and Goals:

Originally, the proposal for Federal funds for the training of the correction officers staff at the Erie County Penitentiary, Alden, New York, grew out of a request by Penitentiary officials for assistance in improving their rehabilitation procedures.

The Penitentiary's choice of the State University of New York at Buffalo as an institutional partner in its training program stemmed in part from the reputation of the School of Social Welfare, which has a long and successful history of cooperation with and assistance to community agencies. And, also, in part from the knowledge that the Division of Continuing Education, is a focal point for the continued education and training of those outside, as well as within, the formal University establishment. The proposal, therefore, was a joint effort to meet the educational needs of the Penitentiary.

The immediate goal was to begin a university-level training program for the custodial staff in the areas of behavioral and social change, essential in a comprehensive prisoner rehabilitation project.

The wider, more ultimate goal was to give the prisoners an increased self-status, better education, and more salable skills, thereby reducing the crime rate and lowering costs. The first step toward these goals was to fill the need for rehabilitative and penal training for the correction officers.

II. Design of the Project: (Planning phase and first year operation)

A. Curriculum Development: The courses to be offered to the custodial staff would include concepts from sociology, social psychology,

individual psychology, and psychiatry. Theories of social and personal change, penology and prison administration, and especially the role of the custodial staff in a prisoner rehabilitation situation were also to be developed. A total of six courses (15 weeks each, one per semester for three years), were developed. The first two courses, "Individual and Society", and "Culture and Personality", were to be offered the first year.

These behavioral science courses were directed toward a change in function of the keepers from chiefly custodial duties to a body of men with sufficient training in rehabilitation concepts and methods for them to be consulted, give guidance, and assist actively in the eventual retraining of the prisoners, both in their skills and their attitudes.

Thirty correction officers were designated to take the first two courses; the total staff consisted of approximately 90 officers. Individual certificates of proficiency would be available upon successful completion of the program.

In addition to the teaching of courses, the faculty of the School of Social Welfare, would be available for consultation and assistance at each phase of the program.

Concurrent with, but not part of the request for federal funds, the Penitentiary would introduce a multi-phase rehabilitation, educational and vocational training program, in which the keepers, outside staff, agencies and the community would be involved.

- B. Program Evaluation: As a beginning point for evaluation of the progress of the project, Mr. Robert Doud, of the School of Social Welfare, was to be employed to develop the following evaluational criteria:
1. A background and attitude study of the keepers, centering on their sex, age, education, and experience as keepers.
  2. Design and utilize a questionnaire to discuss coerciveness as a component of correction officers attitudes.
  3. Evaluate the first year of the project by reusing the questionnaire and accounting for measurable changes in coercive attitudes.
- C. Visitations and Consultations: At the request of the Office of Law Enforcement, the Rehabilitation Committee at Erie County Penitentiary was to augment its previous research with a three-month, intensive study of current methods and procedures of staff training and rehabilitation of prisoners.

The goal was to define as precisely as possible, the problems involved in preparing the correctional officers to be participating members of the rehabilitation staff; to relate contemporary trends and findings to the changing role of the correctional officer; and to draw upon the experience of institutions, agencies, and consultants in developing an imaginative and comprehensive curriculum for both the staff training and inmate rehabilitation phases of the proposed program.

The study was to have three phases:

1. Visits to selected law enforcement, penology and rehabilitation agencies located in Albany, New York, and Washington, D. C. The purpose of these visits was to discuss the proposed program in Erie County and to draw upon the experience of these agencies in its development.
  2. Visits to penal institutions which have specialized or intensive experience with one or more aspects of the proposed program. The experience of these institutions was to be utilized by the Rehabilitation Committee in the final formulation of the program.
  3. Visits with recognized leaders in penology and correction officer training. These persons were to visit the Erie County Penitentiary to inspect the physical facilities, to meet with the officers and administrative staff, and to suggest program amendments based on their experiences.
- D. Advisory Committee: In compliance with an OLEA Grant condition, an Advisory Committee was to be formed, meeting at least once quarterly, to help evaluate the progress of the project and make suggestions for improvements.

The membership of the Committee was to include one or more departmental representatives, each named by the Dean of the School of Social Welfare at State University of New York at Buffalo, the President of the Buffalo Chamber of Commerce, the Superintendent of the Erie County Penitentiary, the Commissioner of the New York State Department of Corrections, and representation from community agencies administering vocational rehabilitation services and mental health services. Other

interested persons could be added to the committee as members desired.

III. Development of the Project (actual implementation):

A. Curriculum Development:

While considerable discussion centered on the question of the type of course to be offered to the correctional officers (that is, whether social science courses were more appropriate than courses related to the actual operation of prisons), it was determined that a theoretical approach, with adequate attention to case histories, would provide more personal growth and professional awareness for the officers. Originally, one-third of the penal staff was to receive each course. Yet, approximately two-thirds of the officers had expressed interest in the project. Without impairing the aims of the project, or the teaching process, it was decided to permit 60 correctional officers to enroll in each course.

The basic teaching approach included, discussions with consultants, films, slides, and case histories, and reference to wide varieties of book materials and social science reprints.

Consultants provided the necessary outside professional competence in the related field of narcotics, parole, apprehension and research. A library, consisting of over 125 recent social science books, was purchased, and exists for additional use by the correctional officers.

(See page 49).

Care was taken to insure that University professors involved in teaching had an understanding of the operation of the prison and the

backgrounds of the officers, and that they had considerable exposure, prior to their selection, to recent penal methods.

One of the usual problems which possibly could develop between faculty and correction officers was the "egghead" image. However, a general rapport was evident throughout both courses; informal discussions were a sign of this relationship.

B. Course Evaluation:

While the measurement or quantification of attitudes is a difficult task, Dr. Robert Doud from the Faculty of Social Welfare, completed a questionnaire, based upon Etzionis' work, which isolated coerciveness as an attitude.

Since a general background study of the keepers, based on sex, education, work experience and age had been completed and the questionnaire administered prior to the starting dates for the course, Dr. Doud was able to readminister the questionnaire after each course to the same group of officers and statistically determine the relative attitudinal changes.

Significantly, a steady trend away from coerciveness was evident in the final two evaluations. Such a trend was viewed as positive by Dr. Doud, as he mentions in the attached report (see page 39).

Other means of evaluation of more subjective content are possible. The comments of the officers, their relationships to fellow men and prisoners, the testimony of the faculty, and the general view of the



University and participating administrators are also indicative of the success of the first two courses.

A separate section, No. IV of this report, is concerned with the wider assessment of the program.

C. Visitations and Consultations:

As mentioned in the project design (II above), the planners arranged for meetings with outstanding regional and nationally known figures, and for institutional visitations. The quality and nature of these contacts can be determined, partly, by their titular listing:

Mr. C. Boyd McDivitt, Deputy Director, Office of Probation,  
New York, New York.

Mr. Robert Trimble, Executive Assistant to the Director, NCCD,  
New York, New York.

Dr. George Shatluck, Professor, Department of Sociology and  
Anthropology, Fordham University.

Mr. George McGrath, Warden at Rikers Island, New York, New York.

Mr. Efrin Ramirez, Narcotics Division, New York City.

Mr. Milton Luger, Director of the Division for Youth, Albany,  
New York.

Mr. Russell G. Oswald, Chairman, New York State Board of Parole.

Mr. Paul McGinnis, Commissioner of Corrections, New York State,  
Albany, New York.

Mr. Laurence M. Pierce, Chairman of New York State Narcotic  
Addiction Control Commission, Albany, New York.

Mr. Milton G. Rector, Director, National Council on Crime and Delinquency, New York, New York.

Mr. Herman G. Moeller, Assistant Director, Bureau of Prisons, Department of Justice.

Mr. J. Robert Weber, Institutional Consultant, National Council on Crime and Delinquency, New York, New York.

Dr. Daniel Glaser, Professor and Chairman of Sociology Department, University of Illinois, Urbana.

Dr. John Grenfell, Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, Illinois.

Dr. Howard B. Gill, American University, Washington, D. C.

Mr. Preston Sharp, American Correctional Association, Washington, D. C.

Mr. William T. Adams, Assistant Director, Joint Commission on Manpower and Training.

Mr. Courtney Evans, Office of Law Enforcement Asst., Washington, D. C.

Mr. James Vorenberg, Executive Director, President Commission of Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice.

Mr. Garrett Hays, Executive Director, Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training, Washington, D. C.

Mr. Roy E. Gerard, Superintendent of National Training School for Boys, Washington, D. C.

Institutions and agencies to be visited included the following:

U. S. Correctional Institution, Danbury, Connecticut.

U. S. Training School for Boys, Washington, D. C.

Bucks County Institution, Doylestown, Pennsylvania.

Rikers Island, New York, New York.

Additionally, the Grant provided for travel to the American Correctional Association Annual Convention for three participants in the project.

While original plans called for meetings with the above listed professionals within a three month time span, the director of the project felt that because of schedules and other needs, the visitations could be accomplished within a three month period, while guest consultants could be used to provide information to the advisory committee, to lecture to the correction officers, and to meet with the faculty throughout the year.

Since contact with all listed persons and institutions would require additional money and time, it was decided to combine visitations to Albany, Danbury, and New York, and to Philadelphia and Washington. Four persons instead of three were able to travel when the automobile was substituted for air travel.

Summarily, it can be stated that the Director of the Project, the School of Social Welfare, and the Penitentiary were represented at all visitations, and that the general spirit of the proposed visitations was maintained, the goal being to gather knowledge related to the penological process.

The group of four persons visited the following persons and institutions:

Russell Oswall	Danbury Prison
Paul McGinnis	Rikers Island
Milton Luger	Bucks County Prison
C. Boyd McDivitt	National Home for Boys
Preston Sharp	NCCD Offices
Howard Gill	American University
Courtney Evans	
Efrin Ramirez	

Other unlisted visitations have included:

Auburn Prison, Auburn, New York  
 Cossackie School for Boys, Cossackie, New York

The use of consultants, as they were invited to the Erie County Penitentiary, was of a threefold nature. They were asked to meet with the professors at the University, consult with the advisory committee, and to address the correction officers. The following consultants came to Erie County:

Mr. Milton Rector, Director of National Council on  
 Crime and Delinquency.

Mr. Justus Freimund, New York State Representative, NCCD.

Mr. Louis Gengler, Federal Prison Administrator.

Major John Case, Bucks County Prison.

Mr. Meyer Diskind, New York State Narcotics Commission.

Other listed consultants were invited; however, due to conflicting schedules and changes in their responsibilities, were unable to come.

As indicated by the titles of the consultants, the topics for discussion varied widely in theory and practice. While immediate application of the ideas generated from such meetings was not always feasible, the theoretical background relevant to recent penal processes became part of the 'thinking patterns' of the persons involved.

Succinctly, it might be stated that the visitations resulted in a greater awareness of the process of prisoner apprehension, confinement, rehabilitation, and release, and the recent efforts to reevaluate the entire criminal process.

A provision for travel to the Annual American Correction Association Convention for three persons was part of the original request. The opportunity to attend the 1968 San Francisco Conference therefore served as a general introduction to recent professional literature.

The conference served to indicate the depth and extent of involvement in corrections by civic, business, governmental and religious groups, and to provide the opportunity for participants to be exposed to literature, group discussion, and informal contact.

The following sessions were of particular interest to the persons attending: "Current Developments in Correctional Training"; "Diagnostic Services for Short Term Institutions"; "Tour of San Quentin Prison and Industrial Facilities"; "Service to the Short-term Inmate"; "Alternatives to Imprisonment"; and "Community Treatment Center Concepts."

Unquestionably, the total experiences of the correction officers, professors, and administrators, gained by the visitations, consultations, and the conference were positive, and will serve to strengthen the program at the Erie County Penitentiary.

D. Advisory Committee:

As mentioned above, a significant Grant condition required that the project director create an advisory committee to help evaluate the progress of the project. Their meetings were to be held once quarterly (see attached list, page 44).

By the nature of their vocational training and civic experience, the eleven advisory committee members were largely unaware of, yet vitally interested in, the operation and affairs of Erie County Penitentiary.

Selected from a cross section of professional vocations, each member was potentially capable of unusual influence upon the operations of the prison.

In some measure, it was necessary to upgrade their knowledge of basic concepts and developments in penology. At the same time, it was necessary to introduce them to the specific prison situation and develop an understanding of the project goals and methods.

A timely series of visits by the listed consultants enabled the advisory committee to meet and discuss issues, general penal questions and problems. Four consultants met with the committee.

They were: Mr. Louis Gengler, Federal Bureau of Prisons; Mr. Justus Freimund, New York State Representative for the National Council on Crime and Delinquency; Mr. Meyer Diskind, New York State Narcotic Commission; and Major John Case, Bucks County Prison, Pennsylvania.

These guests spoke of concepts in rehabilitation, work release techniques, classification procedures, types of prisons, parole, narcotics offense, prison operation, and changing views in penology.

Efforts were made quite early, to allow the committee to operate independently of the Project Director's guidance. Therefore, election of officers was a first step in that direction. During the post-election period, the chairman of the committee was free to set agendas and arrange the tasks of the committee accordingly.

A statement of objectives for the committee was drawn up by an appointed sub-group (see attached). Among these objectives was the desire of the group to be officially recognized by the County Executive, especially because of the absence of other citizen groups and a corrections board, and because of their desire to be effective as a committee.

Efforts were made to invite Executive Tutuska to advisory committee meetings with the understanding that the executive concurred with the need for such a body. Two meetings have been held with representatives from his office; it is expected that the executive will appoint the committee to be a working citizens' committee for the Penitentiary.

An interesting and important problem which has influenced the committee's action has been the change in office and funding arrangements in Washington. The new LEAA action grant funding procedures involving state crime control apparatuses, have forced the committee to turn its attention to the county political unit, which will become the new grantee as the second and third year of the grant continues.

Summarily, it should be stated that the selection, organization, and growth of the advisory committee has been effectively accomplished. Unquestionably, the composition of the committee, the insights and interest of its members can serve to make its operation a most important component of the project, on the basis of the original project goals and the new objectives of the committee.

#### IV. Project Evaluation:

The Project Director's evaluation of the status of the project is influenced by the informal developments on a day-to-day basis and by the formal components and developments of the program. The outstanding problems and successes, which are closely intertwined, should be noted.

Both in the application phase and the implemental stage of the Grant, key problems appeared. The delay in funding the OLEA Grant, resulted in the replacement of the Project Director, because of his position change in the interim. This meant, briefly, that the spirit of the proposal, the specific, technical knowledge acquired by the original Director, must be quickly learned by his successor.



Additionally, an influential figure at the Penitentiary, Mr. Daniel Idzik, Chairman of the Rehabilitation Committee, died soon after the funding date. This was significant because Mr. Idzik was unusually influential and capable in his efforts to better the institution. His successor, Mr. Norman Taylor, has proved to be a capable, insightful successor; the program has continued without serious impairment.

Another significant problem was related to the availability of consultant personnel listed in the original proposal. More than one year intervened between the request for funds and the receipt of them; substitutions were understandably made.

Administrative difficulties arose because of the degree of grantmanship required to effectively administer a program which by the nature of it is rooted in the decisions of persons both in the state and federal government. While this is to be expected, the particular difficulties in getting responses to important questions and suggested changes seemed abnormally numerous, perhaps because of the recent administrative changes in Washington.

Measured by the originally proposed items and goals, the project was unquestionably successful. Two courses were offered to 60 correctional personnel; an advisory committee was established, and the preparation and implementation period were smoothly carried out.

Other, more meaningful, less measurable signs of success were the remarks and involvements of the professional staff, the commitment to the project

by Penitentiary personnel, and the willingness to learn by the University staff and advisory committee.

V. Recommendations:

Civic backing (see letters of support), the personal growth of the correctional officers, evaluational statements by Dr. Doud, professorial and administrative assessments and recommendations, and a supportive and working advisory committee have been requisite to the success of the program. They are also the most apparent, forceful evidence of the need to continue the project.

Prepared by: \_\_\_\_\_

*Allan L. Canfield*  
Allan L. Canfield  
Project Coordinator  
Assistant to the Dean  
Office for Credit-Free Programs  
Hayes A, Room 3

A D D E N D U M

17.

Robert M. Doud  
Research Consultant

BACKGROUND AND ATTITUDES OF KEEPERS  
ERIE COUNTY PENITENTIARY

February 1968

Confidential Report of a Prison-Wide Survey

514 Carondelet Street

New Orleans, Louisiana 70130  
Phone 524-0117

CONTENTS

---

INTRODUCTION.....	ii
THE QUESTIONNAIRE.....	1
FINDINGS.....	2
BACKGROUND QUESTIONNAIRE.....	4
SUMMARY.....	7
APPENDIX I.....	8
APPENDIX II.....	13

INTRODUCTION

---

This report represents an attempt to gain information on the backgrounds and attitudes of keepers at Erie County Penitentiary, which is located in Alden, New York. In particular, this survey was an effort directed toward determining attitudes of keepers before a training program for the keepers becomes operational. It is hoped that, in this manner, attitude changes during the program may be measured.

Prisons have been traditionally stereotyped as institutions in which involvement on the part of the prisoner is of an alienative nature, and powers applied by the keepers are usually coercive.<sup>1</sup> The design of this survey was based on the desire to measure the attitude of each keeper toward the use of coercion as a means of obtaining compliance. Since the study is a prelude to the initiation of the program designed to promote a positive attitude on the part of the keepers toward rehabilitation of prisoners, it was decided that keepers' attitudes toward constitutional guarantees and keepers' preference for certain types of statements (coercive, remunerative, normative) would indicate baselines from which the professors could work in attempting to promote appropriate attitudes.

An instrument<sup>2</sup> was devised in which the keeper would be allowed to indicate his preference for one of the three types of statements and his feelings about several basic constitutional rights.

A second questionnaire<sup>3</sup> was designed to elicit basic background related to the keeper's age, education, length of service, etc.

The keepers were allowed to remain anonymous in the hope that they would more freely indicate accurately their attitudes on these questionnaires.

1. Etzioni, A., A Comparative Analysis of Complex Organizations, Free Press, New York, 1966.
2. See Appendix I
3. See Appendix II

#### THE QUESTIONNAIRE

---

Sections I to X of the questionnaire deal with constitutional guarantees.

The constitutional guarantee is contained in the normative statement with the negative attitude being expressed by the remunerative and coercive statements; the greatest degree of negativeness being expressed in the coercive statement.

## FINDINGS

---

	<u>Preferred Statement</u>		
	<u>Coercive</u>	<u>Remunerative</u>	<u>Normative</u>
Section I	2%	25%	73%
Section II	12	52	36
Section III	62	14	24
Section IV	2	35	63
Section V	57	36	7
Section VI	1	32	67
Section VII	11	71	18
Section VIII	2	85	13
Section IX	13	8	79
Section X	<u>4</u>	<u>27</u>	<u>69</u>
	166%	385%	449%



An examination of the findings reveals that the keepers expressed a preference for the normative type statement containing the constitutional guarantee 44.9% of the time, while preferring the other two statements in 55.1% of their choices.

Further examination also reveals widespread disagreement from issue to issue. Superficial examination reveals attitudes ranging from 2% of the keepers denying freedom of religion to 62% denying the right to assembly.

A closer examination of these figures would be more than relevant to those professors who intend to instruct keepers in a future rehabilitation program.

This report is based upon questionnaires obtained from 89 keepers at the Erie County Penitentiary, Alden, New York.

Those keepers sampled constitute the entire population of male keepers at the Penitentiary.

The following tabulations reflect characteristics of keepers questioned in the survey:

By sex:

Men.....	100%
Women.....	
	<u>100%</u>

By age groups:

20 - 24 years.....	0%
25 - 29 years.....	1
30 - 34 years.....	8
35 - 39 years.....	14
40 - 44 years.....	28
45 - 49 years.....	29
50 - 54 years.....	16
55 - 59 years.....	4
60 - 65 years.....	0
	<u>100%</u>

By education:

College graduate.....	3%
Part college.....	8
High school graduate.....	34
Part high school.....	44
8th grade or less.....	7
Tech. school.....	2
Unreported.....	2
	<u>100%</u>

By years in service as a keeper:

1 to 5 years.....	17%
6 to 10 years.....	38
11 to 15 years.....	21
16 to 20 years.....	19
21 to 25 years.....	2
26 to 30 years.....	1
31 to 35 years.....	0
Unreported.....	2
	<u>100%</u>

28% of the keepers state they have second employment while 64% state they hold no other position. Three per cent report owning businesses. Five per cent did not report.

Of those keepers reporting a second place of employment, the median annual income is reported as \$200 with a range of \$100 to \$7,000 +.

Thirty-four per cent of the married keepers report that their spouse is employed full or part time with a mean income of \$60 per week.

The following is a tabulation of the spouses' reported educational levels:

Spouse - By education:

College graduate.....	2%
Part college.....	4
High school graduate.....	37
Part high school.....	40
8th grade or less.....	<u>17</u>
	100%

By marital status:

Single.....	8%
Married.....	85
Separated.....	2
Divorced.....	0
Widowed.....	0
Divorced and remarried.....	3
Widowed and remarried.....	1
Unreported.....	<u>1</u>
	100%

In addition to the above data, the following may be of use in a future survey of this group or a similar group:

Sixty-four per cent of the keepers own their own homes. The median mortgage is \$10,000 with a range of less than \$500 to more than \$20,000.

Twenty-six per cent of the keepers rent homes or apartments with a median of \$88 a month.

Median family population\* for married keepers was reported to be 5.5 persons.

All completed questionnaires were checked for compliance with instructions, then edited and coded for IBM tabulation. The tabulations were accomplished on computer equipment at the Computer Center, State University of New York at Buffalo.

\* Keeper, Spouse, Children

SUMMARY

---

The typical keeper at Erie County Penitentiary is presented as a white, married, middle aged male, high school graduate, with approximately ten years experience as a keeper, residing in Erie County.

Approximately one-third have additional sources of income and typically own or rent their homes with median mortgage of \$10,000 and a median rental or monthly mortgage payment of \$88.

Approximately one-third of all spouses are employed, adding approximately \$60 a week to the family income.

The typical spouse has either graduated from or has attended high school. She has had three children.

The keepers show a great range of attitudes on questions relating to citizens rights. They, themselves, differ to a great degree from one constitutional guarantee to the next as well as exhibiting differences in opinion with their fellow keepers. They are by no means consistent in the kinds of statements they choose. A small percentage of them exhibit a marked preference for coercive action. Most waver from issue to issue.

Further study would seem to indicate a second check on attitudes as the rehabilitation program gets under way. Analysis appears to reveal that most keepers would be susceptible to the positive forces that prevail in a training program of the nature of the program proposed at the State University of New York at Buffalo.

## APPENDIX I

## ERIE COUNTY PENITENTIARY STUDY

<u>Item Number</u>	<u>Column Number</u>	<u>Row Number</u>
1. Keeper's number	1,2,3,	
2. Age	4,	1. 20-24 2. 25-29 3. 30-34 4. 35-39 5. 40-44 6. 45-49 7. 50-54 8. 55-59 9. 60-65
3. Education	5,	1. Grade School 2. High School 3. Grad. High School 4. College 1,2 5. College 3,4 6. College Grad. 7. Grad. School 8. Tech. School
4. Marital Status	6,	1. Single 2. Married 3. Separated 4. Divorced 5. Widowed 6. Divorced and remarried 7. Widowed and remarried
5. Number of Children	7,	1. one 2. two 3. three 4. four 5. five 6. six 7. seven 8. eight 9. nine and over
6. Place of Residence County	8,	1. 2. 3. 4. 5. 6. 7.

7. Place of Residence  
Town

9,10

01.  
02.  
03.  
04.  
05.  
06.  
07.  
08.  
09.  
10.  
11.  
12.  
13.  
14.  
15.  
16.  
17.  
18.  
19.  
20.  
21.  
22.  
23.  
24.  
25.

#note - make note of street address for  
possible later use

8. Home

11,

1. own  
2. rent  
3. live with  
relatives  
4. trailer  
5. board room and  
meals  
6.  
7.

9. Mortgage

12,

1. 0-499  
2. 5-999  
3. 10-11999  
4. 12-13999  
5. 14-15999  
6. 16-17999  
7. 18-19999  
8. 20 +  
9.

10. Rent/mo.  
or amount mortgage

13,

13,

1. 0-5  
2. 51-75  
3. 76-100  
4. 101-125  
5. 126-150  
6. 151-175  
7. 176-200  
8. 201-225  
9. 226-250

- |   |     |   |
|---|-----|---|
| 11. Years in service as a keeper/mo.                                | 14, | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. 0-12 (0-1)</li> <li>2. 13-24 (1-2)</li> <li>3. 25-60 (2-5)</li> <li>4. 61-120 (5-10)</li> <li>5. 121-180 (10-15)</li> <li>6. 181-240 (15-20)</li> <li>7. 241-300 (20-25)</li> <li>8. 301-360 (25-30)</li> <li>9. 361-420 (30-35)</li> </ul> |
| 12. Previous occupation before Keeper at Erie County Pen. (Specify) | 15, | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Police officer or corrections</li> <li>2. Office</li> <li>3. Professional</li> <li>4. Business</li> <li>5. Self-employed</li> <li>6. Skilled</li> <li>7. Semi-skilled</li> <li>8. Unskilled</li> <li>9. other farming</li> </ul>            |
| 13. Present Second Front Job  | 16, | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. yes</li> <li>2. no</li> <li>3. yes (2)</li> <li>4. yes (3)</li> <li>5. yes-own business</li> </ul>  |
| 14. Present Annual Second Front Income                              | 17, | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. 0-200</li> <li>2. 201-500</li> <li>3. 501-1000</li> <li>4. 1001-2000</li> <li>5. 2001-3000</li> <li>6. 3001-4000</li> <li>7. 4001-5000</li> <li>8. 5001-6000</li> <li>9. 6001-7000 +</li> </ul>   |
| 15. Spouse Employed   | 18, | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. yes-full time</li> <li>2. yes-part time</li> <li>3. no</li> </ul>   |
| 16. Spouse Income/Week if Employed                                  | 19, | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. 0-20</li> <li>2. 21-40</li> <li>3. 41-60</li> <li>4. 61-80</li> <li>5. 81-100</li> <li>6. 101-120</li> <li>7. 121-140</li> <li>8. 141-160</li> <li>9. 161-180 +</li> </ul>  |



17. Make of Car	20,21	01. 02. 03. 04. 05. 06. 07. 08. 09. 10. 11. 12. 13. 14. 15. 16. 17. 18. 19. 20.
18. Year of Car	22,	1. 67 2. 66 3. 65 4. 64 5. 63 6. 62 7. 61 8. 60 9. 59-
19. Sex	23,	1. male 2. female
20. Spouse Education	24,	1. Grade School 2. High School 3. Grad. High School 4. College 1,2 5. College 3,4 6. College Grad. 7. Grad. School 8. Tech. School 9.
21. Father's Occupation	25,	1. Police or corrections 2. Office 3. Professional 4. Business and Managerial 5. Self-employed 6. Skilled 7. Semi-skilled 8. Unskilled 9. Farming

22. Father's Education

26,

1. Grade School
2. High School
3. Grad. High School
4. College 1,2
5. College 3,4
6. College Grad.
7. Grad. School
8. Tech. School
- 9.

M E M O R A N D U M

To: Mr. Allan Canfield, Office of Continuing Education, State University of New York at Buffalo

From: Dr. Robert M. Doud, Director of Research, Erie County Penitentiary Rehabilitation Program

Subject: Interim Report on Evaluation of Erie County Penitentiary Rehabilitation Program

Date: March 31, 1969

During February 1968, a survey in two parts was made regarding backgrounds and attitudes of the keepers at Erie County Penitentiary. During the fall semester of 1968-69, Professor Marvin Bloom lectured to the keepers at Erie County Penitentiary. The goal of this program as stated in the initial proposal was to improve the ability of the keepers to relate themselves to the prisoners and to improve their knowledge of the individual in society during the first semester of the program (as stated on page 12, original program). The original survey on backgrounds and attitudes of keepers demonstrated a broad spectrum of attitudes ranging from coercive to normative on the part of the keepers with regard to various constitutional rights.

During January of 1969, the attitudinal survey was given for a second time to the keepers, and movements in attitudes was evident. The most striking overall movement was a relatively large movement away from the normative application of power applied by keepers toward the prisoners and a slight movement away from coercive powers applied by the keepers. The movement was toward a more pragmatic approach in dealing with problems related to the rehabilitation of prisoners and seems to reflect a great deal of Professor Bloom's personality. Within the

Mr. Allan Canfield

March 31, 1969

range of subjects surveyed, it is easily noted that Professor Bloom has brought about a reduction in the coerciveness of attitudes relating to prisoners within the prison. However, at the same time, we see a more severe attitude developing toward the rights of prisoners outside of the prison setting. This does not appear to be a result of the program but perhaps is more directly related to external events which have occurred during the past semester. In particular, the disturbances on the university campus and the loss of certain personnel at the prison may have produced some of these changes in attitude.

Anecdotal evidence should be obtained from the keepers regarding their feelings about some of these events. No conclusions should be drawn at this time. Rather, at the termination of the spring semester, a third attitudinal study will be accomplished and perhaps some inferences may be drawn.

Attached is a chart demonstrating the movement of attitudes by percentage points within the group of keepers tested.

rrl

Att.

FINDINGS

Preferred Statement

	Coercive		Remunerative		Normative	
	February 1968	January 1969	February 1968	January 1969	February 1968	January 1969
Section I	2.0%	2.5%	25.0%	35.0%	73.0%	62.5%
Section II	12.0	10.0	52.0	45.0	36.0	45.0
Section III	62.0	32.5	14.0	15.0	24.0	52.5
Section IV	2.0	7.5	35.0	42.5	63.0	50.0
Section V	57.0	50.0	36.0	40.0	7.0	10.0
Section VI	1.0	5.0	32.0	42.5	67.0	52.5
Section VII	11.0	25.0	71.0	72.5	18.0	2.5
Section VIII	2.0	7.5	85.0	90.0	13.0	2.5
Section IX	13.0	12.5	8.0	15.0	79.0	72.5
Section X	4.0	5.0	27.0	17.5	69.0	77.5
	166.0%	157.5%	385.0%	415.0%	449.0%	427.5%

-8.5

+30.0

-21.5

\* For meaning of Sections I through X refer to "Background and Attitudes of Keepers, Erie County Penitentiary" February 1968, Confidential Report of a Prison-Wide Survey.

## ERIE COUNTY PENITENTIARY STUDY

## Instructions:

In each of the following sections there are three statements. Choose the one you like the most. There are no right or wrong answers. Circle either A, B, or C, in each section.

## SECTION I.

- A. All prisoners should be compelled to attend religious services.
- B. It is a rewarding experience for a prisoner to attend religious services.
- C. Only prisoners who express a desire to attend religious services should attend these services.

## SECTION II.

- A. Prisoners should speak their mind at any time.
- B. It is to the prisoner's benefit that he speak only when spoken to by a keeper.
- C. Prisoners should not speak to guards unless spoken to.

## SECTION III.

- A. It is to everyone's benefit that prisoners be allowed to assemble together to write and sign petitions.
- B. Prisoners may not assemble together to write and sign petitions.
- C. Prisoners should be allowed to assemble to write and sign petitions.

## SECTION IV.

- A. Newspapers should be allowed to publish any fact.
- B. It is to everyone's benefit that newspapers be careful about the items they publish.
- C. Newspapers must be limited in what they are allowed to publish.

## SECTION V.

- A. Very strict gun laws must be enacted to prevent "just anyone" from owning a gun.
- B. It is to everyone's benefit that citizens be allowed to own guns.
- C. All citizens should be allowed to own firearms of any kind.

## SECTION VI.

A narcotic pusher lives in a house. The police wish to observe activities in that house through the use of a house across the street.

- A. They should be able to demand quarters in that house.
- B. It is to everyone's benefit that they get quarters in that house.
- C. They should not be able to use that house without the owner's consent.

## SECTION VII.

- A. It is to society's benefit that police be allowed to use electronic eavesdropping devices.
- B. Police should be allowed complete freedom in the use of electronic eavesdropping devices.
- C. Electronic eavesdropping devices should not be used to obtain evidence of a crime.

## SECTION VIII.

If a murder suspect has been found innocent by a jury trial and then new evidence is found that may show the murderer is guilty then:

- A. Nothing should be done.
- B. A new trial should be granted and the accused tried in light of the new evidence.
- C. The murderer should be picked up and sent to jail.

## SECTION IX.

- A. It would be beneficial to society if the fifth amendment were removed from the constitution.
- B. The fifth amendment must not be allowed to be used in court.
- C. Use of the fifth amendment is the privilege of every citizen.

## SECTION X.

- A. A person accused of a crime should not be allowed to see the witnesses.
- B. It is to the benefit and protection of society that law officers be allowed to use confidential witnesses against the accused.
- C. The accused should have the right of confronting all witnesses against him.

SECTION XI.

- A. All criminals should be punished by jail terms.
- B. Punishment of criminals brings rewards to society.
- C. Crime is wrong.

SECTION XII.

- A. All men should work.
- B. Work brings many rewards.
- C. All prisoners should be made to work.

SECTION XIII.

- A. Habitual criminals should be sentenced to life.
- B. Crime does not pay.
- C. Crime is morally wrong.

SECTION XIV.

- A. It is to the benefit of society that only taxpayers be allowed to vote.
- B. All citizens should be allowed to vote.
- C. Only taxpayers should be allowed to vote.

SECTION XV.

- A. Education brings many rewards.
- B. All men should be educated.
- C. All prisoners should be compelled to attend educational classes.



38.

**EVALUATION OF ERIE COUNTY PENITENTIARY  
KEEPER TRAINING PROGRAM**

**May 1969**

**Dr. Robert M. Doud**

During February 1968 and during January 1969, surveys of the keepers' attitudes toward the legitimacy of rights of prisoners were measured. The attempt was made in an effort to determine the effects of a program given by the Office of Continuing Education, State University of New York at Buffalo to the keepers at Erie County Penitentiary.

The first report entitled "Background and Attitudes of Keepers, Erie County Penitentiary", was submitted for February 1968\*. This report demonstrated the development of a questionnaire on the keepers' backgrounds and an instrument designed to measure degrees of coerciveness or non-coerciveness in the keepers' attitudes. It was speculated that shifts in these attitudes would measure in part the influence of the university people offering the courses to the keepers.

The February 1968 report demonstrated that the keepers were not usually coercive in their attitudes towards prisoners and criminals and, in fact, often showed less coerciveness than one might suspect. At the termination of the first course offered through the university, the keepers were again tested with the attitude instrument. The interim report\*\* dated March 31, 1969, demonstrated a minute shift in attitudes away from coerciveness and toward a more pragmatic approach. In listening to anecdotes told by both keepers and the teacher, Professor Marvin Bloom, it is evident that a very positive relationship developed and that the keepers gained helpful insights into social problems relating to crime and punishment.

In speaking with Professor Bloom, it was evident that his interest was reinforced by the keepers' willingness to learn and to change.

---

\* A copy of the February 1968 report is attached.

\*\* A copy of the Interim report dated March 31, 1969, is attached.

At the termination of the second course offered through the Office of Continuing Education, the keepers were once again tested with the same attitude instrument as in the two previous evaluations. Although the change in attitudes is not large, a trend is noted which encourages this author to recommend that the courses be continued. In the attitude testing, the author attempted to determine the kinds of power the keepers would use in various situations. These powers were defined in the February 1968 report as coercive, remunerative and normative. At the conclusion of the second course and the third testing of the keepers, it is evident that there is a trend away from coerciveness. This trend is demonstrated in the following table.

TABLE 1. Percent of Instances in Which a Particular Kind of Power was Preferred by the Erie County Penitentiary Keeper

<u>Kind of Power Preferred</u>	<u>February 1968 (%)</u>	<u>January 1969 (%)</u>	<u>May 1969 (%)</u>
Coercive	16.60	15.75	14.17
Remunerative	38.50	41.50	37.49
Normative	<u>44.90</u>	<u>42.75</u>	<u>48.34</u>
Totals	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

This table demonstrates a slight but consistent trend over a period of fifteen months, away from a coercive attitude towards criminals.

At the same instant, one discovers anecdotes such as a keeper telling one of the professors, "Whenever a prisoner looked at me bad I would hit him-- now I stop and think of him as an individual", that indicates a success beyond that measurable by statistical means.

The following are spontaneous comments written by some keepers on the final attitude questionnaires.

I feel that this course should somehow be offered to every employee of this and every other correction institution. Very beneficial.

\* \* \* \* \*

Through this course I have found out that society is very complicated and no one knows the answers. We keep experimenting with society to such an extent as to lose our final goal as new problems keep arising before old ones are solved; therefore, we have to bear down harder to keep at a never-ending task.

\* \* \* \* \*

Through this program I'm gaining new insight into the cause of crime and what motivates the average criminal. In the past I was apt to lump them all together, whereas now I'm beginning to look at them as individuals and treat them as such.

\* \* \* \* \*

I would like to have continuous education of correctional officers as we have had in the past in the sociological field.

\* \* \* \* \*

During the two semesters that offered new knowledge to 60 to 100 correction officers, those 60 became better officers, better friends, and surely even the inmates have benefited. In whole a better understanding has developed.

On the following page, Table 2 completes the interim table which demonstrated percent of answers to individual questions for the February 1968 and January 1969 reports. The reader may easily see the areas of change during the fifteen months of the program.

TABLE 2. Findings

Section	Preferred Statement								
	Coercive		Remunerative		Normative				
	Feb. 1968	Jan. 1969	May 1969	Feb. 1968	Jan. 1969	May 1969			
I	2.0%	2.5%	2.8%	25.0%	35.0%	36.1%	73.0%	62.5%	61.1%
II	12.0	10.0	5.6	52.0	45.0	25.0	36.0	45.0	69.4
III	62.0	32.5	33.3	14.0	15.0	19.4	24.0	52.5	47.2
IV	2.0	7.5	0.0	35.0	42.5	33.3	63.0	50.0	66.7
V	57.0	50.0	66.7	36.0	40.0	22.2	7.0	10.0	11.1
VI	1.0	5.0	0.0	32.0	42.5	52.8	67.0	52.5	47.2
VII	11.0	25.0	19.4	71.0	72.5	69.4	18.0	2.5	11.1
VIII	2.0	7.5	0.0	85.0	90.0	91.7	13.0	2.5	8.3
IX	13.0	12.5	13.9	8.0	15.0	8.3	79.0	72.5	77.8
X	<u>4.0</u>	<u>5.0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>27.0</u>	<u>17.5</u>	<u>16.7</u>	<u>69.0</u>	<u>77.5</u>	<u>83.3</u>
	166.0%	157.5%	141.7%	385.0%	415.0%	374.9%	449.0%	427.5%	482.2%

\* For meaning of Sections I through X refer to "Background and Attitudes of Keepers, Erie County Penitentiary", February 1968, Confidential Report of a Prison-Wide Survey.

The author has provided this table as a device which may prove helpful to future teachers of the prison keepers. The table demonstrates areas where the keepers may need help in understanding constitutional concepts and their relationship to human behavior.

It is the author's feeling that the program has been successful in accomplishing its goals for the past year and that it would be of benefit to the keepers, the prisoners, and the community if the program were continued.

Dr. Robert M. Doud  
Clinical Assistant Professor  
of Psychiatry

ERIE COUNTY PENITENTIARY GRANT ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Dr. Isaac Alcabas  
School of Social Welfare, SUNYAB  
Room 127, Foster Hall  
Campus

Mr. Allan L. Canfield (Secretary to  
the Committee)  
Assistant to the Dean  
Office for Credit-Free Programs, SUNYAB  
Hayes A, Room 3  
Campus

The Right Rev. Msgr. John J. Conniff  
Catholic Charities  
525 Washington Street  
Buffalo, New York 14203

Reverend Lawrence E. Herfurth (Vice  
Chairman)  
Executive Secretary  
Lutheran Service Society of New York  
2500 Kensington Avenue  
Snyder, New York 14226

Mr. Bradley Hurd  
United Tay Payers League  
Crosby Building  
170 Franklin Street  
Buffalo, New York 14202

Mr. Ambrose Lane  
Community Action Organization  
Genesee Building  
Buffalo, New York 14202

Mr. William Lytle  
Attorney  
Marine Trust Building  
237 Main Street  
Buffalo, New York 14203

Mr. Vincent Mancusi  
Warden  
Attica Prison  
Attica, New York 14011

Mr. Felix Mindy  
Deputy Warden  
Erie County Penitentiary  
Box X  
Alden, New York 14004

Mr. Edward B. Murphy  
Liberty Bank Building  
422 Main Street  
Buffalo, New York 14202

The Honorable Raymond R. Niemer  
Family Court Judge  
Family Court  
25 Delaware Avenue  
Buffalo, New York 14202

Mr. Joseph Schuster (Committee Chairman)  
Vice President for Administration  
Buffalo Savings Bank  
Main and Genesee Street  
Buffalo, New York 14203

OBJECTIVES - MEETING MARCH 3, 1969

NAME: ERIE COUNTY ADVISORY COMMITTEE TO THE PENITENTIARY

1. Liaison between the Penitentiary and the public--calling attention to the needs and possible problems occurring at the Pen, interpreting to the public through the news media, public forums, etc.
2. To be informed, as a committee, regarding new methods and ideals of penology.
3. To press for local and/or state legislation when needed for better understanding of programs of penology.
4. To seek money for continuing educational programs for the staff at the Penitentiary.
5. To cooperate with the administration of the Pen to provide in the best possible way for the physical, mental, emotional, and spiritual needs of the prisoners by encouraging the development of classification of prisoners, programs in vocational and academic education, constructive recreation, personal counseling, medical and psychiatric examinations.
6. To enlist the interest of County Government in problems of the Penitentiary.
7. To request that the members of the committee be appointed by the county executive so that its voice may be heard as a semi-official body.

-----

We further suggest that the Committee Meetings be bi-monthly and a speaker be procured to better inform us.



LIST OF CITIZENS WHO HAVE WRITTEN SUPPORTING LETTERS

- Robert A. Ziegler, Secretary Treasurer, Alden Chamber of Commerce.
- Joseph Manch, Superintendent of Buffalo Public Schools.
- Isabelle Vervaeke, Assistant Secretary, Buffalo Board of Education.
- John M. Galvin, President, Buffalo Area Chamber of Commerce.
- Laurence T. Hosie, Jr., Executive Director, Buffalo Area Council on Alcoholism, Inc.
- Charles R. Turner, President, Buffalo Area Council on Alcoholism, Inc.
- William P. Dixon, Vice President, Buffalo Junior Chamber of Commerce.
- David R. Rosenblatt, Secretary, Buffalo-Niagara Frontier Business Federation, Inc.
- Frank A. Merigold, Director of Guidance, Canisius College, Buffalo.
- Very Rev. Msgr. John J. Conniff, Diocesan Director, Catholic Charities of Buffalo.
- Robert Warner, M.D., Medical Director, Children's Rehabilitation Center (A Unit of Children's Hospital).
- Peter T. Randazzo, Executive Director, Church Mission of Help, Inc.
- Frank N. Felicetta, Commissioner of Police, City of Buffalo.
- Herbert J. LeVine, Executive Director, City of Buffalo Youth Board.
- William A. Sari, City Court Judge, City of Lackawanna.
- Ambrose I. Lane, Executive Director, Community Action Organization of Erie County.
- John F. Hickey, Executive Director, Community Welfare Council of Buffalo and Erie County.
- Rev. Carl F. Burke, Director, Social Service Department, Council of Churches of Buffalo, Erie County, and North Tonawanda.
- Jacob A. Latona, Burke I. Burke, Frederick M. Marshall, Charles J. Gaughan, County Court Judges, Erie County Court.

Cy King, Executive Editor, Buffalo Courier Express.

Very Rev. Msgr. Leo E. Hammerl, Superintendent of Schools, Department of Education,  
Diocese of Buffalo.

Michael F. Dillon, District Attorney, Erie County.

Charles L. Hutchinson, Director, Erie County Department of Probation.

James E. Shenton, President, Erie County Technical Institute.

Leon W. Paxon, Judge, Family Court of the State of New York, County of Erie.

Raymond R. Niemer, Senior Judge, Family Court of the State of New York, County of Erie.

Mrs. Ruth Merket, Clerk, Board of Trustees, First Church of Christ, Scientist.

Mrs. C. Edwin Long, Jr., President, Girl Scout Council of Buffalo and Erie County.

Mrs. Elisabeth G. Ponafidine, Executive Director, International Institute of  
Buffalo.

The Reverend L. E. Herfurth, Executive Secretary, The Lutheran Service Society  
of New York.

L. Edgar Hummel, M.D., Superintendent, Edward J. Meyer Memorial Hospital.

Walter R. Lalor, Executive Director, Mental Health Association of Erie County.

Jack M. Clark, Pastor, Millgrove Bible Church, Alden.

Miss Rose F. Steinkrauss, Executive Director, Neighborhood House Association.

Peter R. Sorensen, Area Supervisor, State of New York Executive Department,  
Division of Parole.

Michael F. Blawat, Field Representative, New York State Executive Department,  
Division for Youth.

Harvey A. Guenther, Ex-President, New York State Retired Teachers Association.

Neil O'Donnell, Executive Director, Police Athletic League, Buffalo.

A. Warren Smith, Jr., President, Planned Parenthood Center of Buffalo.

Sanford H. Meyers, M.D., Medical Director, Psychiatric Clinic of Jewish Family  
Service.

Mrs. Ruth E. Allen, Director, Family and Personal Service Department, The Salvation Army.

Theodore R. Sanders, 1967 February Grand Jury.

Sister Rosa, Administrator, Sisters of Charity Hospital of Buffalo.

Mrs. Dorothy H. Rose, The Assembly, State of New York, Albany.

Garnold L. Richards, General Manager, Buffalo Regional Joint Board, and Vice President, Textile Workers Union of America AFL-CIO.

Louis M. Bunis, President, United Jewish Federation of Buffalo.

Walter H. Pfeiffer, Director, Veterans Service Agency, County of Erie.

W. L. Barnette, Jr., PhD, Director and Professor of Psychology, State University of New York at Buffalo.

William J. McFarland, Executive Director, United Fund of Buffalo and Erie County.

Mrs. Albert N. Abgott, President, Young Women's Christian Association of Buffalo and Erie County.

E. Lois Graham, Branch Executive Director, Young Women's Christian Association, South Side Branch.

Rev. Philip J. Badame, Diocesan Youth Director, Youth Department, Bishop Duffy Center.

BOOKS FOR CORRECTIONS OFFICERS LIBRARY

Adams, William T., Papers in the Behavioral Sciences for Teachers in Correctional Work; Amos, William F., ed. Readings in the Administration of Institutions for Delinquent Youth; Bandura, Albert, Adolescent Aggression: a Study of the Influence of Child Training Practices and Family Interrelationships; Barnes, Harry Elmer, New Horizons in Criminology; Beaumont, Gustave de, On the Penitentiary System in the United States and Its Application in France; Becker, Howard S., ed. Other Side: Perspectives on Deviance; Bloch, Herbert Aaron, Delinquency: the Juvenile Offender in America Today; Bloch, Herbert Aaron, Man, Crime, and Society: the Forms of Criminal Behavior; Bok Curtis, Star Wormwood; Bredemeir, Harry Charles, Social Problems in America: Costs and Casualties in an Acquisitive Society; Caldwell, Robert Graham, Criminology; Caplan, Gerald, Principles of Preventive Psychiatry; Cartwright, Corwin, Group Dynamics, Research and Theory; Cassler, Henry H., Ministering to Prisoners and Their Families; Catholic University of America: Workshop on Psychological Counseling of Adolescents 1961, Psychological Counseling of Adolescents: The Proceedings; Caudill, William A., Psychiatric Hospital as a Small Society; Chein, Isidor, Road to H: Narcotics, Delinquency and Social Policy; Clark, Kenneth B, Dark Ghetto; Clegg, Reed K., Probation and Parole: Principles and Practices; Clemmer, Donald, Prison Community; Clinard, Marshall Barron, Sociology of Deviant Behavior; Clinard, Marshall Barron, Anomie and Deviant Behavior; Cloward, Richard A., Delinquency and Opportunity: a Theory of Delinquent Gangs; Cohen, Albert Kircidel, Delinquent Boys: the Culture of the Gang; Combs, Arthur Wright, Individual Behavior: a Perceptual Approach to Behavior;

Conference Group on Correctional Organization, Theoretical Studies in Social Organization of the Prison; Conrad, John, Crime and Its Correction: An International Survey of Attitudes and Practices; Deutsch, Helene, Psychology of Women: a Psychoanalysis Interpretation; Dressler, David, Practice and Theory of Probation and Parole; Dressler, David, ed. Readings in Criminology and Penology; Eaton, Joseph W., Stone Walls Not a Prison Make; Elliott, Mabel Agnes, Social Disorganization; Eysenck, Hans J., Crime and Personality; Fenton, Norman, Explorations in the Use of Group Counseling in the County Correctional Program; Fenton, Norman, Introduction to Group Counseling in State Correctional Service; Fenton, Norman, Prisoner's Family: a Study of Family Counseling in an Adult Correctional System; Fink, Arthur E., Causes of Crime: Biological Theories in the United States 1800-1915; Fink, Arthur E., Field of Social Work; Gans, Herbert J., Urban Villagers: Group and Class in the Life of Italian-Americans; Giallombardo, Rose, Society of Women: A Study of a Women's Prison; Glaser, Daniel, Effectiveness of a Prison and Parole System; Glueck, Sheldon, Family Environment and Delinquency; Glueck, Sheldon, Predicting Delinquency and Crime; Glueck, Sheldon, Unraveling Juvenile Delinquency; Goffman, Erving, Asylums: Essays on the Social Situation of Mental Patients and Other Inmates; Greenblatt, Milton, From Custodial to Therapeutic Patient Care in Mental Hospitals; Grygier, Taduesz, et al ed., Criminology in Transition; Hall, Calvin Springer, Theories of Personality; Harms, Ernest, Handbook of Counseling Techniques; Hart, Bernard, Psychology of Insanity; Hollis, Florence, Casework: a Psychosocial Therapy; Johnson, Elmer Hubert, Crime, Correction, and Society; Joint Committee of the American Bar Association and the American Medical Association on Narcotic Drugs, Drug Addition: Crime or Disease; Jones, Maxwell, Social Psychiatry in the Community in Hospitals and in Prisons;

Josselyn, Irene Milliken, Adolescent and His World; Kay, Barbara A., Probation and Parole; Keye, Paul W., Probation Officer Investigates: a Guide to the Pre-sentence Report; Korn, Richard R., Criminology and Penology; Lazarus, Richard S., Personality and Adjustment; Leighton, Alexander Hamilton, My Name is Legion: Foundations for a Theory of Man in Relation to Culture; Lincoln, Eric, My Face is Black; Lincoln, Charles Eric, Black Muslims in America; Lindesmith, Alfred R., Addict and the Law; McCart, Samuel W., Trial by Jury: a Complete Guide to the Jury System; McGregor, Douglas, Human Side of Enterprise; Maddox, George L., Drinking Among Teenagers; Maier, Norman Raymond Frederick, Appraisal Interview: Objectives, Methods, and Skills; Matza, David, Delinquency and Drift; Mauer, David W., Narcotics and Narcotic Addiction; Miller, Derek, Growth to Freedom: a Psychosocial Treatment of Delinquent Youth; Morrow, Gerald S., Administration of Activity Therapy Service; Mullan, Hugh, Alcoholism Group Psychotherapy and Rehabilitation; Neumeyer, Martin Henry, Juvenile Delinquency in Modern Society; Pearl, Arthur, New Careers for the Poor; Pfiffner, John McDonald, Supervision of Personnel: Human Relations in the Management of Men; Pigors, Paul, Case Method in Human Relations; Polsky, Howard, Cottage Six: the Social System of Delinquent Boys in Residential Treatment; Powers, Edwin, An Experiment in the Prevention of Delinquency: the Cambridge Somerville Youth Study; Powers, Edwin, Crime and Punishment in Early Massachusetts, 1620-1692, a Documentary History; Reckless, Walter Cade, Crime Problem; Riese, Hertha, Heal the Hurt Child; Rogers, Dorothy, Psychology of Adolescence; Rubenfeld, Seymour, Family of Outcasts: a New Theory of Delinquency; Rubin, Sol, Crime and Juvenile Delinquency: a Rational Approach to Penal Problems; Rubin, Sol, Psychiatry and Criminal Law: Illusions, Fictions, and Myths; Scudder, Kenyon Judson, Twenty Billion Dollar Challenge: a National Program for Delinquency Prevention; Selznick, Philip,

Leadership in Administration: a Sociological Interpretation; Short, James F.,  
Group Process and Gang Delinquency; Smith, Ann D., Women in Prison: a Study in  
Penal Methods; Sorokin, Pitirim Aleksandrovich, Society, Culture, and Person-  
ality: Their Structure and Dynamics: a System of General Sociology; Stanton,  
Alfred H., Mental Hospital: a Study of Institutional Participation in  
Psychiatric Illness and Treatment; Sutherland, Edwin Hardin, Principles of  
Criminology; Sykes, Gresham M., Society of Captives: a Study of a Maximum  
Security Prison; Taft, Donald Reed, Criminology; Tait, Columbus Downing,  
Delinquents: Their Families and the Community; Tappan, P. W., ed, Contemporary  
Correction; Tappan, Paul Wilbur, Crime, Justice, and Correction; Tyler, Leona  
Elizabeth, Work of the Counselor; United Nations Department of Economics and  
Social Affairs, Capital Punishment; Weston, Paul B., Supervision in the Adminis-  
tration of Justice; Whitney, Elizabeth D., Lonely Sickness; Wilkins, Leslie T.,  
Social Deviance: Social Policy, Action, and Research; Wolfgang, Marvin E.,  
Sociology of Crime and Delinquency; Friedenberg, Edgar Z., Dignity of Youth, and  
Other Atavisms.