BOSTON UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF SOCIAL WORK

A STUDY OF A COEDUCATIONAL CORRECTIONAL FACILITY

A Thesis

Submitted by

Linda Almy

Vikki Bravo

Leslie Burd

Patricia Chin

Linda Cohan

Frank Gallo

Anthony Giorgianni

Jeffrey Gold

Mark Jose

John Noyes

In Partial Fulfillment of Requirements for

the Degree of Master of Science in Social Service

1975

A STUDY OF A COEDUCATIONAL CORRECTIONAL FACILITY
ABSTRACT

Nationwide, many prisons have instituted innovative programs such as furloughs and work/education release to help ease reintegration back into the community. To date, only two adult prisons have been designated as coeducational correctional facilities. The Massachusetts Correctional Institution at Framingham is one of them. An exploratory study of Framingham was undertaken because no systematic research had been found on an adult coeducational facility.

This study of MCI-Framingham had three general goals. These were:

(1) to provide a general description of the facility and its programs;

(2) to generate some exploratory data on inmates' perceptions of the social climate, the coeducational aspects, and selected programs of MCI-Framingham; and,

(3) to examine the impact of the MCI-Framingham coeducational program on recidivism.

A review of the correctional literature was carried out with a general focus on studies of all-male and all-female institutions. From the literature a conceptual framework for the exploratory part of the study emerged. There was an emphasis on the general concept of the social climate of the correctional facility with particular attention to such issues as: communication and information flow;

punishment and reward; inmate subculture; sexual relationships; and, relationships with the outside community.

The description of MCI-Framingham--its history and physical layout, its staffing patterns, and its correctional programs--was based upon interviews with selected staff members, as well as upon various written documents and reports on Framingham.

The exploratory part of the study was based upon interviews with fifty Framingham inmates. With respect to social climate, the findings can be summarized as follows:

(1) Regarding communication and information flow, males tended to feel there was less communication between themselves and staff at Framingham than there was at their more structured former institution. However, since Framingham is more unstructured, inmates felt more able to participate in decision making concerning how the institution is run.

(2) With regard to punishment and reward, both males and females felt staff will punish them for an infraction, but they see little chance that they would be punished by a fellow inmate. Males reported that they would be more likely to be punished by fellow inmates at their former institutions. Staff at Framingham was also seen as more apt to give praise to inmates for positive behavior.

(3) Concerning inmates' relationship with the outside community, males tend to generally view their relationship as more positive than females. This could be due to the fact that males, exclusive of cadre, are primarily sent to Framingham for pre-release programs and tend to compare and contrast Framingham with their sending institutions.

(4) Concerning inmate subculture, there seemed to be a much less rigid subculture among men than women. Men seemed less involved with each other, resulting in less peer pressure and more individuality. Women tended to be more involved in a social system similar to those found in all-female institutions.

(5) As far as sexual relationships between men and women, the general response was that there was no difference at Framingham from that which exists on the outside. Inmates were willing to openly acknowledge the presence of female homosexuality, but denied the existence of male homosexuality. The inmates' attitudes on sexual roles were rather traditional and stereotyped, with the exception of female homosexuals. Finally, the inmates reported that, in general, they did not expect the relationships formed in Framingham to last on the outside.

With respect to Framingham programs, inmates' perceptions of the furlough program and the work and education release programs were very positive; their perceptions of the cadre program were positive; and their perceptions of the counseling program were mixed. Also, it was clear that their general view of the coeducational correctional experience was an extremely positive one.

Recidivism Follow-up. The comparison between the expected recidivism rate (17.3%) and the actual recidivism

rate (11.6%) revealed a substantial reduction in recidivism for the first 121 persons who were released from Framingham since it became a coeducational facility. The impact of the Framingham program on recidivism tended to be somewhat greater for women--from 19.6% (expected rate) to 12.8% (actual rate)--than it was for men--from 11.8% (expected rate) to 8.6% (actual rate).

An analysis of the relationship between background characteristics and recidivism was also carried out for the men and women, as well as for the total sample. On some factors, such as, institution committed to, offense, race, and drug usage, some interesting findings emerged. For example, none of the 14 men originally committed to Walpole were recidivists, while 14% of the 21 men originally committed to Concord were recidivists. This may reflect a more careful screening of the Walpole commitments. On offense, the recidivism rate of property offenders (26%) was significantly higher than that of all other offenders (7%). Although this pattern is consistent with previous studies, the unusually large difference is noteworthy here. On race, black inmates, both female and male, had a considerably lower recidivism rate (8%) than that of whites (15%). Finally, unlike the findings of previous studies, the recidivism rate of those with histories of drug usage was no higher than that of individuals with no histories of drug usage.

In conclusion, there seems to be a clear convergence of the data in support of the coeducational correctional program at MCI-Framingham. Although some negative issues were raised in the course of this study, the overall findings of this research lead to the conclusion that the Framingham program is an effective and worthwhile correctional enterprise.

It is hoped that this research has contributed to a better understanding of the coeducational correctional experience, and that it will stimulate further study of this important area.

Linda Almy
Vikki Bravo
Leslie Burd
Patricia Chin
Linda Cohan
Frank Gallo
Anthony Giorgianni
Jeffrey Gold
Mark Jose
John Noyes

Francis J. Carney, Jr., Ph.D., (Thesis Advisor)

April, 1975

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Several people provided us with valuable help in the course of conducting this research. We would like to thank them here for their help.

Superintendent Jack Bates and his staff at MCI-Framingham gave full cooperation to this research. Particular thanks go to Ms. Shelley Isaacson, Director of Volunteer Services and her inmate assistant. Their efforts in coordinating and facilitating the interviewing process at Framingham were invaluable to us.

We feel a special sense of gratitude to those inmates of MCI-Framingham who took the time to share with us their experiences and opinions regarding the coeducational correctional enterprise.

The advice of Alden Miller and Robert Coates of the Center for Criminal Justice, Harvard Law School, was much appreciated.

Several people at the Department of Correction assisted us in data collection and data processing. Dan LeClair, Ira Beline, and Ellen Weiner were helpful on specific issues. We thank Miranda Mucciante and Janice McKenna for keypunching the data. We especially appreciated the efforts of Bob Patrician in writing the computer programs for the analysis

of the data, and in providing us with other technical assistance on data processing.

We thank Judy Carney for her painstaking work in typing the final draft.

Finally, we give unlimited thanks to Frank Carney, our thesis advisor, whose involvement was, put simply, above and beyond the call of duty. A project of this magnitude could never have been completed without his extensive commitment.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

What moves me in the morning is to be able to step outside and breathe fresh air; what moves me at night is to look back and know I've been able to handle a job and do something with myself; what moves me on reflection is that my sensitivity to others is coming back when I thought I had lost it.

-- A Framingham Inmate

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

INTRODUCTION

The current trend in corrections has been toward a philosophical base that has community reintegration and social rehabilitation of offenders as its goals, rather than a previous emphasis on strict isolation of the offender from more normal social and community experiences. Nationwide, many prisons have instituted innovative programs such as furloughs and work and education release to help offenders ease back into the community. To date, however, only two prisons have been designated as coeducational correctional facilities, where, in addition to having the above-mentioned progressive programs available, they would also by their very nature provide a more usual social environment. The Massachusetts Correctional Institution at Framingham, originally the state women's facility, is one of these two prisons. Our study of Framingham was undertaken because no systematic research had been found on the effect that such a facility might have. We hope that the study will provide a significant contribution to the literature in the correctional field, and that the correctional administration of Framingham will find it useful feedback regarding specific programs and policies there.

Using a review of the literature on all-male and all-female prisons as a backdrop to our study, we then divided our research into three segments. The first is a descriptive study where we have attempted to furnish an objective description of MCI-Framingham based on printed material and interviews with selected staff members. The second part is an exploratory study of the "inmate culture," emphasizing the social climate and co-ed nature of the prison, and also including an examination of specific institution programs. This aspect of the study was based on answers to questionnaires that were devised by our research group and were personally administered to approximately one-half of the inmates at MCI-Framingham. The third aspect of our study is a recidivism follow-up which has measured the impact of the Framingham coeducational and community-oriented program on recidivism. A six month follow-up was conducted on all men and women released from Framingham over the period of fourteen months, beginning when the first males were released from there.

CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

The literature on adult correctional institutions reveals the intricate social systems that exist within the closed system of a prison. These systems differ to a considerable degree from the kind of social structure that is found in our larger society. This appears to be due greatly to the fact of the single-sex nature of prisons. Studies have shown, however, that men and women respond differently to being incarcerated, and that the informal social norms and organizations which they each create reflect their different sets of needs.

These inmate social systems, which include informal codes for behavior, are a crucial element in the total functioning of correctional institutions. They are the inmates' way of dealing with the formal rules and bureaucracy of the prison structure, and so in turn must be dealt with by those who administer and control the formal structure. The social climate or atmosphere of an institution then is determined by the way in which the inmate social system and the formal structure respond to each other. The basic philosophy and goals of the institution are reflected in its social climate in an integral way.

There is no material in the literature on these systems in coeducational institutions because co-ed incarceration is a very recent phenomenon. As one might expect, we have found the social climate of a coeducational prison to be affected by unique factors, which raise the following issues in terms of what the literature has provided regarding all-male or all-female prison social systems:

1. How do the different prison social structures of males and females merge or conflict when men are brought into a women's institution?
2. How are the different needs of men and women met?
3. Is there a code (or are there two codes) concerning sexual behavior? How is this decided?

We would like to explore these and other issues at MCI-Framingham and compare the social climate there to that of all-male and all-female institutions as they appear in the literature. We hope that it will offer some helpful information and insights into this unexplored area of co-ed correctional institutions. We also feel it is important to stress that we are focusing on the community-linkage aspect of Framingham, which includes work and education release and furloughs, as well as the co-ed aspect. We have found it to be an equally important force in determining the

social climate of Framingham, and thus a significant area to be studied.

We are largely indebted to Alden Miller and Robert Coates of the Center for Criminal Justice of Harvard Law School for originally delineating four of the following five areas of human interaction which we consider to have the greatest impact on prison social climate. These areas are:

1. Communications and information flow, including decision-making
2. Punishment and reward
3. Subculture (values and norms of inmates)
4. Sexual relationships
5. Outside community linkages

We feel this framework provides us with a useful way of examining the literature and comparing our own findings to what has already been written.

Communications and Information Flow

Communications and information flow are important aspects of prison social climate and management. Richard McCleery ('56) states that those in power in the institution create a communications system which will promote or support their power. An authoritarian system will often use censor-

ship and other controls in order that those on top will be best informed. Communications are a power tool, and the tool must be appropriate for the kind of system one wants. An authoritarian system cannot function with an eased communications system. Most of the control is actually imposed by informal systems, such as the inmate culture. In an authoritarian system, the rules and norms of the inmate subculture often parallel those of the administrative structure. Inmate norms work in certain ways to keep the institution functioning in a strict, controlled way.

McCleery studied a small, general prison in Hawaii which went from an authoritarian to a rehabilitative structure within a short time. He puts forward three hypotheses concerning power and communications:

1. a change in the formal power structure should be reflected in the society's patterns of communication and contact;

2. change in patterns of communication, however instituted, should react on the system of formal power and authority; and,

3. failure of communications patterns to correspond to requirements of a given system result in disorder and anarchy.

In studying the power changes in this prison, he found all of the above to be true. He describes the type of communications under the authoritarian system. Everything

was subject to official regulation, and there was strict control over policy and information. There were secret accusations, and disciplinary reports were filed without notice, hearing, counsel, or appeal. Uncertainty was the basis of fear. There weren't any choices of behavior; everything was decided. There was no two-way communication with the hierarchy, so that each superior was better informed than his subordinates. The power to influence depended on position in this hierarchy, similar to an authoritarian government. Similarly, a hierarchy among inmates also existed. There were many norms to enforce conformity. New inmates were completely dependent on inmates who had been there longer. Leadership in the inmate culture involved having information or being able to explain what was happening. The phenomenon of the prison "rat" is very important in explaining how things happen. The "rat" is the prisoner who gives information to the authorities for his own advantage. "Rats," according to McCleery, "explain the appearance of arbitrary forces." (McCleery, '56, p. 59)

He then described the changes which took place with the coming of a new deputy. He instituted due process in the issuance of disciplinary reports. Communications were

eased and "open door" management techniques were used. A number of new people came into various positions, and each one introduced a new informal way of communicating with inmates, and thus the old structure of power began to change. The traditional kinds of relationships between staff and inmates changed.

As communication and decision-making processes changed, the custodial officers did not have all the traditional means for control. For a while, as the transition was taking place, there was little effective authority. As there w s more understanding of how the new system worked and why, and as the communications system and power structure became more comparable, there was again effective control in the prison.

> When the custodial force was stripped of everything but its guns as a basis of control, the rise of disorder indicated that such a basis is weak indeed. The range of discretionary power held by an agency of the institution is no wider than, but tends to be as wide as, its store of information on which discretion is based.
> (McCleery, '56, p. 67)

McCleery also states that the system of communications is a functional equivalent of power and a necessary supplement to force.

Carter, Glaser, and Wilkins ('72) stress the import-

ance of the inmate code in regulating communications. The code sustains inmate solidarity against staff, and legitimates "the privileged access of the elite to interaction with the staff." (Carter et al., '72, p. 248) They note that this type of inmate organization is less prominent in treatment-oriented institutions. They refer to the "C-Unit" study (Studt, '68) in which it was found that inmates living under participative management practices in C-Unit were more likely to communicate with staff than were inmates in the two bureaucratic units which were studied. They also discuss the significance of the prison "rat," who serves the formal prison organization as a link with the informal organization.

Clemmer ('40) also discusses the inmate code, as an essential aspect of "prisonization." The newcomer is encouraged to be a part of an informal group of prisoners, "bound by conduct codes, a communication system, and a structure defining rights and obligations." (Carter et al., '72, p. 197) The mores of this group are likely to be in conflict with the formal prison organization or other informal groups. According to Clemmer, the informer is responding to two or more systems of mores which are influencing him. Sykes ('58) speaks of the "center of man,"

who identifies with the staff, and thus gives them whatever information he can.

Ohlin ('56) also stresses the importance of informal organizations in maintaining the formal organization. He states that the relationship between inmates and administration has traditionally been one of violence. The language and communication systems between inmates reflect their unique set of values, being different from the values of the prison administration and different from the outside world. It is a symbol of opposition as well as a means of private communication.

The studies previously referred to deal with male prisons. Ward and Kassebaum's study ('65) deals with an all-female prison. They state that one of the important functions of the inmate social system is the need for a frame of reference or a way to know what to expect of the prison system. The principal means of control used within the inmate system has been the prohibition against giving information to the staff which might be used against another prisoner. It is interesting that the informer, or "snitch," is so significant that there are many names and categories of "snitches." The "dry snitch" pretends that she accidentally mentioned something. A "cold snitch"

talks about inmates in their presence; a "plain snitch" does so behind their backs. A snitch who wears a "jacket" is one who snitches only occasionally; one who has done so many times has an "overcoat." Inmates feel that someone who talks does so out of weakness or desire to identify with the staff. Chandler ('73) also stresses that snitching is the greatest crime among inmates in female prisons.

In studying Framingham, we would like to see how the co-ed nature and other factors affect communications and information flow. The combination of maximum and minimum security, males and females, creates a unique system. We would like to see what type of communications patterns are established in this type of setting, and how pre-existing patterns are modified or replaced.

Punishment and Reward

Traditional correctional practice has relied heavily upon administering a system of punishment. However, within the past two or three decades there has been a shift toward the treatment and rehabilitation of individuals in correctional facilities. Ohlin ('73, p. 3 & 4) states that "Many of the basic conflicts, failures, and dilemmas of the correctional system are traceable to the obligation to

organize personnel, programs, and resources to punish and to treat simultaneously." He feels that this contradiction in objectives is self-defeating in that it can lead to "ambivalent vacillation of decisions and resource commitments from one goal to the other." (p. 4) He also feels that the majority of correctional administrators perceive the public favoring the goal of punishment and, therefore, pay only lip service to the rehabilitative ideal.

Halleck ('67) says that prisons are designed around four major goals: punishment, deterrence, reformation, and protection. He states that the obvious problem with prisons is that these goals cannot always be pursued at the same time. He feels that treating and rehabilitating a man at the same time that he is being punished by deprivation of his liberty are not at odds with each other, but says that when "punishment becomes arbitrary, cruel and excessive reformation is no longer possible." (p. 286) He also points out that counseling and therapy are seldom allowed to have precedence over the punitive or custodial requirements of prison. He feels that American prisons demonstrate an excessive degree of punishment particularly in the length of sentences, and "that there is more emphasis on punishment in the American correctional system than on anything else.

..In the belief that prolonged deprivation is not sufficient punishment, the inmate is systematically degraded and denied the ordinary comforts of life." (p. 283-284) This includes the mental oppression and psychological pain that is inflicted by the prison social system.

Wheeler ('61) also notes the complications which have resulted in recent years by the addition of treatment personnel whose objectives may diverge from those of custodians.

Cressey ('73) says that there is a hindrance to treatment in prison that derives from social attitudes about crime and punishment which get translated into directives that prison administrators are supposed to follow. He says that if prisons are to carry out their reformative function that positive, nonpunitive treatment programs must be administered. He points out the organizational strain that results from asking wardens to set these new nonpunitive treatment programs alongside, under, or on top of the old punishment programs. He says that the fact is that we send men to prison for pain and that our faith in the rehabilitative ideal dims our view and eases our conscience of this fact. Miller ('74) also feels that myths prevail about prison reform and that we are not free of punitive

philosophy or practices.

Raymond ('74) feels that punishment and treatment are not polarities and that any correctional program involves elements of both. He feels that the goals of each need not conflict and that we need to deliberately incorporate elements of punishment that will aid in rehabilitation.

According to Cohn ('73) the failure of correctional programs is not due to the philosophical conflict between the proponents of rehabilitation and those of custody and control. He says the real cause is the failure of executives to take risks instead of relying on old, obsolete and valueless rules and manuals that are only maintained out of tradition.

Chamlee ('67) describes how the employees of the two divisions of custody and treatment had their responsibilities merged when a model correctional community (based on milieu therapy and therapeutic community concepts) was being developed. The two functions of custody and treatment were combined in the activities of all staff members and everyone was responsible for the entire functioning of the unit. Studt ('68) writes how a single living unit within a larger prison adopted a similar plan which they felt lead to mutual reinforcement, rather than encouraging conflict. He noted

problems they had in implementing their treatment approach in a single unit, however, because of resistance from the larger institution.

It is quite apparent then that a dilemma exists concerning the rationale for treatment versus punishment. There is no easy solution in sight either, because the problem is deeply rooted in the varied and complex attitudes our society holds regarding those who break the law.

Much of the literature that deals with punishment and reward in adult prisons refers to maximum security prisons. It should be kept in mind that Framingham is primarily a minimum security facility and, therefore, may be expected to have punitive policies that are more lenient than those of a maximum security prison.

There is no disagreement with the statement that all prisons do punish. We would now like to examine punishment and reward within the prison, which necessarily includes some mention of those who do the actual punishing and rewarding, i.e., custodial and administrative staff. Ohlin ('56) says that "the chief characteristic of this prison social system is the caste-like division between those who rule and those who are ruled." (p. 14) He says that all prisons are authoritarian and that a main objective of them

is to promote value identification changes in inmates by manipulation of rewards, favors, privileges and punishment. In 1973 he emphasized the enormous discretion that correctional administrators possess to individualize the application of punishment and treatment and the lack of accountability for it. He points out how this system opens the door to arbitrary and prejudicial actions, including both punitive measures and favoritism in the distribution of rewards and treatment advantages.

Scott ('74) reports that one of his findings in research determining what criteria a parole board uses to determine length of sentence of inmates was that those inmates receiving the most disciplinary reports were incarcerated the longest, even when the legal seriousness of their crime and all other independent variables were controlled.

Fox ('64) feels that "disciplinary problems in a prison constitute the manifest culmination of all the problems faced by the inmates and the administration of the institution." (p. 115) They are a threat to administration because they disrupt the order, tranquility, and security of the institution. He notes the tendency to evaluate the prospects of successful outside adjustment based on an

inmate's lack of misconduct reports in the prison, although he does feel that discipline is necessary for the treatment process. He says that punishment is used without much understanding of how to use it. He also states that the proportion of disciplinary problems to total prison population is roughly dependent upon the level of custodial control and its oppressiveness.

Fox goes on to say that the achievement of group order is a balance between the guards, the program, and the inmates. "When this balance permits channeling of aggressions outwardly through sports events, drama, or, of necessity, overt misconduct in a less exaggerated disciplinary milieu, the chances of a therapeutic program being successful are greater than when the balance is in the direction of custodial control so oppressive that resentments and hostilities have to be internalized." (p. 119) He also emphasized the problem of the inmate who repeatedly gets misconduct reports for failure to comply to an original demand. He is subsequently punished and deprived to reinforce the original demand, which only intensifies by imposing more pressures upon already existing pressures without providing any solution to the original problem. He notes that some prison systems have recognized that

disciplinary problems warrant more attention than the traditional reward-punishment system, and these prisons are moving toward the therapeutic community and treatment direction.

There is recognition by some authors then that unequal treatment of inmates exists in regard to both punitive and rehabilitative aspects, and this leads to many inmates being dealt with more harshly than others. In particular, Giallombardo ('66) has noted a tendency toward leniency in regard to women. Therefore, in this study of the coeducational correctional facility, we will explore the inmates' perceptions of the equality of treatment in discipline and rehabilitation at Framingham.

Glaser ('64) writes that discipline in prisons involves issues that produce much staff disagreement and uncertainty. He points out that the immediate concern with discipline is to achieve inmate conformity, so that prison administrators also justify it as a character rehabilitation measure which the inmate can carry back to the community. He brings up the issue of whether penalties for rule infractions should be uniform or should be determined by the characteristics of the inmate who commits the infraction. He says that despite modern trends to treat the offender rather

than the offense, that most commonly within prisons, conformity is most effectively achieved by imposing similar penalties on all who commit similar infractions. He describes the procedure in federal prisons whereby an inmate's conduct may warrant him being sent to a segregation cell by a disciplinary court which usually consists of the associate warden and two additional members. The inmate is released when a committee believes his "attitude" warrants it. Glaser believes that the time spent in segregation cells is less in federal than state prisons and notes that some state prisons restrict men's diets and deny them reading and writing matter. He also mentions the lesser penalties which are used more frequently than segregation. These are: restriction to quarters; barring from activities; warnings; apologizing to injured party; loss of "good time."

Fox ('72) states that there is a trend now toward a new kind of correctional officer rather than the old guard. The new officer is encouraged to communicate effectively, have understanding, caring, and a genuine relationship with inmates in order to be more tolerant of and to have greater effectiveness with them. He states that segregation is used for discipline and also to isolate problems, i.e. troublemakers. He says that some prisons isolate all

troublemakers but most distribute them in the population and permit the informal inmate control to handle the problem. He points out how enforcement of rules and regulations varies from institution to institution and from officer to officer. He says officers must be reasonable and steer a middle course between severity and laxity. He feels punishment must be a last resort in most cases and that it can only be justified if it is necessary to detain an inmate in order to get a point across. He says that penalties vary widely in prisons. Solitary with a limited diet (1800 calories) is general, usually a few days to thirty maximum. The major violations involve gambling, sex,and fighting, and stealing and refusing to work occur with some frequency.

Korn and McCorkle ('59) state that "The eyes of all inmates and custodial officers are on the disciplinary court, and loose, vague, contradictory, and inconsistent dispositions of charges preclude a stable atmosphere of inmate expectations around the definition and limits of orderly behavior. Furthermore, unless the correctional officers have confidence in the court, they may apply their own informal punishments or rely on powerful inmates to assist in the maintenance of order." (p. 477)

Cloward ('60) says that control is the central interest of the custodian and for the inmate the interest is escape from material and social deprivation. The custodian contains the threat of the inmate system by means of both coercion and inducement, force, and incentive. The force being either segregation or physical violence, and the inducements coming in the form of early release, parole, "good time," and gradations in custody and privilege.

Sykes ('58) also says that custody is the highest priority objective to be accomplished by prisons. He points out that "the custodians' task of maintaining order within the prison is acerbated by the conditions of life which it is their duty to impose on their captives. The prison official then is caught up in a vicious circle where he must suppress the very activity that he helps cause." (p. 22)

Cressey ('73) similarly notes the dilemma of the guard in stating that "they (guards) are expected to exact compliance to rules and restrictive conditions that have been deliberately designed to make inmates' lives unpleasant...." (p. 132) A study by Day, et al. ('73) notes that after officers received training in relationship skills and behavioral dynamics that there was an overall decrease in anxiety shown by the inmates.

The literature, in general, affords little space to the discussion of reward within the adult correctional setting. This seems closely tied to the general feeling that the emphasis of prisons is on the punishment aspect. Cressey notes the use of various rewards as parole, "good time" and special privileges as a kind of psychological solitary confinement used to keep inmates under control. Sykes ('58) perhaps best describes the real lack of significance that exists regarding prison reward systems. He importantly notes that the rewards and punishments must be seen as such by the person who is to be controlled, and that it is this very point which is central to the ineffectiveness of the incentive or reward system in prison. He says "...the punishments which the officials can inflict... do not represent a profound difference from the prisoner's usual status." (p. 50) He also recognizes that for some men the threat of withdrawal of certain pleasures can be a powerful incentive to conform, but "that for many prisoners the few punishments that are left have lost their potency." (p. 50) He also points out how punishment can offer a certain prestige to an inmate in the eyes of other inmates. He goes on to state that because most inmate privileges such as mail, visiting, and recreation privileges,

and an inmate's personal possessions are granted when an inmate enters the institution, there is the feeling by the inmates that there is really nothing left to be gained. "In effect, the rewards and punishments of the officials have been collapsed into one and the prisoner moves in a world where there is no hope of progress but only the possibility of further punishments. Since the prisoner is already suffering from most of the punishments permitted by society, the threat of imposing those few remaining is all too likely to be a gesture of futility." (p. 52)

A newer trend in incorporating more of a reward system in adult corrections appears to be along the lines of behavior modification techniques where inmates are more tangibly rewarded for their good behavior. An example of this is cited by Wenk and Frank ('73) where a federal prison had success in modifying behavior toward greater social conformity by making job pay scales contingent upon individual performance.

We recognize that in our own study of Framingham we received the inmates' point of view on the questions of reward and punishment, while much of the literature has described it from an administrative viewpoint. Sykes, who also spoke to inmates themselves, contends that the system

really offers no rewards, only further punishment, but we feel that it may be helpful to keep in mind the possibility that just being at an innovative, "freer", prison such as Framingham may be viewed as a reward in itself by inmates.

The Inmate Subculture

The inmate subculture has been a main focus of research in all-male and all-female institutions. The subculture is an important part of the overall prison system, influencing inmate and staff alike. It is a central part of the inmate's prison experience. The nature of the inmate subculture is basic to creating the social climate. The following studies describe the inmate subculture in all-male and all-female institutions. Some of these are maximum security. We would like to examine the existing systems and then to explore the subculture as it emerges in a co-ed setting.

Deprivations of Prison Life. Many theorists cite the creation of an inmate subculture as a way of adapting to the deprivations of prison life. Sykes and Messinger ('60) name six major deprivations:

1. loss of freedom
2. loss of commodities

3. loss of self-worth
4. loss of company of members of the opposite sex
5. loss of being trusted
6. loss of familiar environment

Goffman speaks of the process of 'mortification' in prison life. It is "a series of abasements, degradations, humiliations, and profanations of self." (Goffman, '61, p. 14)

There are a number of ways in which inmates can adapt to these conditions. The creation of an inmate subculture is viewed in the literature as one of the primary ways of doing this. According to Sykes and Messinger ('60) the pains of imprisonment are eased by achieving soldarity among inmates. Cloward ('60) speaks of status degradation, and sees the subculture as a restorer of status. McCorkle and Korn ('54) describe the inmate subculture as a way of condemning the condemners, in order not to internalize the rejection by society, causing self-rejection. Keith ('64) speaks of using the prison code as a defense: it is a protection from the harsh prison environment and a defense from identifying with authority figures who are feared and hated. These are various possible functions of the subculture as it reflects various needs of inmates.

The Inmate Code. Sykes and Messinger ('60) outline some of the basic tenets of the inmate code as it exists in many institutions:

1. Don't interfere with inmate interests.

   This includes never giving information to staff which could be used against a con. Every con should be able to serve the least possible amount of time with the greatest possible number of privileges and pleasures.

2. Don't lose your head.

   This refers to quarrels among inmates: they should be avoided.

3. Don't exploit inmates.

   An inmate should never break his word, steal from other inmates, or otherwise use them unfairly.

4. Don't weaken.

   This means that an inmate should never whine, cry guilty, or play up to the staff.

5. Don't be a sucker.

   The authorities value hard work and submission to authority, and inmates should avoid these values.

Ohlin states that leaders in most prisons embody anti-administration and anti-conventional values. He describes the code as placing a high premium on physical violence, strength, exploitative sex relations, and a predatory attitude toward property. (Ohlin, '56, p. 28) He sees this as an application of criminal values to the conditions of

prison life.

Studt ('68) describes the original C-Unit inmate system (pp. 195-199):

1. Relationships between staff and inmates are dangerous.

2. It is permissible to talk to staff only about issues which are not likely to lead to information about other inmates.

3. The staff is expected to keep order and protect inmates from other inmates who might harm them.

4. The officials are supposed to provide privileges and material comforts.

5. The inmates might use their own patterns to maintain order.

6. No trust is assumed among inmates.

7. There are three recognized ways to adapt:

   (a) join others
   (b) do it on your own (making trouble)
   (c) withdraw (being isolated)

The inmates used their own methods to maintain order, orient new inmates to the inmate system, and insure a common front vis-a-vis the officials.

Thomas ('70) states that the inmate code combines factors from the inmates' pre-prison experience with characteristics of the prison setting. Factors include the types of relationships which the inmates have on the out-

side, evaluation of how well they will do when they are released, and problems presented by the institutions themselves.

The above studies present the inmate code as an expression of inmate attitudes in relation to staff and to each other. It provides a structure and expresses a philosophy of the subculture. It delineates the subculture's norms.

Clemmer ('40) introduced the term "prisonization" to describe affiliation with inmate norms. He sees closeness with the informal social groups of the prison as equivalent to maintaining opposition to the staff.

Schwartz ('73) studied the extent to which primary group affiliation affects the impact of staff and outside contacts on the inmate. His findings failed to deny the existence of functional relationship between affiliation with inmate groups and orientation toward staff; however, it was found possible that favorable relationships with the staff might be a positive influence in creating positive peer relationships. The results of the study did not confirm affiliation with primary groups as central in accounting for inmates' attitudes and behavior.

Adapting to institutional life is often achieved by

affiliation with inmate subculture. It is agreed that this affiliation can affect relationships with staff and general inmate behavior, but the extent of this influence is not clearly agreed upon.

Social Roles in Male Prisons. The social roles of the inmate system are derived from the code. Sykes ('58) describes in detail the social roles which exist in an all-male maximum security prison. (New Jersey State) An important role, generally looked down upon by inmates, is that of the "rat" or "center man." This person betrays other inmates by giving information to staff members. (see section on communication and information flow)

"Gorillas" are another type of inmate. They take what they want from others, using force. They take advantage of weaker inmates. A "weakling" is an inmate who submits to this type of treatment.

A "merchant" or "peddler" is an inmate who sells things when he should give them away. According to the inmate code, he should recognize the unity of prisoners by giving more. He treats other inmates as objects.

"Ball busters" are inmates who give the screws (guards) a hard time. They constantly create disturbances. They

are often regarded as fools by the rest of the inmates, because they disturb the "delicate balance of compromise and corruption" between guards and inmates. It is not a prestigious role.

"Real men," on the other hand, are admired for their ability to "take it," i.e.,to endure the regime of custodians without flinching. They confront the staff without being aggressive or subservient. They are dignified.

The "tough" is a man who is quick to take offense. The slightest action can cause him to feel insulted and seek revenge. He is seen as courageous and is feared; usually he is placated by other inmates.

The "hipster" is one who pretends to be stronger than he is. He will challenge only those whom he feels he can beat. He wants to be part of a group to which he doesn't belong.

Ohlin ('73) divides the prison community into "thieves," "convicts," and "straight guys." "Thieves" are those men who are connected to the criminal subculture in the outside world. It is a position of status, which includes merchants, referred to above. "Convicts" include toughs and gorillas who have less status and are not connected with the criminal world outside. "Straight guys" are those who

follow rules.

Clemmer ('40) describes the inmate subculture as being comprised of three groups: the elite class, the middle class, and hoosiers. The elite are isolated, and basically not criminalistic. The middle class are not outstanding as criminals or as characters. Hoosiers are practically all "abnormal sex offenders, dull, backward, and provincial" types. (Clemmer, '40, p. 108) This group includes those who are lacking in courage, or "suckers."

Irwin ('72) speaks of "doing time," which is following the code; "jailing," which is behaving as a hood, politician, or merchant; and "gleaning," which is trying to better oneself in prison (such as the case of a "straight guy"). In another article ('70) he states that the behavior of inmates is not always peculiar to prisons, and that the various ways of adapting to prison life are applications of behavior on the outside world. The thief and convict subcultures are seen as "criminal" subcultures, and the "ungrouped" subculture, isolated from these two, is seen as the legitimate subculture. In other words, in this subculture inmates achieve goals through legitimate means.

Schrag ('61) characterizes inmate social types as the following: prosocial, antisocial, asocial, and pseudosocial.

Prosocial inmates are frequently convicted of violent crimes, their behavior reflecting real or imagined misbehavior by a spouse or close friend. They maintain ties with family while in prison and have little knowledge of organized crime. They're generally supportive of established authority.

Antisocial inmates are highly recidivistic, and they are connected with organized crime. They don't rise to positions of power in organized crime, however. They are rebellious of civil authorities.

Pseudosocial inmates are often middle class, involved in subtle,sophisticated crimes. They often shift allegiance from staff to inmates while in prison. They are mediators in staff-inmate conflicts, and are often rewarded with shorter sentences and desirable prison assignments.

Asocial inmates commit a variety of offenses. They often display early severe behavior disorders. They often were rejected at a very early age, living in institutions or foster homes. In prison, these inmates are undisciplined and often involved in riots, escape plots, and assaults. Schrag states that members of each social type except the prosocial select their friends most frequently from their own type. Prosocial show some preference for pseudo-social

friends.

Social Roles in Female Prisons. Ward and Kassebaum (Frontera, Women's Prison in California, '65) describe the roles which exist within a female prison. They feel that separation from one's family is the harshest deprivation of prison for a woman. As was mentioned previously, "snitching" is a serious offense, and there are a number of terms for various types of snitches. However, there appears to be less attention paid to the 'stool pigeon' and 'center man' types than in men's prisons. There are few politicians, merchants, toughs, or gorillas. Giallombardo ('66) sees termination of freedom and loss of autonomy and responsibility as the most crucial problems, rather than being cut off from family and friends. She (as well as Ward and Kassebaum) notes the existence of "inmate cops" and "lieutenants" who are the female counterpart of center men. Both studies note the following roles as well:

(a) squares

> These women are "accidental criminals." They don't value the norms of the inmate culture. A "cube square" is extremely square. A "hip square" is a woman who sympathizes with the inmate code and adheres to some of its principles. No square is homosexual.

(b) jive bitches

These are troublemakers, and are considered untrustworthy. They are viewed as distorting the facts in attempts to cause problems for other inmates.

(c) rap buddies

These women trust each other and can talk to each other, but they are not homosexual couples.

(d) homeys

These are women who come from the same city or nearby. They have a mutual bond of helping one another, which extends to after release. They are expected not to give out information which could be harmful once they are on the outside. Being from the same area, "homeys" are the ones who could potentially do the most harm to each other after release.

(e) connect

Any inmate with a good job.

(f) booster

This refers to someone who steals from the officials or official sources as a business enterprise. This is differentiated from stealing little things from here and there, such as sugar from the dining hall.

(g) pinners

Women who are "lookouts" for other women committing unpermitted acts are pinners. They must be trustworthy and "in the know."

Harris ('67) speaks of merchants and politicians in women's prisons. The merchant sells or gives away goods

and services. If they are given away, it is usually for opportunistic reasons.

Heffernan (D.C. Women's Reformatory, '72) speaks of three general categories: the "square," the "cool," and the "life."

1. square

This is a non-criminal offender.

2. life

She is the "habitual offender" who commits such crimes as prostitution, gambling, alcoholism, and drug abuse.

3. cool

This inmate is committed to criminal activity as a way of life, and she adheres to the inmate code.

In Heffernan's study, approximately 9% were 'square,' 57% were 'life,' and 32% were 'cool.' (Heffernan, '72, p. 281)

Knowledge of these social roles contributes to an understanding of the nature of the inmate subculture. The development of such roles is seen as a response to the prison environment. This study of Framingham provides an opportunity to shed some light on the type of social roles that tend to emerge in a coeducational correctional facility.

Relationship Between Inmate Organization and Formal Organization. There are various theories concerning the relationship of the inmate organization to the official organization. McCleery ('61) states that the inmate organization supplements the official custodial goals. Though the prison appears to include two distinct social systems, they are actually related and share common functions and attitudes. Wheeler ('61) writes that the social systems are created to give the impression of great conflict in role expectations, but on an individual level these attitudes aren't so divergent. He feels that the differences between expectations of staff and inmates are large, but not as large as they're perceived to be by staff and inmates. Implicit in Sykes' and Messinger's analysis (according to Wheeler) is the hypothesis that the inmate system will be controlled by those most hostile to the staff. Ohlin writes that the inmate subculture, along with the informal relationships maintained with the staff, "mediates and controls the functioning of the formal system." (Ohlin, '56, p. 18) He feels that there is a great deal of variation among prisons in the degree of conflict and opposition that exists between inmates and administration.

Studt presents the C-Unit inmate system before and after a special project was initiated. The previous inmate system is described above. The latter system had the following characteristics:

1. Inmates talked to staff about many issues, including personal issues. Problem-solving became an accepcable way of adapting to inmate life. Inmates interacted with staff more.
2. Inmates appeared to trust each other more.
3. The official system accepted more inmate influence, and the inmate system accepted more staff influence.
4. Collective goals developed. (Studt, '68, pp. 203-215)

In comparing this to the original C-Unit system, we see that the relationship between inmate organization and official organization changed from competition to cooperation, and a sense of group purpose became central.

Carter and Wilkins ('72) describes two types of inmate organizations: those for the offical structure, which are found in treatment-oriented institutions; and those against it, found in custodial institutions. In the former, control is not valued as highly as in the latter, and there is more emphasis on consensus and cooperation. Informal controls are used. Informal organizations in these institutions are geared towards fulfilling needs of inmates,

rather than securing concessions from staff.

Grusky ('72) hypothesizes the following relationship between inmate organization and official prison organization:

1. Inmates feel more positively toward the institution in treatment-oriented institutions.

2. Difference in prison structure is found to be related to differences in informal inmate structure. He reached this conclusion because he found that:

   (a) degree of inmate involvement in the informal organization affected attitudes.

   (b) leaders' attitudes varied according to prison goals.

3. Inmate leadership in custodial organizations is more centralized, in order to effect more control over inmates.

We see from the above studies that the subculture and the formal organization interact with one another and affect the nature of each other. The uses and character of each are determined by the circumstances of each individual prison.

Cloward ('60) focuses on the role of the inmate elite. He claims that they are the most important source of social control in the prison. They are sometimes allowed certain infractions by the staff so that they will, in turn, keep other inmates from breaking the rules. They must control

other inmates in order not to lose their special positions. Thus, they have as much stake in control of the prison as do the guards. Guards can get information from "politicians," and thus they are sometimes forced into an accommodative relationship with them. The politician is in the position of being able to reward or punish inmate and guard alike. The guards allow some inmates to rise to elite positions, and others are not allowed. Thus, there is a delicate relationship of giving and taking power between the guard and the elite. Just as the guard is affected, the inmate too is affected. The elite tend to be more conservative by limiting the use of illegal behavior on the part of other inmates and limiting aggressive outbreaks. Both of these threaten their position. Sykes suggests that many custodial institutions "buy compliance at the cost of tolerating deviance." (Carter, et al., '72, p. 242) These various theories communicate the complicated nature of the relationship between inmate culture and official staff in the prison. Rather than a clear-cut position, there may exist cooperation or compromise in varying degrees.

Subculture and Treatment. McCorkle and Korn ('71) suggest that the inmate needs to conflict with staff in

order to (a) cathect hostility, (b) reinforce self-image, and (c) absolve personal sense of guilt. Schwartz ('73) suggests the possibility that rehabilitation efforts should be geared toward the inmate group rather than the individual inmate. Garabedian ('63) studied the patterns of association with inmate culture according to stage of incarceration. He found that inmates usually allied themselves with groups in the middle stage, with less association at the beginning and end of incarceration. At the beginning of incarceration, the inmate is more identified with the society from which he came; at the end, he tends to identify with the society to which he will return. He, therefore, suggested that rehabilitative efforts might be geared towards the end so that the inmate would be less affected by group ties. The degree of inmate solidarity will probably be affected by the number of inmates at each stage in a particular prison.

Sykes ('58) states that the daily interaction between prisoners is the most important feature of imprisonment. "This results in a social system, and the extent to which this system functions to help or harm the inmate and the extent to which we can modify or control the social system and the extent to which we are willing to change it, these

are the issues that confront us, and not the recalcitrance of the individual inmate."

Grosser ('60) describes the inmate culture as being characterized by mistrust of general society. He attributes to it a system of social controls independent of the official controls maintained by the administration. He feels that identification with the inmate code makes it improbable that an inmate will be affected by non-criminal values which the staff would like to communicate. He wonders if the inmate system can itself be used as the target of treatment intervention.

In these studies the inmate subculture is seen as being the central feature of the experience of incarceration. It is suggested that treatment efforts be aimed towards the subculture rather than towards the individual, due to its great influence on attitudes and behavior.

Alternatives to Subculture. Not all inmates find associating with the inmate culture a helpful way of adjusting. McCorkle and Korn ('71) write that the only other alternative is withdrawal. Irwin ('72) sees most studies postulating two adaptive modes: individual and collective. He suggests the following alternatives: 1. failure to cope (suicide or psychosis) 2. identifi-

fication with the broader world (either keeping one's identity as it was on the outside or changing one's identity to conform to the outside) and 3. identification with prison. These studies point out that not all inmates adapt by means of the inmate organization.

Men's and Women's Needs. The literature provides us with several analyses of the differences between men's and women's needs in prison. Ward and Kassebaum state that women need to adapt to separation more than anything else, and one of the indicators of this is the creation of "families" within the prison. Women also fulfill the need for closeness through (1) homosexual relationships, (2) withdrawing into fantasy, based on memories of the past or dreams for the future, and (3) colonization (Goffman). Men need to retain their status and masculinity. Thus, men's behavior is often geared towards acquiring status, power, and proving manly qualities.

Giallombardo ('66) states that the need for women to define their femininity doesn't occur as does the men's need to prove their masculinity. Women are, thus, more free to play the masculine and feminine 'roles' in homosexual relationships, whereas men won't play the feminine

role. Culturally, it is not acceptable for men to show affection to one another, as it is for women. This certainly affects homosexuality in prisons. (See section on sexual relationships) Giallombardo states three main points concerning the nature of male and female inmate subcultures:

1. These subcultures can't be attributed solely to reactions to the "pains of imprisonment," since male and female subcultures are different.
2. Inmate culture is outside culture brought in (see Irwin above).
3. The nature of the subcultures is influenced by norms relating to males and females on the outside, particularly the following:
   (a) orientation of life goals
   (b) passivity vs. aggression
   (c) acceptability of displaying affection towards members of the same sex
   (d) perception of same sex with respect to popular culture. (Giallombardo, '66, p. 280)

According to Giallombardo, women are thus more family-oriented and the goal of having a family is overriding for most women in society. So, creating families in prison (i.e., groups of inmates taking on family roles, including extended family such as aunts and grandmothers) is expected because it is culturally significant on the outside. She explains that women in prison are more passive than men, for the same reasons (cultural definition of women).

Tittle ('69) states that consistent differences in

forms of inmate organization occur between the sexes. Women are more likely to affiliate in primary groups, and men show a tendency to affiliate into an overall symbiotic organization.

A note on Giallombardo and other studies of women in prison: Because of changes in the way our culture is viewing the position, goals, needs, and rights of women in society, some of these studies reflect views that are not universally accepted. These studies are presented with this thought in mind: other studies reflecting the same or similar views are omitted.

These studies relate the differences between the needs of men and women. The literature does not provide information on how these needs are met in co-ed prisons. We would like to explore the way in which the various mechanisms for meeting these needs are combined or changed in a co-ed setting.

Sexual Relationships

When looking through the literature on sexual relationships, one finds that it is concerned with homosexuality or conjugal visiting. Thus, the nature of the literature review on this section reflects the large emphasis on

homosexuality. In studying the co-ed setting of Framingham, we are presented with a situation which is not dealt with in the literature. We hope to add to the body of literature on correctional insitutions in our exploration of this co-ed aspect and its effects.

The homosexual subculture is central in both male and female institutions. Much has been written on homosexuality in prisons. It is agreed that being segregated from members of the opposite sex is unnatural and an additional cause of stress for the inmate. It is also agreed that homosexuality is widely practiced in prisons.

In women's prisons, numerous roles are based on the homosexual subculture. Ward and Kassebaum and Giallombardo describe these roles. The "butch" is the woman who plays the male role in homosexual relationships. The "femme" is the female role. The butch protects and provides for her femme by getting her favors, procuring goods for her, defending her, and speaking for her. The butch takes an aggressive role in social interactions, as well as sexually. Femmes do things considered "feminine" for their butches, such as washing clothes and cleaning the cell or room. Butches often use material goods to seduce femmes. New inmates called "fish" are seen as a source of possible

partners and are sought out by butches. Especially because of their need for information and attention at the start of prison life, the butches help them out,and the new inmates are then indebted to them. Many butches are homosexual on the outside. Women who become homosexual in prison are referred to as "jailhouse turnouts" or "penitentiary turnouts." The butch often wants the femme to accept homosexuality as a way of life.

"Stud broads" or "macs" are other names for the butch role. A "trick" is a woman who lets herself be exploited. She might be a partner of a "stud broad" who has several partners, and she is one outside the stud broad's cottage. The one inside her cottage is considered the main partner. The "chippie" is the stud broad who exploits each partner. "Kick partners" are people in a relationship solely for physical gratification. "Cherries" are women who have never been 'turned out.' A "punk" is one who is pretentious; i.e., one who "acts like a female" when she is expected to act like a male.

Male homosexual roles include the following (from Sykes):

"wolves": Men who play the aggressive role.

"punks": These are men who play the submissive or passive role. This usually refers to someone who is forced to do so.

"fags": These are homosexuals by choice. Fags are seen as "feminine"; punks are seen as weak.

Harris ('67) speaks of the interrelationship between rackets and the homosexual subculture in female prisons. Rackets are controlled by the most "masculine oriented" inmates (stud broads and macs). The homosexuals, through contacts with inmates working in all parts of the prison, have access to all the goods and services which are desired to make life easier. Homosexuality is, thus, a means of getting goods, as well as physical gratification and emotional closeness.

Studies have shown that the main problem in homosexual relationships in female prisons is the danger of violent jealousies developing (Chandler, '73) Women have been severely beaten and otherwise injured for this reason. deRham ('69) writes that the most prison officials can do is to try to prevent people from being drawn into sexual relationships against their will. She characterizes many of these relationships as sado-masochistic, with inmates injuring themselves when a partner leaves or is moved.

Ward and Kassebaum differentiate between the basic

cause of homosexuality in male and female prisons. For men, they believe, it is a matter of physical release. For women, it is again related to the pain of isolation and the need for closeness. The specific needs of the "butch" and "femme" are discussed. The butch, it seems, wants to "make love but not have love made to her" (Ward and Kassebaum) because she does not want to lose control in the relationship. Though the butches are initially aggressive in attaining femmes, it is they who are usually "used" by the femmes. Many femmes return to a life of heterosexuality on the outside and are just involved with the butches to make prison life a bit easier. Some femmes, or jailhouse turnouts retain a homosexual life style after prison. They find it more rewarding than they ever found heterosexual relationships and feel they've found themselves.

There appears to be a mutual dislike between real homosexuals and people who pretend to be. Those who are temporary homosexuals usually display it more,in clothes or actions in public.

Though marriage and familying are more widespread among female prisons, Caldwell ('56) reports marriage in male prisons, including courtship and ceremonies. Hopper ('71) states that in male prisons homosexuality is chiefly

a result of affectional deprivation. Hopper writes of conjugal visiting as a way to allow a prisoner to retain ties with his wife and thus keep the self-image of a person who is important to others. He tested the effects of conjugal visiting on various aspects of behavior in prison. He found that inmates' relationship to staff changed: they trusted staff more, cooperated with staff more, felt the staff was more fair, and agreed to work harder. (Hopper, '69, p. 135) At the same time, there was no less loyalty to other inmates.

Clemmer states that "possibley no other influence in prison life is so conducive to the disorganization of particular persons as are the sex ideations which develop." (Clemmer, '40, p. 249) He speaks of three types of sexual adjustment: normal, quasi-abnormal, and definitely abnormal. He is referring to psychosexual development, and then to the effect of prison on this. His main criterion of placement in one of these categories is whether the inmate prefers heterosexual relationships or not. This is another area in which cultural ideas are changing, and Clemmer and other studies are presented with this in mind.

Ward and Kassebaum summarize what they feel are the similarities and differences of homosexuality in male and

female prisons. Material goods are seen to be used in at least two similar ways:

1. goods may be used in the beginning to seduce uninitiated inmates
2. goods can be demanded as a show of loyalty once the inmate is committed.

They reiterate that men see homosexual relationships as a vehicle for physical satisfaction, and women tend to be more concerned with emotional aspects. The "wolf" thus carries no sense of love or attachment with his role. He does it for physical satisfaction: his counterpart in female prisons, the "butch," does not generally want sexual satisfaction. Yet, she defines herself as homosexual and the "wolf" does not. The "butch" role also puts some limits on emotional involvement in some cases, though it generally fills emotional needs rather than physical for the butch. The "wolf" has sexual relations with "punks" whom he rejects as legitimate emotional partners.

The nature of violence in these relationships also appears to be different. Women don't seem to generally use physical violence to force other women into sexual acts, and men do use force in this way.

Classes and Cliques. An inmate in a California prison (1971, "Inside the Prison Clique," Victor Dillon) has written that an inmate has two choices of receiving love from another individual once in prison: either he takes the "pseudo love" of a clique or he becomes homosexual. He describes the clique as providing emotional and physical security. The emotional security involves learning role-playing of a convict and identifying with others. Physical security is found in the back-up of others in case of fights. Some cliques are like businesses, providing goods based on supply and demand. Others are more socially oriented, with the accent on social acceptance. Different cliques, such as clerks or religious groups, have different codes than the mainline code.

Clemmer speaks of various levels of group involvement. The "complete clique man" is in a group of three or more very close friends, with a strong "we" feeling. The "group man" is friendly with a group, but not as close as the complete clique man. He would not go "all the way" for them. The "semi-solitary man" never becomes intimately friendly. The "complete solitary man" shares nothing.

Clemmer states that most groups have two to seven members. The prison community is not comprised of a great number of integrated groups as is the outside community. It is estimated that forty out of every one hundred inmates

are not closely affiliated with informal social groups. A questionnaire gave the following statistics on feelings about friendship in prison (Clemmer, '40, p. 123):

(a) 72% felt that friendships are of short duration.
(b) 77% felt that familiarity in prison breeds contempt.
(c) 70% felt that friendships in prison result from mutual help, which one inmate can give another rather than because of some admired trait.
(d) 95% felt that most prisoners are more interested in themselves than in any other prisoner.

In summary, the literature presents the existence of an inmate subculture and code in institutional settings. This subculture is always relating to and affecting the formal organization and is always affected by the formal organization. Within this broad description fall many types of subcultures in many types of prisons. Inmates take on roles reflecting various needs and ways of adapting. The effect of the group affiliation has been studied, and application of efforts toward the group has been suggested. Various needs of men and women have been described and discussed. Patterns of association have been documented. All in all, much work has been done on describing, in detail, prison subcultures and relationships.

With the advent of the co-ed prison, we hope to further these studies by exploring the effects of a co-ed setting on all the above issues. Not only the co-ed nature, but

also community linkage at Framingham affect the nature of life there. With the above descriptions in mind, we will look at the existing systems in this unusual setting.

Outside Community Linkage

One of the significant aspects of MCI-Framingham is the relatively frequent contact that inmates have with the outside community. In addition to the furlough program and the work/education release programs there is an extensive volunteer program where members of the outside community come into the institution and provide more contact than is usually seen in a prison environment. For the purpose of this literature review, however, the concentration is on the community relationships from the furlough program and the work/education release programs since these are the programs specifically asked about in this study.

Present literature on prisons' and inmates' relationships with the outside community contains several recent studies on work release programs, but very little on education release and furloughs. As such, the data related to these programs in the Framingham study may help to fill a gap in the literature. In addition, in this study much of the information comes from inmates and not administrators

or officials. The perspective, therefore, is significantly different.

Carter, et al. ('72) view the extension of correctional institutions into the community as including residents outside of the traditional institutions. Studt, et al. ('68) suggest that the prison should be transitional so that a "continuum" can be formed with the greater community. The Massachusetts Department of Correction has taken the position in their "Statement of Philosophy" ('73) that the reintegration of the offender into the community is their primary concern. One of their stated goals is to return a person to society with the knowledge and skills necessary to earn an honest living. It can be assumed then, that it is upon this concern and goal that the work and education release programs and the furlough program at MCI-Framingham are based. How successful these programs are and how they are viewed by inmates in them can be seen in the results of this study. One significant fact is that these programs were often mentioned by inmates as being among the most important to them at the institution.

A general study on community reintegration was conducted by the University of Maryland School of Social Work ('73). The project was an attempt to demonstrate the importance of community contact in preparing offenders for

release. The project set out to: (1) identify individual and family needs; (2) prepare the offender and his family to be united in the community; and (3) make appropriate referrals to community agencies for continuity of services. The project lasted two years and 209 men were studied. The recidivism rate was 16%. Those who received the most service had the lowest recidivism rate of the total. The researchers suggested that this indicated a direct correlation between service received and potential for recidivism. To compare these results with ours, see the section on the recidivism follow-up study.

Regarding work release, Swanson ('73) conducted a study of these programs in 43 states, the District of Columbia and the Federal Prison system. He found that 3.17% of the national felon population were involved in work release. He further presented results of a national survey that showed community based programs as being more rehabilitative than non-community based ones.

The "Monthly Statistical Report of the Work and Education Release Programs" for January, 1975, for the Massachusetts Department of Correction shows a total of 72 out of 1,212 inmates on work release as of January 25, 1975. This is 5.9% compared to the 3.17% figure mentioned by

Swanson in the national survey. Out of 128 inmates at MCI-Framingham on that date, 39 (30.5%) were on work release. (What should be noted when examining these figures and those for education release, which will be presented later, is that MCI-Framingham is a pre-release center for some inmates, and they are sent there already destined for work or education release).

Data from individual studies were found for Pennsylvania, Florida, New York, and California. According to an evaluation made by Informatics, Inc. ('72) of 719 residents admitted to the Pennsylvania Community Treatment Services from May 1, 1969 to June, 1972, there was a major difference in the commission and conviction of new crimes as compared with men who were released directly to parole. A "mainstay" of this program is out-residency as well as self-supporting community employment. The prison return rate since this program took effect was reduced by 31% and the researchers claimed a potential for further reductions.

One work release program that has not had such positive results is in New York City. According to the Youth and Corrections Committee of the Community Service Society of New York ('74), the program has been ineffective but not from lack of merit, but rather as a result of administrative

failures in the central office and the failure of the facilities to interact with the community.

Another study which found the work program to have either neutral or negative results was conducted by the Southeastern Correctional and Criminological Research Center ('73). Here, inmates were selected randomly from Florida Department of Correction facilities to an experimental and a control group, and both responded to attitudinal questionnaires before and after release. There was no significant difference between the two groups regarding perception of legitimate opportunity, achievement motivation, legal self-concept, and focal concerns. The only attitude change apparently attributable to work release was that the level of self esteem of work release participants after release was significantly lower than that of the control group. Thus, work release appeared to have a harmful effect upon self esteem.

In California, two studies conducted showed beneficial results for work release in terms of recidivism, social cost, and adjustment to post-prison life. Jeffrey and Woolpert ('74) published the results of a four year study commencing in 1967 in San Mateo. The four year totals showed the percentage of work releasees with no arrests and

no convictions (23% and 43%) to be nearly double that of the control group (13% and 23%). They found, however, that these differences declined over the years, (i.e., less difference in the 3rd and 4th year groups than in the 1st and 2nd). Also significant was that those who tended to do worst under standard institutionalization showed the most improvement after work release.

The other California study, published by Rudolph and Esselstyn ('73) was conducted in Santa Clara between 1968 and 1970. Data was collected on 2,360 inmates from minimum security institutions. The major findings were: (1) the inmate on work release did not define himself as a criminal but staff did; (2) specialized vocational rehabilitation for the inmates was a high cost/low yield venture; and (3) work release inmates made a far better adjustment in the post release period than non-release inmates.

For furlough programs, a national survey was conducted by Markley ('73). Furlough programs were analyzed in all 50 states as well as the District of Columbia and the Federal Bureau of Prisons. This study revealed that in March, 1972 there were 29 Departments of Correction conducting furlough programs and 17 of the remaining Departments planned to implement them in the near future.

The "Monthly Statistical Report of the Furlough Program" for January, 1975 for the Massachusetts Department of Correction showed 487 furloughs issued that month in the system. Of these, 52 were from MCI-Framingham. Six individuals escaped (1.2%) that month, but none were from MCI-Framingham. The total number of furloughs granted in Massachusetts since the inception of the furlough program in November, 1972 is 16,956 as of January, 1975. As of that date, there had been 265 escapes (1.6%). Of that total 1,422 furloughs had been granted at MCI-Framingham with 17 escapes (1.2%). Only three of these escapees were still at large at the end of January, 1975.

For education release, the "Monthly Statistical Report of the Work and Education Release Programs" for January, 1975 for the Massachusetts Department of Correction showed 54 inmates on education release of which 16 were from MCI-Framingham.

Finally, a study by Griggs and McCune ('72) discovered some of the problems that the various programs of work and education release were having across the country. The one found most was negative community reaction. Other problems related to lack of funding and the need for statutory and programatic changes. Some of these are also mentioned by

inmates in this study.

In summary, then, community relationships and community reintegration programs will be an important focus in this study of Framingham.

Attention will now be turned to the description of MCI-Framingham.

CHAPTER THREE

DESCRIPTION OF MCI-FRAMINGHAM

DESCRIPTION OF MCI-FRAMINGHAM

INTRODUCTION

The goal of this section is to provide a general description of MCI-Framingham. Information for this section was derived from interviews with Framingham personnel, as well as from various reports and publications concerning Framingham. Specifically, the following approach was used to collect information for this descriptive section.

On January ninth two students attended a weekly treatment staff meeting in order to interview the representatives from each program. However, this was not feasible due to the large number of individuals present. We, therefore, scheduled individual interviews with a member of each department.

Two days were then spent at the institution interviewing staff from: Division of Legal Medicine Counseling Service, Social Service, School, Work/Education Release, Furlough, Discipline, Volunteer Services, Library, Clergy, and Classification.

From several program staff we obtained written material which contributed to the description of their programs. We also used information from the 1973 Annual Report of MCI-Framingham, budget submissions, and Edwin Powers' The Basic

Structure of the Administration of Criminal Justice in Massachusetts.

We then compiled all the written material with the personal interviews to arrive at our final descriptive analysis. This descriptive section was reviewed by Framingham staff for accuracy prior to final typing.

HISTORY AND PHYSICAL LAYOUT

On November 7, 1877, the second institution exclusively for adult women was established in the United States. Since the prison was located in the town of Sherborn, it was popularly called the Sherborn Prison, but when the town limits were changed in 1913, this placed the prison in Framingham and caused the change in the Prison's name.

Before the establishment of Framingham, women were placed in various jails and houses of correction, and although in 1870 a prison was chosen in Greenfield to be used specifically for women, this was a failure because there wasn't enough backing.

The woman who first held the office of Superintendent of Sherborn Prison was Mrs. Endora Atkinson (1877-1880). It was under her direction, that a classification system, an educational program and vocational training program were

begun.

An appropriation of $300,000 went into selecting the proper site for the prison. The original building was three stories high with five wings off of a main corridor. The Superintendent's quarters were connected to the main building by an archway. Over the years, the physical layout of Framingham has changed quite a bit. Three of the original five wings have been partially removed.

Dr. Elisha Mosher (1880-1883) was the second superintendent of the prison and under her direction, the indenture program, the forerunner of the current work release program was begun.

Succeeding Dr. Mosher as superintendent, Clara Barton, R.N. took the position (1883). She was responsible for starting a point system of good conduct and a grade promotion plan. Industries were also developed as a source of training. Miss Barton resigned after a year and Mrs. Ellen Cheney Johnson took office (1884-1899). She introduced the "ticket of leave" system, which was a modified version of our current parole system. Mrs. Johnson was also credited with improving medical services, sanitation and fire prevention facilities.

Frances A. Morton (1899-1911) as Acting Superintendent, introduced the indeterminate sentence, finger printing and increased inmate privileges. Her successor was Mrs. Jesse Hodder (1911-1931) whose accomplishments included abolition of solitary confinement cells, establishment of the social service department, services of a psychologist, psychiatrist and dentist. She is also credited with establishing a gymnasium for inmate use.

The longest period of service by one superintendent was held by Dr. Miriam Van Waters (1932-1957). She was responsible for allowing inmates to wear their own clothes for the first time. Dr. Van Waters also established various social clubs with therapeutic goals and intern programs for graduate students in psychology, psychiatry and social work. In 1936, while Dr. Van Waters was Acting Superintendent, two minimum security cottages were built; one called Hodder Hall housed youthful offenders and Wilson Cottage housed pregnant women and mothers with babies. In 1950, the Day Work law was established which allowed the inmate to go out to work in the morning and return to the institution in the evening, allowing women to earn money for themselves. Fifteen percent of their earnings were required to be contributed to the State's General Fund. Dr. Van Waters is

probably the most well-known of all the superintendents at Framingham. Many of the programs she established became the focal point of prison reform. Unfortunately, in 1949 and again in 1957, Dr. Waters came under attack by political powers for her new reform programs, which in turn gained her international fame.

In 1958, Mrs. Bette Cole Smith assumed position of Superintendent at Framingham. Under her superintendency, in 1962, the legislature appropriated funds for the construction of four cottages, with a thirty-five bed capacity. The buildings were named Pioneer, Townline, Algon and Laurel, and their aim was to provide a more home-like living experience for the inmates. An honor residence was also set up for certain selected inmates who lived there unsupervised. This residence was used until the Summer of 1971. In addition, a new infirmary and admissions building were also erected. Along with this, a halfway house sponsored by the Friends of Framingham was established.

In 1965, the Alcoholic Rehabilitation Center was started to provide assistance to the inmates committed to Framingham on charges of drunkenness as well as those alcoholics who voluntarily committed themselves. The center was housed in the old staff home.

In 1966, Mrs. Smith expanded the work release program,

which proved very successful, and in 1969, a drug addiction treatment center was established in the admissions building to provide treatment for drug users. The latter program operated for about two years.

In 1971, under the superintendency of Mrs. Gloria Cuzzi, the team concept was introduced. This was a time of great upheaval for prison reform around the country, and after seven months, Mrs. Cuzzi was replaced by Mr. Kenneth Bishop, who acted as Interim Superintendent.

In August of 1972, Mrs. Dorothy Chase assumed the position, stressing further independence and responsibility for the inmates. The Inmate Council was revitalized under the Advisory Council. Committees such as community work, entertainment, training for outside, were established to further develop the inmates self-determination. During that year, the Correctional Reform Act was established which repealed the Day Work law of 1950. This law "provided for employment at any place within the Commonwealth approved by the Commissioner, subject to the rules and regulations made by him and to section 49 of that Act." (Edwin Powers, p. 219).

In July, 1974, Mrs. Chase resigned as Superintendent. Mr. Jack Bates was appointed the first male permanent Superintendent of Framingham in March, 1975.

MALE RESIDENTS

In March of 1973, men residents arrived at Framingham for the first time. By June of that year, there were fourteen men. This was a major change for Framingham which had been exclusively a women's prison for almost 100 years. Transfers came from Walpole, Norfolk and Concord.

Men who are transferred to Framingham must be in a minimum-custody status, with no major disciplinary reports on their records for the preceeding month. All the men who apply must do so on their own initiative, and their cases are carefully reviewed by a selection committee. Many men who do come to Framingham are within eighteen months of parole eligibility and others are long-termers who are transferred to Framingham to participate in the cadre program. All are screened by a departmental classification committee after voluntarily submitting an application for transfer to Framingham.

STAFF DESCRIPTION

MCI-Framingham has the highest ratio of staff to residents of any correctional facility in Massachusetts. The personnel listed below were taken from the Program Budget Summary for the fiscal year of 1974.

1. Security Services:

   Personnel - 58 (41%)

2. Treatment/Social Services (25%)

   A. Furlough Personnel - 1

   B. Work/Education Release Personnel - 4 State, 4 Federal

   C. Academic Education Personnel - 4

   D. Industries Personnel - 10

   E. Mental Health Personnel (non-DOC) - 6

   F. Classification and Social Service Personnel - 14

3. Administration

   Personnel - 18 (13%)

4. General Maintenance

   Personnel - 30 (21%)

CLASSIFICATION

When inmates come into MCI-Framingham, their cases are reviewed within a month by the "Institution Classification Committee," whose job it is to assess where individuals are psychologically, legally and medically, for the purpose of initiating an educational, vocation, work and treatment program for them. Much time goes into the evaluation and decisions about each inmate as they are placed on "classification teams" upon entrance to MCI-Framingham. The teams

are responsible for making the initial work and residence assignment for all inmates. At the end of the first month, the teams prepare planning and evaluation reports to present to the "Institution Classification Committee." Cases which are different or complex are referred to the "Administrative Advisory Committee" for advice. Men may be sent back to the institutions they came from if they fail to adjust at Framingham. This decision is made by the Departmental Classification Committee which screened their original application.

The "Institution Classification Committee" writes progress reports every six months on all inmates' programs and also considers requests for changes in programs.

SOCIAL SERVICE

The Social Service Department is based on the team concept, in the belief that integrating inmates in teams rather than working with each inmate individually, helps them deal with more than just their own problems and learn to cope with the total environment.

There are four correction social workers and a head social worker in the department. The team consists of one corrections social worker, one D.L.M. worker, a job

developer and an inmate who undergoes evaluation. When an inmate comes to Framingham,(s)he is immediately assigned to a team who evaluates, classifies and then makes recommendations about that inmate. The social worker is specifically responsible for assigning an inmate to a cottage and work placement.

Whereas the D.L.M. worker does clinical therapy, the social workers try to maintain a supportive relationship with the inmate; they deal with reality issues as well as practical and administrative ones. If inmates wish to make telephone calls to the outside, they must get permission from their social worker. A large part of the social worker's work load consists of record keeping and keeping the case histories up to date.

COUNSELING

The counseling program, under the Division of Legal Medicine, consists of five therapists--three psychiatric social workers, one clinical psychologist, and one counselor. These therapists are involved in the total institution and not just individual counseling. Each therapist is part of a classification team and with their assistance an appropriate individual program is worked out

for each inmate.

All therapy is voluntary, and an inmate may be seen either individually or in a group. Thus far two encounter groups have been completed. These are short-term (twelve weeks) and meet two hours per week. This group is a mixture of learning experience and therapy. The concept of the group is to work on relationships here and now within the group. Oftentimes exercises are used to help people become more relaxed and enable them to open up. The last group is a marathon and lasts four hours. There is also presently one therapy group.

Individual therapy is done by all the therapists. Although some inmates are seen on a long-term basis, much of the individual work is now short-term, goal-oriented therapy.

Therapists are also responsible for doing short one hour evaluations for those inmates who are being referred to the vocational rehabilitation programs of the Massachusetts Rehabilitation Commission; on occasion they will do an extensive evaluation on an inmate who is up for parole.

One day per week is spent in Boston seeing people who are on parole and working in the community.

If there is any psychological testing or consultation to be done, counseling is responsible.

VOLUNTEER AND COMMUNITY SERVICES

The goals of this program are to provide services to the inmates within the institution, and also to help them learn about resources available to them which they can turn to upon release. The importance of having volunteer services is great because not only do these services help reintegrate the inmate back into the community, but it also allows the community to share in the responsibility of the inmates' eventual return to the outside. By increasing community participation, the apprehension and dissatisfaction towards the prison can be reduced, and services led by volunteers can fill the gap of activities which are not part of the normal prison schedule.

Volunteers, with the help of inmates have been able to develop recreational activities which were badly needed for the morale of the institution. Such activities as yoga, tennis, and softball have been arranged as well as volleyball and basketball teams which play community teams. Concerts, theater and films have been another source of entertainment instituted by the volunteers.

As far as public relations go, the Community Service office has established a core of inmates who have agreed to act as tour guides, and tours for colleges and church groups have been arranged. In an attempt to further educate the community to MCI-Framingham, media coverage has been brought in as well as a speakers bureau to give lectures to the surrounding community.

The Director of Community Services is in charge of all volunteer services. Her job is to screen all those who want to become volunteers, as well as to go out to the community to recruit individuals or groups who could be of assistance to the institution. The Director is also in charge of arranging schedules for such activities as photography, tutoring, and art programs, which include such classes as pottery and silk screening.

The Friendly Visitors are a group of volunteers who aid in the programming and also are responsible for coordinating many parties at MCI-Framingham.

A Readjustment Program is run by the combined efforts of five counselors, a selected number of volunteers and an inmate. The goal is to advise the inmates who will be released shortly about such concerns as credit, housing, medical needs, welfare, and any other questions the inmates

CONTINUED

1 OF 3

might have.

FURLOUGH PROGRAM

The furlough program at MCI-Framingham has proven to be a successful one. The 1973 Annual Report states of the furlough program, "It has been an incentive to the men and women incarcerated here. It has brought a much closer unity between them and their families and has opened a wider range of opportunities for the resident's integration into the community. It has helped pave the way to a more understanding communication between the residents and the community--having also helped to decrease a common feeling of alienation from society by allowing the resident to re-enter his or her community at various times during the year."

A furlough committee consisting of social workers, D.L.M. counselors, and correction officers meets weekly to determine through evaluation and screening, if the inmate's application for a furlough will be granted. The Commissioner of Correction must approve furlough applications submitted by special offenders--i.e., those sentenced for crimes of violence.

Inmates are allowed fourteen days (336 hours) per year

in furloughs, seven to be taken the first six months and seven in the remaining six months. The first furlough taken is a "quarterly" which lasts for twelve hours and is dependent upon the inmate's trust and responsibility. Inmates are considered to be trustworthy if there is reason to believe that they will return to the institution on time and not commit any crimes while on furlough. In addition, their past and present conduct in the correctional facility is reviewed as a measure of trustworthiness. Four quarterly furloughs are allowed per year and none can be taken overnight. Inmates who have successfully completed a quarterly furlough and are involved in rehabilitative programs in the institution are eligible for "earned" furloughs. Inmates not involved in rehabilitative programs are only eligible for quarterly furloughs.

An inmate may be granted an "emergency furlough" when it is indicated that an emergency situation exists. Additionally, when a resident is not considered to be trustworthy, a "furlough under escort" may be obtained.

In 1973, of 580 furloughs, eight escaped but six returned voluntarily to the institution within four hours of their expected arrival.

WORK AND EDUCATION RELEASE

The rehabilitative aim of the work and education release program is to aid individuals in adjusting to the outside community. Ideally, on work and education release they will better themselves vocationally and educationally which will aid in establishing new roles and a different life style on a permanent basis. The goal of such a program would be to find inmates jobs they like and can continue on with upon release from the prison.

All men at Framingham have been cleared for work and education release except those removed for disciplinary purposes and those on cadre. Women are eligible for work and education release when they have been incarcerated for one month and are within eighteen months of their eligible date. A successfully completed furlough is usually required prior to approval for work and education release. Some staff also felt that success in the work and education release program is related to how well the inmates have performed in the institution.

Finding a job for the inmate is sometimes difficult due to lack of skills and training as well as to the currently depressed job market. Inmates are taught how to go about looking for work, an important skill in terms of

future employment after release from the institution.

Inmates are paid the going salary rate for their work. They are required to contribute 15% of their net earnings to the State and spend the rest as they wish. Employers and immediate supervisors are aware that the individual is an inmate, yet no one else need know unless the inmate chooses to do so.

Several inmates are involved in higher education programs. The Department of Corrections has provided tuition and books for inmates who attend the University of Massachusetts, Roxbury Community College and Bunker Hill Community College. Full-time students work part-time and sometimes full-time jobs in order to cover their transportation, food and other expenses. This makes for a busy and exhausting schedule. Often inmates leave the institution very early in the morning, return late at night and spend weekends studying.

The rehabilitative success of the work and education release program is highly dependent upon the motivation of the inmate.

COMPUTER PROGRAMMING

This program is called the "Con'puter Systems Programming" and was formed in March of 1973 by men coming from Norfolk and Walpole computer groups. The beginning of a computer group added a new dimension to the existing educational program.

Before an individual can take any computer courses, an entrance examination is given by Honeywell personnel to see if the individual has an aptitude for programming.

During the year 1974, the following customers benefitted from this program: Department of Natural Resources, Department of Lead Paint Poison, Tufts University, Hingham School Department, Boston School Department, Department of Education, Boston, City of Brockton.

The "Con'puter Systems Programming" is run completely by the inmates involved. It is a unique program due to the fact that inmates are teaching other inmates, without staff involvement. A new office is in the process of being built by the inmates.

INDUSTRIES

Industries, a formerly active program at the institution is now being phased out and is not considered to be an active work department presently. Prior to 1972, the Industries Department employed inmates in the sewing and flagmaking shops. However, the Correctional Reform Act of 1972 favored replacement of the industries program with other work of greater value to the inmate.

In the 1973 Annual Report of MCI-Framingham, Dorothy L. C. Chase, Superintendent, states, "The concept of Industries is an ancient one and has lost its "raison d'etre." It basically is seen as demoralizing as it is really "make-work" with no meaning to our residents in terms of community planning, serves only to provide services to other state institutions at a slave-labor rate. In reality, it now functions solely as a source of employment for present employees."

WORK PROGRAMS

The inmates are responsible for maintaining the institution and all are assigned particular task(s) which they are responsible for. The inmates are compensated for their work, receiving a minimum of $.50 per day and a

maximum of $2.00, which the cadre are paid. Examples of the types of jobs the inmates perform include working in the laundry, kitchen, grounds, library, storeroom, greenhouse, and hospital. Cadre men do some of the carpentry, plumbing, and electrical work in the institution. Education is considered to be a work assignment so that time spent in school is considered to be part of the work day.

EDUCATION

Three teachers operate the school at MCI-Framingham on a twelve month basis. Educational instruction begins at the first grade level. Upon admission, an inmate is evaluated to determine his educational level and is then assigned a program of study. Participation in the education program is voluntary and inmates are excused with pay from their work programs within the institution in order to attend school. Business practices and a high school equivalency program are among the courses offered by the institution school. There are an average of 10-15 inmates in school on a daily basis. In 1973, twenty-eight students received their high school equivalency diplomas. Some college level courses have been introduced to the institution and have met with varying degrees of success.

RELIGION

There are Protestant and Catholic Chaplains available at MCI-Framingham who devote a portion of their time to the institution. Their responsibilities include such activities as conducting religious services, counselling, and visiting hospitalized inmates. Attendance at church services has been somewhat limited recently.

A number of other religious activities are conducted within the institution by volunteers from the community. These include such activities as Bible study groups and Christian Scientist and Jehovah Witness services.

MEDICAL SERVICES

On admission to MCI-Framingham, all new inmates undergo a complete physical examination, urinanalysis, blood count, tuberculosis test, sickle cell anemia test, pap smear, and venereal disease testing. Any positive tests are followed up with appropriate treatment. A dispensary, run by nurses, is open twenty-four hours a day and the inmate is given medication prescribed by the doctor. Inmates in the institution hospital are seen and examined daily. A doctor is on call twenty-four hours a day, seven days a week. Inmates requiring hospital care are admitted to

Framingham Union Hospital. A dentist, optometrist, and psychiatrist visit the institution once a week to provide medical services to the inmates.

CHARLOTTE HOUSE

Charlotte House, opened in September, 1973, is a pre-release center for women, located on Charlotte Street in Dorchester. The women at Charlotte House have been transferred there from MCI-Framingham, are within eighteen months of their parole eligibility date and all are on work release. Presently, ten women reside at Charlotte House.

INSTITUTION COUNCIL

The Institution Council is an advisory body comprised of both staff and inmates, including representatives from each cottage and department. They review policies, make suggestions for change and discuss inmate collective grievances. The Superintendent then receives recommendations from the Institution Council.

DISCIPLINARY PROCEDURES

The disciplinary policy of the Department of Correction explains its philosophy: "These rules are promulgated in the belief that a speedy and fair adjudication of alleged

wrong-doing coupled with meaningful sanctions contributes to the maintenance of security and the rehabilitation of the resident."

If inmates break rules or regulations of the institution, disciplinary reports are written up and sent to the disciplinary officer. The infractions are divided into two categories--minor and major offenses. Examples of minor offenses might include refusing to go to work, a verbal argument, and returning less than fifteen minutes late from a furlough. Examples of major offenses might include a physical argument, possession of contraband, a female entering a male cottage (and vice versa) and returning from fifteen minutes to two hours late from a furlough. (More than two hours late from a furlough is considered to be an escape.)

Punishment varies with the degree of the offense. A minor violation is handled by the disciplinary officer who investigates the offense and recommends a sanction where appropriate, within twenty-four hours of the alleged violation. If the inmates are not in agreement with the sanction, they can appeal to a three person disciplinary board, consisting of a chairman, correction officer and member of the treatment staff. Major violations are

handled by the disciplinary board which the resident appears before. The action of the board may be appealed to the Superintendent and on occasion, to the Commissioner of Correction.

AWAITING ACTION

On orders of the Federal Court, the female section of Charles Street Jail (Suffolk County Jail for the City of Boston) was closed down and all women on an "Awaiting Trial" status were ordered from then on to be sent to MCI-Framingham. On November 26, 1973, the first twenty-four Charles Street women were admitted to Framingham. The Awaiting Trial unit has been a financial drain on Framingham's budget because no new resources were provided by the State to support the Awaiting Trial unit when it was added.

This concludes the general description of MCI-Framingham. Attention will now be turned to a discussion of the methodology used in this research.

CHAPTER FOUR

METHODOLOGY

METHODOLOGY

The methodology section is divided into two parts. In the first part the method used in the exploratory segment of the study is presented; in the second part the method used for the recidivism follow-up is presented.

Methodology for Exploratory Section

In preparation for this section of the study we utilized some of the same introductory steps that have been described earlier. This includes a survey of the literature, a tour of the institution, discussion of issues with staff members, and a meeting with the Acting Superintendent for clearance into the institution. Through our review of related literature we became aware of and interested in the concept of social climate in the prison. A meeting was arranged with Alden Miller and Robert Coates at the Harvard Center for Criminal Justice, as these two researchers had completed a study of the social climate in a juvenile institution that seemed to be similar to our interest.

Formulation of the Instrument. Through our discussion with Miller and Coates, we were introduced to their questionnaire and studied the possible utilization of it as an instrument we might use. The first forty five short

answer questions on Miller and Coates' instrument directly measured social climate and suited our purposes almost exactly. With their permission, we elected to utilize this social climate scale, with minor changes in wording so that it would be relevant to adult men and women rather than juvenile male offenders. This instrument has the double advantage of having been pre-tested, as well as offering us the possibility of comparison of data from our sample and that of Miller and Coates. We did not use a portion of the Miller and Coates instrument which utilized a semantic differential as it did not seem relevant to our interests.

In addition to these questions on social climate, we devised open-ended questions in order to explore opinions and attitudes of the inmates on specific subjects. First, we constructed a series of questions concerning the experience of the inmates at a co-ed institution. This area of interest was partially stimulated by reports of social roles in one-sex institutions and our consequent desire to compare those roles with ones developed in a co-ed prison. More specifically, we devised questions which would explore the perceived advantages and disadvantages of a co-ed institution; questions concerning the nature of inmate relationships; and questions concerning norms for sexual bheavior.

Secondly, we oriented our exploratory section of our instrument to attitudes concerning selected programs at Framingham. These questions were included partially in response to concerns expressed by the staff, so that they might better evaluate the efficiency of the programs. Also, we believed it to be vital to gain inmate attitudes on such programs as furlough and work and education release because these activities characterize the institution as much as the co-ed nature.

Thirdly, we included seven questions of specific demographic data, such as age, sex, race, etc., so that we might gain these vital statistics without violating our promise of confidentiality by having to utilize institution records. We felt that it was particularly important to honor this committment, in light of our meeting with the Institution Council. At that time representatives of our group met with inmates and staff to explain the study, and the inmates stressed to us the need for anonymity.

Pretest and Revision of the Instrument. On completion of our questionnaire, five group members went to the institution to pretest the instrument using five volunteers. These volunteers served as consultants, and were asked to comment

on the clarity and relevance of the questions. Because the Director of Community Service had gotten five verbal and helpful interviews, we got much useful feedback on such things as the appropriateness of questions, our choice of wording, and the degree to which our pretest sample enjoyed the interview. As a result of the pretest and our subsequent discussions, we made several changes in the instrument. We changed the word "resident" to "inmate",as the inmates felt this was more honest. We removed a question asking the inmate if he or she felt that they fit in the institution, as the inmates found this insulting and absurd. Finally, we provided a list of specific areas for the interviewer to explore in order to offer some structure to the interview.

A copy of the interview schedule is attached as Appendix C.

Population. MCI-Framingham had a population of approximately one hundred and twenty five inmates at the time of our study, but of this number about twenty five were either in the awaiting trial unit, in the hospital, or at the Charlotte House pre-release center in Boston. Therefore, we had access to about one hundred persons who fell into the following categories: slightly more than 50% were

women, about 30% were men eligible for work or education release, and about 20% were men who are considered cadre and were not eligible to leave the institution, except on furloughs.

The Sample. We chose to sample fifty (50) inmates at MCI-Framingham since that would give us a workable number which would also increase the reliability of our findings as it represented half of the inmate population at that time. Our belief was that with this number we would derive a representative sample of individuals within the institution. We divided the population into two parts, with one containing the women and the other part containing the men. The male population was further subdivided so that one subgroup contained all of the cadre and the other included all the men eligible for work or education release.

We selected a random sample from the three groups listed above. This was accomplished by using a list of the institution population, arbitrarily selecting a starting point, and then setting an appropriate interval (every other person) and making selections until the sample was completed. Our final sample drawn by this process included twenty-five women and twenty-five men. The male sample was

subdivided so that it included fifteen non-cadre men and ten men in the cadre program.

Due to difficulties in gaining participation from our random sample, we were faced with considering other alternatives. Of the fifty persons in our sample, all of whom had been notified, only twenty chose to respond. After careful consideration of the factors we elected to supplement our random sample with volunteers. (See following section on data collection for details.) We made the decision to utilize volunteers because it was impossible for us to gain fifty persons for our random sample. We believed the size of the sample to be important because the larger the sample, the more representative would be the opinions we received. Since we still believed that our original system was ideally the best plan, we chose volunteers in accordance with the numerical breakdown of our original three groups, and we continued to pursue those inmates from our original random sample. In other terms, we shifted from a probability sample to a quota sample.

Data Collection. There were two individuals within the institution on whom we were greatly dependent, and without whom our study would have never begun. These two, the

Director of Community Services and her inmate associate, proved invaluable in contacting inmates, reminding them of appointments, selecting volunteers, providing interviewing space, and generally functioning in an extremely supportive and facilitative manner. Because our study was carried out in a prison, certain reality factors had to be dealt with. It was impossible for interviewers to make direct contact with inmates to solicit their participation. The inmates at Framingham are concerned about their privacy and wary of outsiders. Therefore, any contact with inmates had to be established by the two above mentioned individuals.

Initially, the Director of Community Services sent notices to, telephoned, and reminded people in our sample to come for their interviews. After she had notified everyone at least once, we attempted to schedule interviews on our own. Because serving as a facilitator for our project was becoming a full-time task and the Director had other responsibilities, this seemed a necessary step. We were not successful in this attempt to work independently.

After a careful analysis of the situation, we decided to use volunteers for our interviews and we made the above mentioned change from a probability sample to a quota sample. Because of the basic difficulty in communication and mobility

we were still dependent on the inmate Community Services Coordinator to select and gather volunteer interviewees for our study. Without the persistence of this gentleman we could not have completed more than a minimal number of interviews.

Fifty interviews were completed and we remained very close to our original quotas. Our final sample contained twenty-four women and twenty-six men, twelve of whom were from the cadre group and fourteen of whom were eligible for community work and education release. Also, of the fifty, thirty-two were persons chosen in our original random sample.

Interviews themselves were conducted on a face to face basis, with one interviewer conducting a session with one respondent. These interviews ranged in length from forty minutes to two hours, with a median time of about one hour. In all cases the interviewer scored the questionnaire. Before any of the interviews were begun the interviewers met to decide upon standards of behavior and response in an attempt to make the experiences as similar as possible. Also, each interviewer attempted to make his or her behavior consistent from one interview to the next. Two large rooms were used to hold the interviews, and the interviewer and respondent sat across a table from one

another as the interviewer held the instrument and read the questions.

In order to be as accessible as possible to the majority of the inmate population and to the various sub-groups of it, we came to the prison to interview on weekday mornings, afternoons, and evenings, on Sundays and on a holiday. One of the logistical problems was to find a time convenient for thoseinmates who participated in the work and educational release programs as they were often out of the prison from dawn till late at night, six days out of the week. A number of such persons were among those who did not respond to our original notices to the random sample. The interviews were completed over a three week period in January 1975. There was no plan concerning coordinating the sex of the interviewer and that of the respondent. We worked on a first come, first interviewed basis. Most interviewers did see close to equal numbers of men and women.

The fifty interviews were completed by eight different interviewers with two persons completing ten interviews, one person doing nine, one doing seven, two completed five, one did three interviews, and one person completed one. It was necessary for all of the students involved with this

study to gain clearance from the Department of Correction and the Criminal History Systems Board. All group members were required to file a statement of non-disclosure with the Criminal History Systems Board. These applications were approved and clearance was granted. (Copies of the research application submitted to the Criminal History Systems Board and the letter of approval received from the Chairman of the Criminal History Systems Board are presented in Appendix D.)

Data Analysis. Two general data analysis approaches were used in the exploratory section of the study.

First, a computer was used to analyze responses to the closed questions on the interview schedule. Specifically, responses to the Likert-type items on the Social Climate Scale, responses to specific program questions, and responses to background questions were coded, keypunched and analyzed by computer. The code used in categorizing these responses is attached as Appendix E.

Second, a form of content analysis was used to analyze responses to the open-ended questions. The interviewers first reviewed the responses to the open-ended questions on the interviews they conducted and noted any general themes. Then, the responses to each open-ended question

were reviewed and discussed by the research team as a group. Where there was a convergence in the content of the responses, it was noted in the presentation of the findings. Also, an attempt was made to indicate the range of the responses to each open-ended question.

Background Characteristics. All members of the sample were asked the following background questions in order to eliminate the need to use their names and so that we have an idea of the backgrounds of these inmates: race, cadre status, age, first incarceration, time at Framingham, and total time served on one's present commitment. This statistical profile of the sample is included at the end of Appendix A.

Of the females, there were 46% black and 54% white. The composition of males in our sample was 38% black and 62% white, for a total of 42% black and 58% white.

Although 30% of the sample was made up of cadre members, 13 of these 15 people were male.

Generally, women at Framingham were younger than men. While 88% of the women were under age 30, only 35% of the men were under 30. Therefore, 12% of the women and 65% of the men were 30 or older.

This was the first incarceration for 54% of the women

and 69% of the men.

A majority of females, 62%, had spent one year or less at Framingham, and 42% of the males had been there for one year or less.

Only 12% of the women had served four years or more on their present commitment, while a majority of men, 69%,had served four years or longer.

Attention will now be directed to the methodology used in the recidivism follow-up.

Methodology for Recidivism Follow-up

Sample. This analysis was based primarily on male and female inmates who were released from MCI-Framingham between May 1, 1973 and June 30, 1974. This cut-off date was chosen so that a six month follow-up period for determining recidivism could be maintained. The minimum of a six month release period was decided upon, because it was felt that at least this much time was needed by the inmate to establish himself in the community. Data cards containing background characteristics and criminal histories were available on each subject at the Department of Correction. Those subjects who were sentenced for drunkenness only were excluded from the sample, as well as those serving a

sentence of thirty days or less. (After June 30, 1973 drunkenness was no longer considered a crime). A total of 121 subjects met these criteria.

Recidivism data were collected on these 121 individuals by checking records available at the Massachusetts Parole Board and the Mass. Board of Probation. These data were then coded and keypunched onto data cards.

Definition of Recidivism. For any study in which recidivism is a variable of crucial concern, it is important to define precisely what is meant by a recidivist. Recidivism rates can vary considerably depending on how the recidivist is defined and on the length of the follow-up period. In this study any subject returned to a Federal or State Prison or to a County House of Correction or Jail for 30 days or more was considered a recidivist. The follow-up period in this study was six months from the date of the subject's release.

This definition of recidivism includes a wide range of behavior in terms of seriousness of the activity for which a subject could be incarcerated. For example, a person may be returned for a technical parole infraction (indiscreet conduct, associating with another parolee) or for the commission of a major felony. In presenting the findings

of this study, no attempt was made to discriminate among the recidivists according to the seriousness of the behavior involved.

Base Expectancy Design. A technique for measuring the impact of the Framingham program in this study is the recidivism rate. While other kinds of measures may be possible, it was felt that the recidivism rate is probably the most objective and clear-cut criterion available. It seems clear that an ultimate goal of the Framingham program is the successful adjustment of the released offender to the outside community. In addition, the use of recidivism as the measure of program effectiveness allows the researcher to control, to some extent, for the effect of selective factors. If selective factors were operating, it could happen that a high proportion of the types of inmates least likely to become recidivists participated in the Framingham program. This is particularly relevant for the men transferred to Framingham. If this were the case, the Framingham group would probably have an extremely low recidivism rate, but it would be impossible to determine whether the low return rate was related to the types of inmates who were involved in the Framingham program, or to

the effectiveness of the program, or to the interaction of both factors.

To control for this selective factor, the recidivism rate of the Framingham sample will be compared with their expected recidivism rate. The expected recidivism rate is derived from predictive cables called Base Expectancy Categories. (Carney, '67 & '71). The Base Expectancy Categories were developed from those factors that have been found to be most highly predictive of recidivism. They indicate the relative probability of recidivism for several categories of inmates, ranging from the lowest to the highest risks. If there is an overrepresentation of low recidivism risks in Framingham, the expected recidivism rate will be low. Thus, if a significant difference is found between the actual and the expected recidivism rates of the Framingham sample, the researcher has some assurance that this difference is related to the program and not simply to the types of inmates who were involved. The Base Expectancy Categories were available at the Department of Correction and were based on all persons released in 1971.

The basic analytical technique was to derive the expected recidivism rate of the Framingham sample and compare it with the actual return rate. For the women the

the Base Expectancy Categories of MCI-Framingham were applied to derive an expected recidivism rate. For the men the Base Expectancy Categories of the transfer institution (Walpole, Concord, and Norfolk) were applied to derive an expected recidivism rate. Three adjustments in the Base Expectancy Categorics had to be made for consistency. First, the follow-up period for all institutions had to be reduced from one year to six months. Secondly, for MCI-Framingham those individuals who were sentenced for drunkenness only were excluded. Thirdly, for MCI-Framingham those individuals who were serving a sentence of thirty days or less also were excluded. Adjustments at the transfer institutions for the men did not have to be made in the second two areas. After the adjustments were effected an overall expected rate for the entire sample was derived by combining the expected rates from each of the above Base Expectancy Categories.

Background Characteristics and Recidivism. Another approach used here was to derive cross tabulations of background characteristics and recidivism rates for both men and women. This allowed us to examine the relationship between a number of background variables and recidivism for

men and women as well as for the total sample. These tables are presented in appendix B.

CHAPTER FIVE

RESULTS

RESULTS

The results are presented in two general parts: the findings on the exploratory section and the findings on the recidivism follow-up. The findings on the exploratory section are presented first.

Results on Exploratory Section

The findings in the exploratory section are presented in three general categories: responses to the Social Climate Scale, responses to program oriented questions, and responses to the open-ended questions on the co-ed nature of Framingham.

Perceptions of Social Climate. Responses to the Social Climate Scale are presented in Appendix A. These responses include the perceptions of the Framingham social climate by 24 women and 26 men, as well as the total of 50 persons. Twenty-five men responded to the Social Climate Scale items for the all-male institution from which they were transferred. (One man was transferred directly from the Reception and Diagnostic Center to Framingham. He did not have a long enough experience in an all-male institution to respond to the social climate items for the sending institution.)

Regarding Communication and Information Flow, there were four questions that were incorporated to measure this dimension. In response to the statement that "Most of the rules here are clear to everybody" (#19) approximately one-quarter of the inmates agreed with it (25% males and 23% females). However, 40% of the males agreed with this statement when applied to their former all-male institutions. Approximately two-thirds (67%) of the females and slightly less than one-half (46%) of the males agreed with the statement, "If the inmates really want to, they can share in the decisions about how the institution is run." (#5) However, only 32% of the males found this statement applicable to their former all-male institutions. On the statement, "The staff members try to keep you informed about what's happening here at Framingham." (#1), 21% of the females agreed with this as compared to only 8% of the males. Yet, more than one-quarter (28%) of the males agreed with this when applied to their former all-male institution. While 72% of those interviewed (75% female and 69% male) agreed with the statement "The staff makes changes without consulting the inmates." (#4), the males were more inclined (88%) to agree with the statement when applied to their former institutions.

The Punishment and Reward section of the questionnaire was composed of seven questions. While both males (85%) and females (96%) agree that "If an inmate messes up, the staff will punish him or her some way." (#3), a slightly larger percentage (92%) of the males agreed for their former institutions. However, "If an inmate screws up, other inmates here will punish him or her in some way." (#11), only 16% of females and 15% of the males agreed with this statement. Yet, four times as many (60%) of the males felt this was so at their former institutions. The response to the statement that "Inmates in this institution usually tell another inmate when they think he or she has done something wrong." (#14) was exactly the same (60%) for both the total of males (54%) and females (67%) and the all-male former institutions. While 33% of the females agreed with the statement, "The staff will reward an inmate for good behavior." (#7) only 15% of the males at Framingham agreed. A slightly larger percentage of males (20%) agreed when this statement was applied to their former institutions. Nearly twice as many females (21%) compared to males (11%) agreed that "Other inmates will reward an inmate for good behavior." (#8) while only 4% if males agreed when applied to former institutions. While

79% of the females and 58% of the males agreed that "If an inmate does well here, the staff will personally tell him or her so." (#13), less than one-quarter (24%) of the males agreed when applied to former institutions. Although 37% of females agreed with the statement "If an inmate does well here the other inmates will personally tell him or her so." (#18) only 19% of the males at Framingham and 12% of males at former institutions agreed with it.

The subculture (rules and norms of inmates) was evaluated through a series of six statements. The first statement, "The staff here is concerned with keeping inmates under control." (#2), saw males at Framingham (92%) and at former institutions (96%) agreeing with it, while females were split in the question with 54% agreeing. "The staff is concerned with helping inmates with their problems."(#6) saw females (71%) agreeing more often than males (54%). However, less than one-quarter (24%) of the males agreed with the statement when applied to former institutions. It was generally agreed by both females (75%) and males (81%) that "People here at Framingham are pretty much split into two different groups, with the staff in one, and inmates in the other." (#9) Males tended to agree more strongly (96%) regarding their former institutions. With

regard to the statement that "Inmates here have their own rules on how to behave that are different from those of the staff." (#10), males tend to agree that they possess different sets of rules than staff at Framingham (58%) as compared to former institutions (84%). Likewise, more than one-half (58%) of females also agree with the statement. Females were split with (46%) agreeing on the statement "There are too many inmates here who push other inmates around." (#16) while only 8% of the males at Framingham agreed as compared to (76%) of males at former institutions. Males (85% at Framingham and 88% at former institutions) tend to agree slightly more than females (71%) that "Most inmates here are just interested in doing their time."(#17)

One of the foci of the questionnaire dealt with the relationships with the outside community (community linkages.) There were eleven statements pertaining to this aspect of the Framingham program. In response to the statement that "People on the outside look down on inmates from Framingham." (#15), two-thirds (67%) of females agreed, with approximately one-third (35%) of the males at Framingham agreeing. However, almost three-fourths (72%) of males agreed when applied to former all-male institutions. "The inmates at Framingham spend a lot of time outside in

the community." (#20) saw males (73%) agreeing more often than the females (58%) with only 4% of males agreeing when applied to their former institutions. Both males (77%) and females (75%) tend to agree that "The staff here helps the inmate get jobs outside, get into community groups, into educational programs, and things like that." (#21) while only 20% of males agreed when applying the statement to former institutions. Only 11% of males and 42% of females agree that "People on the outside don't help inmates in this institution get jobs outside, get into community groups, into educational programs, and things like that." (#22) However, five times as many males (56%) agree with the statement when applied to former institutions. While both males (92%) and females (75%) tend to agree with the statement "If an inmate really wants to plan his or her future out in the larger community, he or she can." (#23), only 60% of males felt that way regarding their former institutions. Slightly less than one-third (31%) of males at Framingham compared to slightly less than one half (48%) of males at former institutions tended to agree with the statement that "If an inmate from Framingham screws up out in the community the people in the outside community will punish him or her in some way." (#24) More than one-third

(37%) of females agreed with the statement as well. Although two-thirds (67%) of females agreed that "If an inmate from Framingham does well out in the community, people in the outside community will personally tell him or her so." (#25), only 50% of the males at Framingham also agreed while only 28% of the males felt this way regarding their former institutions. Both males (96%) and females (92%) agree that "When inmates from Framingham go out into the larger community, it's hard to tell them apart from other people." (#26) When applied to their former institutions, 84% of the males agreed with this statement. Nearly half the inmates at Framingham (46% female and 42% male) agree that "Inmates from Framingham have their own rules in the outside community that are different from those of the people who supervise them in the community." (#27) However, more than half (60%) of males agree regarding their former institutions. While 62% of females tend to agree that "People in the larger community are more concerned with keeping inmates from Framingham under control than with helping them with their problems." (#28), only 27% of males at Framingham compared to 68% of males at former institutions agree with this statement. Although 21% of females agree "People in the outside community generally hassle residents from

Framingham." (#29), none (0%) of the males at Framingham agreed with this statement. Also, only 12% of males agreed with it when applied to former institutions.

The response to the miscellaneous questions on social climate (items 12 and 30-45) will now be presented and wherever possible, an attempt was made to link items together which were similar in content.

Over three-fourths of all inmates agreed that "Other inmates usually try to help a new inmate get used to the institution." (#12) or to "get along." (#41). An average of 86% agreed to the first item while 76% agreed to the second. Figures were very close for both men and women. In both items, fewer men agreed when questioned about the institution they were transferred from.

A majority of inmates agreed that "Real friends are hard to find in this institution." (#30) and that "Almost all of the inmates here are friendly to you." (#35) Although 76% and 78% of all inmates agreed to the items respectively, there is a large difference in responses from men, 65%, and women, 87%, in the first item, while responses were similar for the second. However, while 81% of the men agreed that inmates are friendly at Framingham, only 44% said the same about the sending institution, where real

friends were equally hard to find; 76% agreed in this instance. It is interesting to note also that 54% of the women strongly agreed that real friends are difficult to find at Framingham, compared to only 15% of the men.

Responses from all inmates were consistent regarding the two opposing items, "The staff deals fairly and squarely with everyone." (#31)--12% agreed--and "Some inmates get away with a lot while others can't get away with anything." (#34)--94% agreed. Opinions of men and women were similar. Many people strongly disagreed with item 31 and strongly agreed with item 34. According to the men the same is true of their previous all-male institutions. However, while 92% of the men agreed to item 34, only 64% agreed when asked about the institution they transferred from.

More than one-half of the men, 58%, agreed that "The institution is a very peaceful and orderly place." (#32), while only 17% of the women thought so. Many women strongly disagreed with this statement, and an overwhelming majority of men, (92%), disagreed when asked about their sending institution. Also, it is interesting to note that all of the men from Walpole strongly disagreed.

Although a minority of inmates agreed that "A lot of the inmates think they are too good for you." (#33), there is a

large difference in positive responses between men, (11%), and women, (42%). Some women strongly agreed. Only 20% of the men agreed when asked about their former all-male institutions.

Less than one-half of the inmates agreed that "Almost all the inmates here try to take advantage of you." (#36) and that "Most inmates here will fight you to get what they want." (#45). But, many more women, 37% and 42% respectively, agreed to these two items, while only 8% of the men agreed in both cases. As for the all-male institutions, while 20% of the men agreed with the first item, 56% agreed with the second, the majority of whom were from Walpole.

An almost equal amount of inmates, less than one-half, agreed that "Inmates around here show good judgment." (#37) Responses were similar for men, 38%, and women, 29%, concerning Framingham and for men, 34%, concerning the institution they transferred from. Of all the questions in this section, the largest percentage of inmates, 10%, were unsure.

Forty-six percent of the women and 65% of the men agreed that"Inmates won't work together to get things done for the institution." (#38) In contrast, only 4% of the men thought this was true of their sending institution.

Responses vary for two contradictory statements, "There are no real leaders among the inmates here." (#39), or "There are a few inmates here who run everything." (#43) Approximately one-half of the women, 58% and 50% respectively, agreed, while the men's responses were more biased toward lack of leadership, 69% and 23%. On the other hand, men responded in the opposite way for the sending institution, 32% and 72%. Some strongly disagreed with the first item and strongly agreed with the second.

A majority of the women, 58%, agreed that "Inmates here give you a bad name if you insist on being different." (#40), while only 35% of the men thought so. On the other hand, 60% of the men said this was true of their previous all-male institutions.

Generally, a minority of inmates agreed that "Inmates here, as a whole, mind their own business." (#42) and, "Inmates around here usually get on your back for no reason." (#44) While 37% of the women agreed to both items, it is significant that 50% of the men agreed to the first item while none agreed to the second. However, 32% of the men agreed that inmates hassled each other at the sending institution and 68% believed that inmates mind their own business.

Perceptions of Programs. The second major portion of the open-ended section of the questionnaire concerns inmate opinion and evaluations of specific programs at Framingham. We asked about the furlough program, the work/education release program, the Division of Legal Medicine (DLM) Counseling Service, the cadre program, and what the inmates liked and disliked most about the institution. Each specific program was broken down into separate areas of concern and will be examined individually.

A. Furlough Program - The general response to the furlough program at Framingham was a positive one. Forty-three persons from our sample of 50 rated the furlough program and their experiences with it as positive. Three inmates felt that the program was negative in some ways, while three were ambivalent and one individual did not answer this question. The spectrum of positive responses ranged from mild to very strong, as did the three negative responses.

Almost all of the men, 92%, and a majority of the women, 62%, have been on furlough. Fewer women have participated, because many new arrivals do not yet qualify. More men, 69%, than women, 50%, think the program is administered fairly. The majority of men and women, 65%

and 75%, respectively, consider furlough to be a privilege rather than a right.

In order to determine what made the inmates perceive the furlough program in such a positive way, we asked them to detail what they believed to be its main benefits. Some inmates offered more than one, but all of the factors mentioned fell into three main categories. Thirty-four inmates believed that the furlough program allowed the inmate to rebuild, maintain, or establish bonds with families and friends. Many inmates informed us that without this chance to minister to family support network, they would lose these relationships and with them would go a great deal of hope and motivation to change. Relationships with spouses, children, parents, siblings, all were mentioned as being vital to prison survival and dependent upon the furloughs for maintenance.

An equal number of inmates, 34 (some who also gave the previous response), believed that a main benefit of the furlough program was that it allowed an inmate to maintain other social contacts, build and support contact with attorneys, possible employers, etc. and generally served a reintegrative function in allowing the inmate to experience and learn to adjust to the outside world. Many of the male

members of our sample who had served long periods of time in prison were particularly concerned with this facet. They, and other inmates, stressed that furloughs allowed them to keep in touch with the quickly changing world in all of its aspects, so that they would not feel left behind. Such things as ways of dress, current interests and attitudes, and proper methods of behavior on the outside were mentioned.

Finally, 26 inmates believed a main benefit of the furlough program was that it allowed them to relax, to have a release, and helped them to do their time better by offering a system of short-term goals. Inmates stressed that years seemed shorter and control easier when they knew that they possessed an outlet.

There was no agreement as to what the main problems with the furlough program are, but in most cases they were not considered serious, or were not felt strongly. Eleven inmates were concerned with time limitations, both in terms of the length of individual furloughs and the total number of furlough days per year. Several mentioned that the first twelve-hour furlough was too short. Others were concerned with the limited number of furlough days per year, or the fact that the inmate could not use the days as he or she

saw fit. Eight inmates felt that there were no main problems with the furlough program. Other areas of concern mentioned were those of an administrative nature; concern that when inmates escaped or committed crimes while on furlough, it reflects poorly on the others and that there was some favoritism involved in granting furloughs.

Twenty-three of the inmates could not compare this furlough program with similar programs in other institutions because they had not served time in a facility with such a program. Twenty-one inmates believed the furlough program at Framingham to be as good or better than that at other institutions, and only six inmates believed the furlough program at Framingham to be worse. Some of the reasons offered as to why or how this program was better than others were also the same reasons given to explain why it was worse. An example of this is the small size of Framingham. This was seen by some as an advantage and by others as a disadvantage, as some inmates believed that the staff knew them better.. This was seen by some as an advantage and by others as a disadvantage. Another positive aspect of the Framingham program was that the paper work went faster. Among the negative comments was the feeling that the rules, especially those concerning the time of return and the need

to be sober at that time, were petty. As one inmate put it, "At Walpole they were just glad to get you back. A few minutes late and a little drunk didn't matter." This did not seem to be a general trend, but rather the concern of a few individuals.

B. Work/Education Release - General response to the work/education release program at Framingham was almost unanimously positive, with 48 out of 50 inmates answering that they believed the program to be a good one, one inmate saw it as negative, and one was ambivalent. Speaking for the males, one inmate stated that "It's the best that could happen, especially for men in prison a long time."

In this sample, 32% of the inmates have been on work release and 8% have been on education release. Proportions are very close for men and women. Although most people said that both were administered fairly, more men,(77%), than women, (54%), said so. On the other hand, many more women, (33%), than men, (4%), thought neither was fair. Figures were fairly even for the right or privilege question; 40% considered work/education release a right and 46% considered it a privilege, with little difference in responses between men and women. Eight percent were unsure.

All 50 of the inmates agreed that the main benefits

of the work/education release program were reintegrative in nature. The program allowed inmates to make money, get an education, develop work habits, prepare for the future, gain respect and self-respect, learn to handle responsibility in the outside world, and generally to take a positive, useful, esteem-enhancing place in society. Some inmates believed that it was useful for them to have the support of the institution as they go through this difficult process, as it would be too hard if they were entirely on their own.

When asked to list the main problems with the work/education release program, inmates had several areas of concern. Eighteen inmates believed that the main problem was somehow related to the administration of it. Such things as statutory restrictions on cadre members going outside to work, lack of job development for women, poor communication between prison administration and employers and the difficulties with adequate transportation were listed here. Eight inmates believed that the main problem was that they had to pay the institution 15% of their salary. The inmates felt that this was unfair since they had no choice about their being in prison, and were legally controlled by the State. Some inmates felt that the 15%

charge was not unreasonable but felt that the money should be used exclusively for the inmates, who should also decide what it is spent on. Ten individuals felt that the biggest difficulty with this program was that the number of jobs is so limited, but they did not blame this on their inmate status so much as on the economy. Sixteen inmates did not believe there were any main problems.

Thirty-five of the inmates in the sample were unable to compare the work/education release program at Framingham with any other, as they had never experienced another such program. This was because it was either their first incarceration or because their previous facilities did not have such an option. Thirteen inmates who could compare felt that this program was as good or better than others they had participated in, and two inmates believed this program to be worse. One of these men had participated in a program in another state where inmates did not return at night to a prison, but lived in a farmhouse.

C. Counseling - This program was viewed with much more ambivalence and a greater number of varied opinions than either of the previous two. The opinions of individuals about the counseling program were often strong emotional ones. This held true both for persons involved in counseling

and those who would have nothing to do with the program. In general, 18 inmates felt that the program was a good one, 14 believed it to be negative in some way, and 18 individuals either did not know or were ambivalent. Inmate statements illustrate some of these viewpoints. One said "Counselors tend to forget that what inmates are most concerned with is getting out." Another said, "They helped me over the agonies of working with and associating with women. They have really humanized corrections." A third inmate characterized the DLM staff as "a bunch of coffee drinkers who can't communicate."

A majority of inmates, 64%, said that they had been in counseling, with approximately similar proportions for both men and women.

The next two items asked the inmates to indicate how he or she believed counseling was viewed by the inmates and by the staff.

Only 11 inmates felt that the majority of inmates viewed counseling as positive; 20 felt that most inmates saw this program as negative; and, 19 inmates either did not know or were ambivalent. Although it was reluctantly admitted by some inmates that counseling could be helpful, most people in our sample expressed doubts. Such things as

the program is a "gaff", a place to kill time, that it is a trap, that the staff are all busybodies, and that you must go, not for yourself, but to please the parole board, were expressed.

On the other hand, 25 inmates or one-half of the sample, believed that the staff sees counseling as a good program; only 10 thought that it was viewed in a negative manner by the staff; and, 15 persons were not sure. It is of note that many of the inmates who believed that the staff held an ambivalent or negative view, offered the explanation that there is an inherent conflict between the staff of the Department of Correction and the Legal Medicine staff. Hence, depending on which staff one refers to, the view of counseling can change. Many of these inmates felt that the Corrections staff viewed the counselors as overly permissive or lenient. In contrast, other inmates believed that the staff of Corrections perceived counseling as positive because there was collusion between the staffs in order to control the inmates. Other inmates felt that the staff supported counseling because it might really help the inmates. A male inmate explained this by saying "A lot of the staff here are like mothers, so of course they would view it favorably."

The main benefits of counseling, as seen by the inmates, are somewhat different than might be expected when compared to the number of negative, ambivalent, or unclear evaluations of it made earlier. The range of answers given about counseling's main problems are more fitting with the earlier responses. Twenty-three or almost half of the inmates believed that the main benefit of counseling was that it offered a chance for emotional help, self-growth and knowledge, and general personal development. We were told that one could get help with getting to the root of problems, gaining self-control, and release of tension. Another positive aspect was just having someone to talk with.

Nine inmates felt that the main benefits of counseling were pragmatic. That is, that through participation one could get parole faster and assistance with letters of recommendation. Seven inmates were quite certain that there were no benefits to counseling and 11 inmates felt that they did not know.

Although many main problems were given, there was not any response that was shared by a number of inmates. Fifteen inmates felt that there were no main problems. Six persons had concerns over issues of confidentiality,

and use of records in trust. Others expressed a more general negative feeling. One issue that was mentioned several times was that it is impossible to expect a counseling program to flourish and succeed inside a prison, given the nature of each of them and what many inmates saw as an inherent conflict. Other main problems that inmates saw were that the staff did not advocate for inmates, that there was not enough staff interest in inmates and that counseling is ineffective as regards the problems of many inmates.

Thirty-six inmates could not make a comparison with any other prison counseling programs as they either had no past or present involvement in counseling. Of those who did respond, 11 inmates believed the counseling program at Framingham to be as good or better than any others, and three individuals believed it to be worse. Of those who were negative about Framingham's program, two felt that the counselors were more honest at other prisons.

D. Cadre Program - The final specific program which we asked the inmates to evaluate was the cadre program. Well over one-half, or 32 inmates, believed it to be a good one; six felt that it was negative in some respects; four persons were ambivalent; and eight did not feel they could answer.

It is interesting to note that there was almost unanimous inmate approval of the cadre members themselves, and many of the inmates distinguished between the cadre as individuals and the administration of the program. The cadre men were almost universally respected and liked. In fact, most concerns, or negative feelings about the program were a result of what the inmates felt were injustices to the cadre members. The cadre, it was believed, were more mature, more involved, strong, more open, added a great deal to the institution, did their time better, and were a fine example for all. Some inmates believed that Framingham was great for these men because it allowed them to readjust to the world, and gave them some relief, hope, and chance to get along with others. On the other hand, many inmates felt that the cadre program was unfair to its members. Even though they are in minimum security and allowed regular furloughs, they are not allowed to participate in work/education release until they are within 18 months of parole, under Massachusetts law. Other areas that inmates saw as unfair or negative for cadre included: there are not enough programs for those who remain inside daily; cadre don't get paid enough; and some staff members resent cadre and will not let them assume positions of

real responsibility in the prison.

Most Important Programs. The two most important programs, according to the inmates in our sample, are the computer and work release programs mentioned by 38% and 32% of the inmates. Twenty-two percent mentioned either the furlough or institutional education programs. While approximately the same percentage of men and women listed any of the first three programs, considerably more women than men thought that institutional education was among the most important. Fewer people mentioned education release and counseling. One or two people mentioned each of the following programs: cadre, readjustment program, avocation, photography, pottery, religious activities, community service, an institution job, the institution council, athletic activities, drug programs, and Mass. Rehabilitation. Four people responded by saying that there was no one program he or she thought to be most important.

Conclusion. To bring in any factors that we had not included in other questions, the members of our sample were asked to give the three things which they liked most about Framingham and the three things they liked least. As might be expected, this produced a rather broad list which encompassed many things. Some positive aspects received

agreement from many inmates. Twenty-three inmates favored the co-ed nature; 27 felt that the relaxed atmosphere with the personal freedoms was a great asset; 15 persons viewed the furlough program as outstanding; and 13 mentioned work/education release in the most liked category. Other responses covered most aspects of the prison, but it is worthy to note that the quality of the staff and the ability to build self-respect at Framingham were both mentioned at least five times. Two inmates did not like anything about the institution.

Most commonly mentioned in terms of greatest dislikes were institution policies and practices. Thirty-two inmates agreed that those were among the worst aspects of Framingham. Included were various concerns about policies, but all generally related to the opinion that Framingham, in spite of any positive change, is still a prison. Fifteen inmates stated that the lack of programs and activities within the institution was another major dislike. Nine inmates felt that the thing they most disliked about the prison was other inmates, and several mentioned the staff, both in general and specifically. Also mentioned was food quality, and one male inmate believed that the worst thing was that the institution is co-ed.

Although many inmates did not choose to offer any final comments, several issues did arise that seemed worthy of note. One male inmate questioned the screening process for sending men from other institutions to Framingham. As he said, "Adjustment to the Walpole atmosphere does not imply good adjustment to Framingham." Many inmates felt that prisons should be closer to cities to aid in both maintenance of family networks and establishment of jobs. One inmate seemed to sum up these comments when he stated, "It's been a year where I have been happier than I would have been at a maximum security prison, but it's still jail."

Responses to Open-Ended Questions on Co-educational Correctional Experience. The first section of the open-ended exploratory segment of the study concerned the coeducational aspect of MCI-Framingham. Included here are queries about sex roles, nature and type of inmate relationships, inmate perceptions on the quality of and goals of this novel program. There are also items to examine subculture norms for sexual behavior and relationships between inmates and staff as concerns the coeducational nature.

A strong majority of the inmates described their experience in a co-ed facility as a positive one. In

response to the question, "In general, how would you describe your experience as a resident in a coeducational correctional facility?" forty-three, or 86%, of the 50 responses were in the positive range. Some individuals answered that their experience was extremely positive while others were somewhat more reserved in their praise. Reasons given for the positive feelings included inmate beliefs that this represents a step towards moving back into the larger community and that because of the co-ed nature of the prison, inmates have an opportunity to learn to live in a more realistic, tension-free setting where they must deal with the opposite sex. Of the remaining seven responses, five were ambivalent and two were negative about the general experience. These inmates mentioned the feelings of confusion that were brought about by being at Framingham along with experiences of chaos. The inmates who did not feel positively about their experience believed a strong double standard to exist for men and women. It is worthwhile to note that of the seven inmates who were either ambivalent or negative, five of them were cadre members. This implies longer time served in one sex institution.

When asked the question, "What would you say are the goals of the coeducational program here at Framingham?"

approximately two-thirds of the inmates perceived the goals to be reintegrative or rehabilitative in nature. Thirty-three of the respondents believed that the Department of Correction had established this facility as a place where inmates can experience a more realistic environment from which they can gradually re-enter the world. The above response includes the strongly held opinion that inmates of both sexes need to relate to one another at Framingham, and are therefore prepared to do so once outside of the institution. Twelve inmates, or almost one quarter of the sample, believed this co-ed situation has evolved because of pragmatic concerns and not humanism. These 12 felt that it was convenient, economical, or unavoidable for the Department of Correction to combine the sexes at Framingham. Responses included the following beliefs: the State has nowhere else to put the women, although the purpose was originally an all male work release institution; there was not enough money for a new facility; and, Framingham has the best access to Boston of any of the State institutions. One inmate expressed this viewpoint when he stated, "I've tried and tried to believe it's an experiment, but I've been in the system long enough to know better. It must be because they needed the space."

Some inmates offered more than one goal for the integration of men and women. Five persons, all female, believed the goal was to lessen homosexuality, and six females saw the program as an attempt to limit violence and to relieve tension. Four inmates did not have any ideas as to what the goals of the program might be.

The inmates were asked, "How successful or unsuccessful do you think the coeducational program is in achieving these goals?" Forty-three inmates believed it to be successful or better. Seventeen of the inmates rated the program as very successful, while 26 perceived it as successful. Three of the sample believed the co-ed program to be unsuccessful, and four persons were unclear or did not know. This evaluation represents a strong affirmation of the program on the part of the inmates.

When asked, "What do you think are the main advantages of a coeducational correctional facility?", the inmates drew an interesting parallel with what they perceived the program goals to be. Fifty-nine responses (many inmates listed more than one advantage) out of 78 concerned rehabilitative and reintegrative possibilities to be the main advantages of such an institution. In other words, there is a close proximity between the inmates' perceptions of

institutional goals and the factors which they perceive as most advantageous about the facility. Of the 78 total responses, 33 inmates felt that the opportunity to be with the opposite sex was a main advantage. Twenty-six inmates also focused on the opportunities for work, education and responsibilities on the outside. Seventeen inmates were pleased that the institution was generally a more comfortable, liveable place, and two inmates believed there to be no advantages to living at MCI-Framingham. Three male inmates stressed their belief that the advantages of this insitution lay with its access to programs and had nothing to do with the co-ed nature. In fact, one individual felt that Framingham would be much more efficient if it were all male.

The answers to the question, "What do you think are the main disadvantages of a coeducational correctional facility?" fell into three primary categories, with some inmates offering more than one response.

Eighteen of the inmates in our sample felt that there were no disadvantages to MCI-Framingham. This represents more than one-third of the respondents.

Twenty-one of the responses concerned disadvantages that were institutional in nature, such as: there were

different standards of discipline for women and men; the relative lack of structure and regimentation reduced the motivation of some inmates to engage in productive activities; there are not enough programs for those persons who do not go out to work; the food is no good; the limits set on sexual interaction are unrealistic and restrictive; and, the physical plant is oriented towards women.

Eighteen inmates felt that the main disadvantages were sexual in nature. Given particular emphasis by a number of inmates were the following: there was much competition and jealousy in the institution; family bonds were interfered with; and inmates involvement in other activities was disturbed because of sexual temptations. Other disadvantages perceived were sexual exploitation, unhealthy "jailhouse" relationships being begun, and a tendency to get over-involved in prison romances because of deprivation in other areas of prison life, and hence to ignore rehabilitative programs.

In response to our question concerning the respondents' perceptions of inmate relationships, "Could you describe the kind of relationships that exist between men and women inmates?", answers were varied. One general theme was carried throughout, that the relationships formed between

inmates in the coeducational prison were no different from those relationships formed outside of the prison, or anywhere. Not one of the 50 members in our sample felt that the relationships in the institution were worse than those on the outside, and some inmates believed the prison relationship to be slightly better. However, a common response was to point out that the relationship at the prison ran the gamut of human relationships. Some inmates did point out specific types. In describing these interactions, the people in our sample told us that: many relationships were more intense due to the surroundings; relationships were less intense for the same reason; relationships were based on lonliness; there was some changing of partners; and, some people sold their bodies for drugs.. ..very much like the outside.

In an attempt to probe more deeply into the effects of the institution on the coeducation and vice versa, we asked the inmates if they believed the male and female inmates were treated equally. We were concerned with both program access and disciplinary matters.

In response to the general question, "Are men and women inmates treated as equals?", 37 of the inmates felt that men and women were not treated as equals; 12 believed that they were; and, one person did not know.

As regards program access, for example: on access to programs such as furloughs, work release, counseling, etc., 35 inmates agreed that there was equal treatment, 14 felt that there was not, and one who did not know. On the other hand, the proportions reversed when the question of discipline arose. Forty inmates answered the question regarding equal treatment on disciplinary matters by saying that the treatment is not equal, while 10 believed it was. Forty inmates stated that men received worse treatment.

A comparison of these figures indicates that the greatest felt inequality was in regard to discipline and that this inequality was so strong that it took precedence over the majority belief in equality on program access. The equality of treatment in regard to program access was not enough to give the inmates the feeling that overall male-female treatment was equal. We received some comments which allow us to speculate on the reasons for the above responses. Several inmates declared that the entire reason that most men were transferred to Framingham was to allow them to participate in work release. Therefore, the Correction Department would be going against itself if it did not allow men equal access. As regards the disciplinary matters, almost all of the inmates questioned gave as the

reason for disciplinary inequality the opinion that male inmates were returned to all-male institutions for serious rule infractions, whereas women remained at Framingham. Of the 43 inmates who specifically stated who they believed got the better treatment, 40 answered that women had the advantage, whereas only three believed that the men did. One women explained this discrepancy by saying that "The administration sees men as more stable as adults, so they are dealt with more harshly."

In an attempt to elicit the inmates' observations and experiences as concerns the equality of relationships at Framingham, we asked them, "In what ways do you think relationships among inmates at Framingham are different from relationships among inmates at all-male institutions...and at all-female institutions?" We were told that at Framingham there is: less tension; less homosexuality; less solidarity among the same sex; more verbal communication, especially about life on the outside; less emphasis on"doing your own time"; more concern; and more open show of emotions. Specific to male institutions we were told that there are smaller, less structured social systems and groupings, and no homosexual relations. Several inmates, male and female, shared the opinion that some staff were more willing to

overlook female homosexuality than heterosexual behavior. One male inmate summed up the difference by saying, "At Walpole you do your own time; here you're in a popularity contest." An interesting observation is that no inmates believed there to be male homosexuality in Framingham, whereas female homosexuality was said to continue. As an explanation, men mentioned the screening process at male institutions.

The next series of questions concerned inmate norms or codes of sexual behavior and possible sources of conflict between inmates and staff or inmates and inmates around differing standards of behavior. When asked the general question, "Is there agreement among the inmates on what is acceptable and what is unacceptable, as far as sexual behavior is concerned?", 25 persons,or one-half of our sample believed this to be the case; 15 felt that there was no agreement and three persons did not know. The remaining seven individuals said essentially that each person should do what he or she wishes. This response seems closely related to that of the 25 respondents who believed that there was in fact agreement. Many of them stated that within certain limits, each inmate could do what he or she pleased, as long as they did not violate the privacy of

others and attempted to respect the inmate community in general.

When we asked, "Is there a code for sexual behavior among inmates?", 29 persons agreed that there was a code; 17 thought that there was not; and, the four remaining did not know.

In response to the query, "How much agreement or disagreement is there between inmates and staff on acceptable sexual behavior?", a strong majority of inmates believed that there was no agreement. Thirty-three inmates answered that there was no agreed-upon standard. Only five persons felt that there was open agreement between staff and inmates on this question. Eleven individuals believed that there was an unwritten, or even unsaid,accord basically to the effect of "What I don't see, I don't know." One inmate could not answer this question. Among both groups, those who believed there was an agreed-upon standard and those who felt that there was not, there existed the common belief of "Whatever you do, don't get caught."

The level of inmate/inmate conflict due to the coeducational program was explored by asking the respondents: (a) "Is there competition among males for female companionship?", (b) "Is there competition among females for male

companionship?"; and (c) "Does living in a co-ed facility create problems for married inmates?"

Twenty-nine of our sample felt that problems were created for married individuals in this setting; 18 did not believe this to be the case; and three did not answer. Various reasons for problems in marriages were offered. These ranged from jealousy and loss of attraction between partners, one of whom was incarcerated, to the lack of privacy and the inability to share living quarters by inmates who were incarcerated at Framingham with their spouses.

Inmate perceptions of competition between the same sex for the opposite sex varied greatly, depending upon which sex was being questioned and which sex the questions were about. Twenty inmates believed that there was competition among males for females; 26 did not believe this to be the case; and, four inmates were unsure or did not know. When further broken down by sex, 11 of those who perceived competition between males were women, while nine of this group were men. Of the 26 inmates who believed that there was no competition between men for women, 16 were men, and ten were women. Three of the four individuals who were unsure on this question were also women.

Concerning female competition for men, the sample was very much in agreement. Thirty-seven out of the 50 inmates questioned believed that there was competition among females for males. This is almost twice the number of those who believed the opposite to be true. Eleven persons felt that there was no competition among females, and two persons did not know. Again, viewing this response in terms of the sex of the respondent, the results take on a different light. Of the 24 women in our sample, 23 believed that there was competition among females for males, while only one women did not believe this to be the case. Although the majority of men also agreed with this observation, the agreement was not as definitive as with the women. Fourteen men agreed that there was competition among females for men, 10 men disagreed, and two men were unsure. The women tend not only to see themselves as more competitive for opposite sex attention, but also to see more competition among both sexes than do the males.

The final question on the subject of the inmates' experience at a coeducational facility asked, "Do inmates generally want relationships to last when they get out?" Although 18 inmates believed that individuals leaving the prison did want their relationships to last, 15 persons

believed that inmates did not want these relationships to continue. Fifteen persons felt that it was impossible to generalize and was dependent on individual cases, and two persons did not know. Many of those who agreed that inmates wished relationships to last followed that statement by saying...."but they don't".

Results on the Recidivism Follow-up

As discussed in the methodology section, the basic approach here is to compare the expected recidivism rate with the actual recidivism rate for the Framingham releasees. As the following table indicates, the actual recidivism rate for our total sample of 121 releasees was 11.6%. This compares to an expected rate of 17.3% for the sample, a difference of 5.7 percentage points. A difference of this magnitude has a probability of occurring by chance less than 10 times in 100 ($X^2 = 2.82$, df = 1, $p \ll .10$).

Expected vs. Actual Recidivism Rates

for Framingham Releasees

	N	Ex. R.R.	Actual R.R.	Difference
Total Sample	121	17.3%	11.6%	5.7
Total Women	86	19.6%	12.8%	-6.8
Total Men	35	11.8%	8.6%	-3.2
Walpole Transfers	5	12.4%	0.0%	-12.4
Concord Transfers	18	14.1%	11.1%	-3.0
Norfolk Transfers	12	8.1%	8.3%	+0.2

When the sample is split into male and female populations, the actual recidivism rate for women turns out to be 12.8% as compared to an expected rate of 19.6%, a difference of 6.8 percentage points. The difference is less for males. The actual rate is 8.6%, as compared to an expected rate of 11.8%, for a 3.2 point difference. (The expected rate from males was derived from the institution from which they were transferred to Framingham).

Some interesting patterns show up when we compare recidivism rates across certain variables. All these cross tabulations are presented in Appendix B. Those findings which stand out as important will be mentioned here.

In looking at institution committed to (Table 1), we find the 21 men in the sample originally committed to Concord to contain all of the male recidivists for a rate of 14%.

The 14 men originally committed to Walpole have no recidivists.

If we look at institution released from (Table 3), we find a small percentage (11%) of the sample were released from pre-release centers. These releasees had a R. R. (recidivism rate) of 8% as compared to 12% for the rest of the sample released from Framingham.

In the variable, age at release (Table 4), we find that the highest recidivism rates occur in the middle range, about 25-30, while the lowest rates are below 20 and above 35.

Considering the original offense leading to the present incarceration, we find those sentenced for property offenses to have a much higher R. R. (26%) than the rest of the sample (7%). It should also be noted that over 1/4 of the total sample and almost 1/3 of the women were sentenced for drug related offenses. The R. R. for the drug offenders is 9%.

If we look at minimum sentence (Table 6), we find all of the recidivists among those with indefinite sentences, which constitute 86% of the sample. The remaining 14% of the releasees having minimum sentences are recidivist-free.

Under the variable race (Table 8), we find white

releasees have a higher R. R. (15%) than those who are black (8%). This is true of both women and men.

Considering marital status (Table 9), we do not find a clear pattern, except that single releasees have a R. R. of 9%, as compared to 17% for the rest of the releasees who have ever been married.

If we look at military service data (Table 10), we find that most of the sample (90%) has no known service affiliation. But of the 12 men who have previous service affiliation, 9 have discharges other than honorable, and these 9 men have a R. R. of 22%.

It is interesting to note that 1/2 of the sample lists Boston as their last address (Table 11). We also find that among the men, all the recidivists fall in the group listing other than Boston as last address for a R. R. of 16%.

In regards to socioeconomic status (Table 12), 2/3 of the sample falls in the lower class range. There were no upper class releasees. For the women, middle class releasees have the highest R. R. (21%), while for the men, all the recidivists (R.R., 11%) fall in the lower class.

Likewise, if we look at occupational group (Table 13), almost 4/5 of the sample fall in the 3 lowest groups of clerical, manual, and service workers. This is also where

the highest recidivism rates are (20% for service workers).

The variable, longest period on one job (Table 15), shows no clear pattern as far as recidivism. Almost 1/2 of the sample has held a job for less than one year.

In looking at last grade completed (Table 16), 70% of the sample did not complete high school. The R. R.'s are lowest in those going further than high school (0%) and those completing no more than grade school (6%). It is interesting to note that those women graduating high school had an R. R. of over 6%, while all of the male recidivists were in this category (R.R. 25%).

With respect to drug use (Table 17), 52% of the releasees indicated some former drug use. Over 1/3 of the sample had used heroin. The R. R. for those having no indicated drug use was 12%; for those with some use it was 13%.

For this sample, 70% were under 21 years of age at first arrest (Table 18). Further, 46% of the men were 15 or younger at first arrest as compared to 24% of the women. Those releasees 20 and below have a R. R. of 11% compared to 14% for those 21 and older.

No clear pattern in recidivism can be seen in number of court appearances (Table 19), but about 2/3 of the sample have had 6 or more appearances.

Considering offenses against the person (Table 20), we find that 56% of the women have committed one or more of these offenses while 86% of the men have done so. The R. R. for those having no person offenses on their records is 19%, compared to 8% for those with one or more.

Most of the sample (81%) had prior arrests for offenses against property (Table 21). Those with the higher number of prior property arrests had the higher recidivism rate--i.e., those with six or more prior arrests had a return rate of 18%.

We find 1/2 of the women and 1/3 of the men had previous narcotic arrests (Table 22). There is no significant difference in R. R.'s between those having prior narcotic arrests and those having none.

Also, 30% of the women and 43% of the men have been arrested on drunkenness charges (Table 23). Those having one or more drunkenness charges have a R. R. of 15% as compared to 10% for those having none.

While only a few (12%) of the releasees have had one or more escape charges (Table 24), their R. R. is 21% as compared to 10% for the rest of the sample.

The data also shows that 62% of the sample have had one or more previous incarcerations (Table 28). Broken down,

36% have had previous incarcerations in state or federal facilities (Table 27), 33% in county houses of correction (Table 26), and 23% in juvenile facilities (Table 25). (These percentages add up to more than 62%, as some have had more than one previous incarceration). Comparing R. R.'s for those with no previous incarcerations to those with one or more, we find the R. R.'s to be 13% and 7% respectively for juvenile facilities; 10% and 15% for houses of correction; 9% and 16% for state and federal facilities; and 7% and 15% for any previous incarcerations.

We also find that 1/2 of both men and women served one year or less before release (Table 29). For the women the R. R. seems to increase with the length of time served.

Finally, on type of release (Table 30), 85% of the sample were paroled(80% of the women and 97% of the men). There was no significant difference in R. R.'s between those paroled and those discharged.

CHAPTER SIX

DISCUSSION

DISCUSSION

The discussion of the findings will follow the same order as the presentation of the results in the previous chapter. The exploratory results will be discussed first, followed by a discussion of the recidivism follow-up results.

Discussion of Results on Exploratory Section

The exploratory results will be discussed in the three general categories presented in the previous chapter--i.e., perceptions of social climate, perceptions of programs, perceptions of the co-ed nature of Framingham.

Perceptions of Social Climate. The results of the communication and information flow section seem to substantiate what McCleery had to say regarding communication systems in an authoritarian system. Males seem to feel that there was better communication between themselves and staff at their former all-male institutions, indicating a breakdown of communication of sorts in the less structured setting such as Framingham. This is borne out also in their response that rules are more explicit in the more structured setting. (It is also possible that the absence of a permanent superintendent for the six months prior to the interviews affected the inmates' perceptions of the clarity of the rules and

regulations at Framingham.)

McCleery talks about information having value in a structured setting such that an informal hierarchy is formed among the inmates with "information" being equated with "power". So in essence, there are actually two systems operating at the same time. At Framingham this does not seem to be as evident as McCleery has suggested. With the easing of structure inmates at Framingham feel more able to share in decision making regarding how the institution is run.

With respect to punishment and reward, inmates of both sexes, whether at Framingham or elsewhere, seem to be in agreement that the staff will punish them in some way if they mess up. Likewise, there seems to be little difference between male and females at Framingham in their reluctance to take punitive action against other inmates if they feel he or she has done something wrong. The responses to these two statements seem to be more reflective of inmates' perceptions of authority, and how they relate to it, as compared to how they view and relate to each other as members of an oppressed group. Although males and females at Framingham agree that there is little chance of other inmates punishing them for infractions, the fact that nearly

four times as many males feel this would happen in their former institutions tends to be consistent with the literature review. For example, Studt (68') talks about inmates using their own patterns to maintain order in the C-unit system, while Gursky (72') talks about the differences in prison structure being related to differences in the informal inmate structure. Again this tends to point out the different nature of the inmate subculture at Framingham, compared to that of the sending male institution.

Generally, inmates view neither staff nor other inmates as rewarding them for good behavior, although the females responded positively to this statement twice as often as the males. To understand why this is so, perhaps a clearer definition of the word, "reward," as it pertains to the males and the females would have been helpful. Men "rewarding" other men is apt to take on a negative connotation as compared to the female sex. The same ratio 2:1 females over males tend to agree that inmates "tell" other inmates when they think he or she has done well. The sharp rise in positive responses to the staff "telling" inmates that they've done well seems to indicate that praise from an authority figure is more acceptable to both men and women inmates. The fact that more than twice as many males agreed

with the statement when applied to Framingham, tends to indicate that there is less suspicion regarding staff/inmate relationships at Framingham in comparison to the all-male sending institutions.

Whether at Framingham or elsewhere, males almost unanimously agree that staff is concerned with keeping them under control, while slightly more than one-half of the females felt that way. This finding is consistent with the perception that men are dealt with more harshly than women regarding disciplinary matters at Framingham. This discrepancy may reflect the stereotyped male drive for independence while the female maybe more accepting of the stereotyped submissive role relegated to her.

More than twice as many males at Framingham, compared to former institutions, see staff as concerned with helping them with their problems. This may reflect their reluctance to associate themselves with staff at all-male maximum security prisons where this type of behavior is considered as "selling out." Grosser ('60), Clemmer ('40) and McCorkle & Korn ('71) all refer to the need for inmates to dissociate themselves from staff in order to survive in a maximum security prison. Males tend to differentiate themselves from staff to a greater extent in the all-male

maximum security prisons. In the maximum security prison inmates are much more apt to push other inmates around, consistent with the various roles in the system as described by Sykes ('58). It is interesting to note that on the "inmates pushing other inmates around" statement, the large discrepancy between male responses regarding Framingham and their former institutions, tends to verify the different nature of the inmate subculture at Framingham, compared to that of the male sending institution. Although it is generally agreed by both sexes that inmates are just interested in doing their time, the females did not feel quite as strongly about this as the males.

Inmates' relationship with the outside community appears to be contingent upon their frame of reference. Males tend to view their relationship with the outside community in more positive terms. Two out of three females at Framingham felt the outside community looks down on them, as did nearly three out of four of the males when they were in their former all-male institutions. However, only little more than one-third of the males at Framingham felt this way. Since males are predominantly sent to Framingham for pre-release programs, they tend to spend more time out in the community, are more comfortable there, and apparently

enjoy a better rapport with the people. This is borne out somewhat in that males at Framingham tend to view the people on the outside as more helpful to them in securing jobs and getting into community groups and educational programs. This aspect of the Framingham program seems to be consistent with the view of Carter, et al. ('72) that correctional institutions should extend outside the traditional institutions out into the community. Studt, et al. ('68) also suggested that prisons should be transitional so that a "continuum" can be formed with the greater community. Along with the lessening of structure and more community involvement, the males at Framingham almost unanimously feel that they have some control over planning their future in the community. While approximately one-third of the inmates at Framingham feel the community will punish them if they screw-up, two-thirds of the females feel that the community will also tell them if they do well. The males at Framingham are split (50%) on this statement, indicating that the females see the community as being slightly more responsive to their efforts than the males.

Females tend to view people in the community as being more concerned with keeping them under control than with helping them with their problems. The males at Framingham

do not share this view, perhaps reflecting their positive experience as part of the pre-release program. However, the males shared the females' perception when applied to the sending male institution. This same reasoning prevails in that approximately 20% of females feel hassled by the outside community while none of the males there feel hassled by the community. Almost all of those interviewed agreed that it's hard to tell inmates apart from other people when they are out in the larger community, thereby confirming that inmates feel that while in community programs they are seen as people like anybody else, possessing neither two heads or any other distinguishing abnormalities to set them apart from the rest of society.

The remaining 17 items of the social climate scale will now be discussed. As above, interpretation of the data will refer to the literature review of one-sex prisons. Conclusions will first be drawn about individual items, and then about this section as a whole.

In general, a large majority of respondents reported that inmates help new inmates get adjusted to the institution. This concern of "inmates helping inmates" was seen as much more prevalent at Framingham than at the sending institutions. Studt ('68) described an inmate code to

which new inmates are oriented in the original C-unit system. Apparently, this practice of acclimating new inmates is also true of a coeducation prison.

Evidence suggests that although almost all of the inmates are friendly, real friends are difficult to find, more so for women than for men. In this matter, men usually viewed Framingham in relation to their former all-male institutions where feelings about friendship were in all probability more negative. A study by Clemmer on a male institution showed that at least 70% of his sample felt that friendships are of short duration and pragmatic, and that familiarity in prison breeds contempt. In a more relaxed environment such as Framingham, this is still true, but not to such a great extent. However, the women at Framingham may see this issue of friendship from a different perspective. Since the majority of them cannot compare Framingham to another prison, they are basing their opinion only on experiences on the outside.

According to the results of our questionnaire, staff at Framingham were not seen as dealing with everyone fairly; nor were the staff at the all-male sending institutions. The results also indicate that many more males felt that some inmates get away with a lot while others can't get

away with anything, when asked about Framingham as compared to their former institutions. This could be attributed to the perceived differential treatment of men and women at Framingham with stricter discipline for men, while rules were viewed as applying more uniformly to all inmates at the institutions from which they were transferred. From the literature review, it seems that unequal treatment of inmates is quite common. Cloward ('60) states that the inmate elite are sometimes allowed certain infractions by the staff as a reward for helping the staff maintain control over other inmates. At any rate, it is clear that the treatment of men and women by staff is perceived as unequal by a majority of inmates.

Inmates generally do not think of Framingham as peaceful and orderly, but many more men than women agree that it is. It is likely that by comparison, men experienced much more tension at their former all-male institutions, especially at Walpole. Every inmate in our sample who transferred from there felt strongly about this. There could be many reasons for inmates not to find peace and order in prison, especially in the all-male sending institutions. For example, Sykes and Messinger ('60) list six major deprivations of prison life (see literature review).

Grosser ('60) describes an inmate culture with social controls independent of official controls. Furthermore, McCorkle and Korn ('71) suggest that an inmate needs to conflict with staff for psychological reasons. These factors may all contribute to feelings of tension and unrest in inmates at the sending institutions and to some extent at Framingham.

Although only a minority of respondents felt that many inmates think they are too good for you, many more women than men felt this way. The evidence suggests that women are more likely than men to perceive a caste system and a certain amount of snobbishness.

A minority of inmates, but more women than men, felt that inmates try to take advantage of you or fight you to get what they want. The results indicate that more women may be on the defensive in their interaction with fellow inmates and that women are less supportive of one another. In women's prisons the literature indicates that much competition can result from the creation of social roles based on the homosexual subculture. Butches and femmes exploit each other to get what they want. As for men, there seems to be more exploitation of one another and fighting at their sending institutions. According to Sykes ('58) the inmate subculture of the maximum security

male institution places a premium on the use of force, with stronger inmates often taking advantage of weaker inmates. One major reason why less tension of this type is perceived by the men at Framingham may be their frame of reference, i.e., their sending institutions. Also, women may be reacting to one another's competition for men, resulting in less support for each other.

To the question of whether or not inmates show good judgment, there were mixed reactions. The majority of inmates answered negatively, while a significant part of the sample gave the response that they were unsure or didn't know. There seems to be some uncertainty as to exactly what is good judgment. This could be seen as vague in that good judgment would probably not have caused an inmate to do something which resulted in his/her incarceration.

In contradiction to the previous items which indicated a perceived lack of solidarity among women at Framingham, more men than women believed that inmates won't work together to get things done for the institution. Men were seen as more willing to get together at their previous institutions. If they were to spend a lot of time there, they cared enough to get things done for the institution.

For women, Framingham is more "their" institution--men are like guests who can always be shipped back.

Connected with the issue of working together is the one of leadership among inmates. According to the results of the questionnaire, women are somewhat split 50-50 as to whether there are any leaders among inmates or if there are a few inmates who run everything, while men seem to be more biased toward lack of leadership at Framingham. The opposite is true for males concerning the institution they were transferred from. Evidence suggests that there is an element of leadership or elitism at the male institution which was not seen as present to the same degree by men at Framingham. This is not as clear-cut among females. It is very likely that for men at Framingham, in relation to their previous all-male institutions, there is a different subculture at Framingham.

Further results to support this inference lies in the question of peer pressure among inmates at Framingham. More women than men agreed that an inmate who insists on being different is given a bad name. On the other hand, a majority of males said this was true of the institution they were transferred from. Findings suggest that there is more peer pressure among women at Framingham and men at

other institutions, but that men are more individualistic at Framingham. This is further indication that there may not be a very distinct male subculture at Framingham, perhaps because they perceive themselves as being at the end of a long period of incarceration. In his study, Garabedian observed that cohesiveness among inmates diminished as they approached release.

In the remaining two items, there exists more evidence that males may feel more at ease at Framingham, compared to their sending institutions and that women feel more hassled at Framingham. It is significant that half of the men in our sample felt that inmates mind their own business and none felt that inmates get on your back for no reason. About one-third of the women agreed to both questions.

The social climate at Framingham is such that the environment is seen as more relaxed than at one-sex prisons by males. There seems to be a much less rigid subculture for males, than for females, who still seem to adhere to some of the roles described by Ward and Kassebaum and Giallombardo. Generally, men perceive less peer pressure and less exploitation at Framingham than the women do, and less peer pressure and exploitation than at their former institutions. Friction among women seems to lie in the

area of interpersonal relationships which are emotional in nature.

In general, then, the men tended to have a much more positive perception of their fellow inmates as well as of the relationships among inmates. Again, this may have been because the men used their former institutions as the frame of reference in responding to the social climate scale items. It is unlikely that the women had a comparable frame of reference. They may have responded to these items with a non-institutional setting as their frame of reference.

Perceptions of Programs. The focus of the inmates' perceptions of programs was on four program areas--furloughs, work/education release, counseling, and cadre. In some cases it was possible to compare inmates' perceptions of programs with those of staff, since the staff frequently expressed their views on programs in the course of the interviews which were conducted to elicit information for the descriptive section of the study.

Furlough Program. The vast majority of the inmates viewed the furlough program to be a positive one. This was consistent with the views of the staff on furloughs.

The goals that were stated by the administration for

the furlough program were very much the same as the benefits derived from the program as expressed by the inmates. The most positive reason expressed by both administration and inmates was that inmates could retain contact with the outside for a variety of reasons, such as maintaining bonds with family and friends and adjusting to the continuously changing outside world.

Perhaps the fact that more men than women responded positively to how the furlough program is administered is because a number of the women were new arrivals and had not yet qualified to participate in the program.

It appears there were no major complaints about the furlough program, other than that some of the minor rules appear too strict. This could be due to the fact that at a less structured prison such as Framingham, greater demands for inner control are placed on the individual and that at maximum security prisons, inmates are not given as much responsibility for their own actions. Because Framingham offers more freedom, inmates are more responsible for upholding the rules that are laid down.

It is interesting to note that 70% of the inmates interviewed saw the furlough program as a privilege, while only 46% of the inmates saw the work and education release

CONTINUED

2 OF 3

program as a privilege. This difference in viewpoint might be due to the inmates' seeing a furlough as a "vacation," an enjoyable time for themselves which occurs infrequently and which they have to earn by positive behavior. On the other hand, work and education release might be seen as somewhat of an everyday "chore" and, therefore, less of a privilege.

Work/Education Release Program. The goals of the administration seem to coincide with the inmates' views as to the positive value of the work/education release program. For example, both administration and inmates viewed the program's main benefit as reintegrative in nature.

Approximately one-third of the inmates in the sample had been on work/education release. This is representative of the total population on work/education release.

The reason more men might have felt the work/education release program was administered fairly could be due to the fact that the main purpose that most men are sent to Framingham is to participate in this program.

One of the benefits of the program stated by the inmates and agreed upon by the administration was that the institution gave them the support they needed to enable them to go out and obtain work.

Some of the concerns that the inmates felt about the program were also some of the concerns that the staff felt, i.e.,lack of jobs available due to the economy, inadequate transportation, and the 15% charge that the inmates are required to contribute to the State.

Counseling Program. Perhaps the reason that the counseling program evoked such strong emotional responses is due to the fact that the counseling experience itself tends to be a strong emotional one. Even those inmates not involved in counseling responded with strong affect to this question, seemingly reflecting the outside society's fears of being "mentally ill."

Because so many of the inmates (64%) said they have been in counseling, it is possible inmates confused social service with DLM. This could have been due to the questionnaire's not being clear in its definition of counseling. It is also possible that the inmates do not perceive a distinction between the functions of social service and counseling staff in the institution and/or that there is so much overlap in the roles of social service and counseling staff that the distinction is, in fact, not clear.

Our question on inmates' perceptions on how the staff viewed counseling met with varying responses. Perhaps the

inmates had no idea as to how staff really view it. However, their subjective responses provided some interesting data on the perceived relationship between correctional staff and counseling staff.

The various responses regarding the benefits of counseling could be compared to the general population's view, since those that are more motivated, in general, find counseling more helpful.

Cadre Program. One of the reasons why the cadre was brought to Framingham by the administration was to add stability to the institution. Such a view coincides with how the inmates nearly unanimously saw the cadre, i.e., they were viewed as more mature, more involved, as adding a great deal to the institution, and as being a good example for all. Therefore, it seems that the cadre program is providing some stability for the institution, while, at the same time, offering a positive correctional experience for those who participate in this program.

Most Important Programs. The programs most frequently mentioned by inmates as the most important programs at Framingham were the computer program, work release, furloughs, and institutional education. Men were more likely to include the computer program among the most important programs, while women were most likely to include institutional education. This was probably because the computer program tends to be more oriented toward the men, while institution education tends to be more oriented toward the women. Work release was mentioned by an equal number of men and women, and the numbers mentioning furloughs were very similar.

In summary, on the four program areas which provided a focus for this section, the inmates' perception of furloughs and work/education release were very positive; their perceptions of the cadre program were positive; and, their perceptions of counseling were mixed. Where comparisons were possible, the goals of the programs, as stated by staff

were generally consistent with the benefits derived from the programs, as expressed by inmates.

Perceptions of the Co-educational Correctional Experiences. There is little doubt from our results that the inmates' perceptions of attitudes about the coeducational aspect of MCI-Framingham were positive. Although there were, indeed, some strong negative opinions, the results, overall, showed an overwhelming preference for co-ed incarceration over one-sex institutionalization.

The first five questions in this part of the questionnaire dealt with general attitudes about a co-ed prison experience; what the goals might be; how successful the institution was at meeting the goals; and what the advantages and disadvantages of a co-ed correctional facility are. For interpretive purposes, the results of these questions can be grouped together. The themes that seem to dominate the responses are that for a prison this seems to be the best approach; the experience at Framingham will be more helpful than harmful; the co-ed program has its problems but is generally successful; and the major difficulty with the co-ed program, as perceived by both sexes, is that there is a double standard of treatment for men and women inmates.

One point to keep in mind when examining the high positive response of the inmates, (86%), in describing their general experience at Framingham, is that although the question does not specifically ask for a comparison to other institutions, it is implied. Thus, it is assumed that the superlative descriptions do not mean that Framingham is superior to not being in prison, but is superior to being in other prisons. This does not deny the significance of the 86% positive response because,it is extremely rare that inmates will ever speak positively about the prison in which they are incarcerated.

What also proved interesting about this first question is that more than half of the cadre interviewed expressed some ambivalence in their responses. Some reported difficulties in adjusting to the co-ed aspect and the unusually "free" atmosphere. It is believed that this is due to the longer periods of institutionalization that cadre have had and the socialization that goes along with it. All of the cadre men had been incarcerated for at least four years on their present sentence. After learning how to function sufficiently to be selected as a member of the cadre, and then to be placed in a much less structured environment where different personality skills are required for social

acceptance, it should not be surprising that problems in adjustment were reported.

Regarding the degree of perceived success of the co-ed program, we consider it extremely significant that 43 of 50 inmates perceive the program as successful. Also, when asked for disadvantages, 36% saw none at all. What is interesting about the advantage and disadvantage results is that some responses for advantages were listed by others as disadvantages. An example of this is that some men listed the presence of women as a distinct advantage, while a few said it was a definite disadvantage.

The final question, which had several parts, attempted to probe for a description of the quality of the relationships that exist between men and women. The general theme was that there is no difference here than on the outside. This response was almost unanimous. What puzzles us about this response is that, with the sexual restrictions placed on the inmates, there must be some differences with the outside. This response may well reflect the frame of reference, that is, relative to relationships in other prisons, relationships at Framingham are seen as more similar to those on the outside.

As we probed for specifics regarding the relationships,

our results became very interesting. There was virtually unanimous agreement that men and women are not treated equally, especially regarding disciplinary matters. This perceived inequality was related to the fact that men could be shipped back to their sending institutions, while no such sanction exists for women. In addition, there was a feeling that staff, in general, dealt less harshly with women than with men.

The results of the question on ways relationships differ here from those at one-sex institutions seem to be self-explanatory. Perhaps these are the reasons that people see Framingham as such a positive experience. One response from a number of inmates was that some staff were more willing to overlook female homosexuality than heterosexual behavior. This leads us to some speculation. We know from our literature review that homosexuality in all-female institutions is common. Since we know that institutions are generally systems that resist change, we can speculate that some staff from the old system felt threatened by the new male inmates and may have found it easier to deal in the old way. These responses came from both male and female inmates.

Our questions about a sexual code were incomplete

found traditional stereotypic views. In fact, the only inmates expressing other than traditional sexual roles were the female homosexuals. It appears that inmates reflect the sex role stereotypes usually found in the community from which they come.

The final questions were about the long-term effects of the relationships at Framingham. Most inmates did not expect these relationships to last after release. Perhaps because inmates are released at different times and return to different communities, they don't have expectations for long term relationships.

In summary, then, inmates generally regarded the co-educational correctional experience as a very positive one. Although some difficulties were reported, they viewed the Framingham experience as an important step in the process of reintegration back into the community.

Discussion of Results on Recidivism Follow-up

While the difference between the expected vs. actual recidivism rates was not statistically significant, it seems clear that the Framingham program is having some effect in reducing recidivism rates (one criterion for success). Since our sample is small, and the follow-up period short, differences of the magnitude we found indicate

because, although they ask if there is a code, they did not provide for sufficient probing into the nature of the code. We asked the question because of evidence in the literature that forms of sexual codes exist in one-sex institutions. There was some evidence that a code does exist at Framingham. The code seems to be that inmates "do their own thing" as long as it does not intrude on others. If one gets caught breaking a rule, one takes the penalty. Correction officers' attitudes on the enforcement of sexual rules were perceived as ranging from laissez-faire to very strict and rigid.

This code is in line with the prevalent jailhouse codes in the literature of "break as many rules as you can without getting caught." Since this kind of attitude was only evident regarding sexual matters at MCI-Framingham, it suggests that when people are treated like adults, such as with the various programs, people act like adults. When people are treated like prisoners, as with the sexual rules of the facility, people act like prisoners. To think that men and women can be confined in a limited space for many hours a day and not pursue each other sexually seems unrealistic.

Regarding inmate attitudes about sexual roles, we

a real need for a more extensive study of this type at a future date.

While both the expected and actual recidivism rates for men are somewhat less than those for women, it is important to note that the reduction is greater for women (6.8 vs. 3.2 percentage points). This suggests the program may have a somewhat greater impact on women. This is noteworthy in that the entire state female prison population is being exposed to the program, not pre-screened inmates as in the case of the men.

The difference in recidivism between the commitment institutions of Concord (14%) and Walpole (0%) may be due to the fact that Concord inmates are, generally, less serious offenders, serving shorter sentences than those committed to Walpole. Therefore, Walpole inmates probably undergo more rigorous screening by the Classification Board before transfer to Framingham. Also, a previous study (Massachusetts Department of Correction, 1974, a one year follow-up of all releasees from state facilities in 1971 compiled by Daniel P. LeClair) showed a noticeably lower R. R. for Walpole commitments.

The somewhat lower R. R. in the few releasees going through pre-release centers (8% vs. 12%) suggests that they

serve as one more step to a smoother reintegration into society.

Usually, the younger the age at release, the higher the R. R. (LeClair, '74). The lower R. R. for young releasees in our sample is interesting but not easily explained. It may only be due to chance, but it may also indicate that the Framingham program is effective for young inmates.

The high R. R. for those incarcerated on property offenses is consistent with usual findings (i.e.: LeClair, 1974). However, the low R. R. for drug offenses is unusual. We might speculate that the unique Framingham program is especially effective in helping drug offenders make an adjustment before returning to "the street."

The higher R. R. for those on indefinite sentences is consistent with LeClair's findings. This is also consistent with the finding of the lower Walpole (committment institution) R. R. The large number of female indefinites is also consistent.

In the LeClair study, the R. R. for white releasees was almost identical to those who were black, although white female releasees had a somewhat higher R. R. than black females. There is no clear explanation for the R. R. difference we found in our sample, although it does seem that the Framingham program is more effective in reducing

recidivism for blacks (8%) than for whites (15%).

The lower R. R. for single releasees is in contrast to the LeClair study where they had a higher R. R. than those who had ever been married. This difference may be due to chance, or it may be the co-ed program itself could produce some additional stress for married inmates. For example, the recidivism rate of the 17 women who were married or separated was 29%.

The high R. R. for men with other than honorable discharges is consistent with previous data and suggests there may be a history of adjustment difficulties in some of these men.

The large number of inmates from Boston may reflect the higher crime rates there. The somewhat lower R. R. for Boston residents (and slightly higher from female releasees from Boston) is seen also in the LeClair report.

The large number of releasees on the lower end of the scales for socioeconomic status and occupation group reflects the fact that the criminal justice system has always dealt primarily with persons from the lower classes. This may also be why the lower ends of the scales are where the highest R. R.'s exist.

The large number of inmates with short time on any one job is consistent with previous data, but the relatively

equal R. R.'s across the board is not. Usually those with shorter times on one job have higher R. R.'s. The Framingham experience, especially a consistent job through work release, may work to reverse this tendency.

The low R. R. for those with grade school education and for those with more than high school education is again consistent with previous data. However, the relatively high R. R. for high school grads is not consistent with previous data, and this discrepancy comes from the men in the sample. This again may be due to the relatively small sample size.

The number of inmates indicating former drug use (52%) is more than twice as high as those released from Framingham in 1971 (25%). The same is true for heroin use. This may indicate that more drug related offenders are being sentenced to Framingham or that more inmates are willing to acknowledge their involvement with drugs. What is striking is, again, the lack of a high R. R. for users, especially heroin. This is inconsistent with former studies and may indicate again a greater impact of the program on drug users.

The tendency for men to be younger at first arrest suggests either that women get involved in crime at a later age or the differential treatment of men and women in the

criminal justice system. The lower R. R. for younger arrests is again contradictory to previous studies.

The large number of releasees with prior offenses against the person is again consistent with LeClair's finding. The larger number of men is consistent with their incarceration for more violent crimes. On the other hand, there is no difference in the LeClair study in R. R. between those with no offenses against the person and those with 1 or more.

The positive relationship we found between number of property offenses and R. R. is consistent with LeClair's findings.

Again, the high number of releasees having previous narcotic offenses (45%) is higher than 1971 (26%). And, again, the lack of difference in R. R. in our sample between those with and without narcotic offenses contradicts LeClair's findings and suggests high program impact on drug offenders.

The high number of releasees with drunkenness charges is consistent with previous data. There seems to be a slight positive relationship between drunkenness charges and R. R. which is what LeClair found.

The high R. R. for those with escape charges again

follows the LeClair findings.

The high number of releasees with previous incarcerations suggests the magnitude of recidivism we are dealing with. Except for incarceration in juvenile facilities, the finding that those having previous incarcerations have a higher R. R. is in line with other findings. Former recidivists are higher recidivism risks.

The finding that one-half the sample served one year or less on their present incarceration indicates that the length of time served by those released from Framingham was relatively short. There is a positive relationship between time served and R. R. at least for women, suggesting that those serving longer sentences are more prone to recidivism.

Looking at paroles, we can see the extent to which this system of release is used (85% of the releases). Previous studies have consistently shown that parolees have higher R. R.'s than discharges (due to the fact that they are more closely supervised and that they can be returned to prison for behavior that is not necessarily criminal--i.e., for a technical infraction of parole rules). The recidivism rates were virtually the same for the Framingham parolees and dischargees. This suggests that the Framingham program provides for a smoother reintegration into the community,

and, accordingly, better prepares a person for parole.

CHAPTER SEVEN

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

This study of MCI-Framingham had three general goals. These were:

(1) to provide a general description of the facility and its programs;

(2) to generate some exploratory data on inmates' perceptions of the social climate, the coeducational aspects, and selected programs of MCI-Framingham; and,

(3) to examine the impact of the MCI-Framingham coeducational program on recidivism.

Review of the Literature. The first step was to conduct a review of the correctional literature. This literature review focused on five areas in all-male and all-female institutions related to social climate: communications and information flow, punishment and reward, inmate subculture, sexual relationships, and relationship with the outside community. As we found no material in the literature on adult coeducational institutions, we analyzed our data on Framingham according to these five areas and, where possible, indicated where and how coeducation has had an effect on the social climate at Framingham, as compared to the literature and to the inmates' previous experience in one-sex institutions.

Description of MCI-Framingham. The first part of the study is a description of the Framingham facility--its history and physical layout, its staffing patterns, and its correctional programs.

Exploratory Data. The second part of the study was exploratory in nature. Fifty inmates were interviewed. The interview schedule included a Likert-type social climate scale and a number of open-ended questions concerning the coeducational aspects and the programs.

Social Climate. Regarding communication and information flow, males seemed to feel that there was less communication between themselves and staff than there was at their former more structured institutions where rules were more explicit. However, in a less structured institution like Framingham, inmates felt more able to participate in decision making concerning institutional policy.

Compared to the all-male sending institutions, there seemed to be a different subculture at Framingham with regard to punishment and reward. Although both males and females felt that staff will punish them for an infraction, it is improbable that they would be punished by a fellow inmate. On the other hand, according to males, one was

more likely to be punished by peers at their former institutions. At Framingham staff was also more likely to give praise for positive behavior.

In general, more males than females felt that staff was concerned with keeping inmates under control. This seems to be related to the perceived inequality in disciplinary measures between males and females in Framingham. Inmates at Framingham are more likely to feel that staff is concerned with helping them with problems, as compared to the opposite feeling of males concerning their former institutions. On the whole, there seems to be less suspicion regarding staff/inmate interaction in a less structured institution such as Framingham.

Males tend to generally view their relationship with the outside community as more positive than do females. Males, exclusive of cadre, are primarily sent to Framingham as a pre-release center. Therefore, they seem to view this as termination of a longer period of incarceration and a gradual return to society.

Males experience less tension at Framingham than do the females. Among men there seems to be a much less rigid subculture than among women who are still somewhat involved in social systems similar to those found in all-female

institutions. Men also seem to be less involved with each other, resulting in less peer pressure and more individuality, which is not as apparent for the women.

Coeducational Aspects. Overall results of the questionnaire showed an overwhelming preference among inmates for co-ed incarceration over one-sex incarceration. The major drawback of this co-ed program was that there is a perceived double standard of treatment for male and female inmates. Furthermore, a majority of the cadre interviewed expressed some ambivalence about co-ed incarceration. They were accustomed to the more structured environment of a one-sex institution, and as a result of their long incarceration, they reported some difficulties in adjusting to the less structured co-ed atmosphere at Framingham.

As for the quality of relationships between men and women at Framingham, the general response was that there was no difference at Framingham from that which exists on the outside. A major specific issue regarding relationships was the perceived unequal disciplinary treatment of men and women. It seemed that the men sent to Framingham were considered to be privileged, so standards for their behavior were seen as being much higher. On the other hand, the

co-ed experience is now standard for women who are incarcerated by the state, since Framingham is the only state facility for women. Therefore, the disciplinary sanction of being "shipped out" does not hang as heavily over the women as it does over the men.

When asked whether or not there is a code for sexual behavior, the response from inmates seemed to be along the lines of "doing your own thing as long as it does not infringe on the rights of others," or "as long as one does not get caught." Inmates' perceptions of officers' attitudes concerning this matter range from laissez-faire to very strict.

Inmates' attitudes on sexual roles tend to be rather traditional and stereotyped, with the exception of the female homosexuals. In general, inmates seem to reflect the sexual stereotypes in the communities from which they came.

Although inmates reported that relationships inside Framingham did not differ from those on the outside, there was some evidence to the contrary. Married inmates, to be sure, had some difficulties not experienced by married persons on the outside, and most inmates did not expect relationships formed in prison to last after release.

Programs. The next section of the interview focused on four program areas: furlough, work/education release, Division of Legal Medicine (DLM) Counseling, and cadre.

Both the administration and the inmates believed that the furlough program is a positive experience. Although there are some minor complaints from inmates about some rules being too strict, most inmates see the program as highly beneficial to their maintaining contact with the outside.

Inmates and administration also seem to agree on the positive value of work/education release in serving reintegrative purposes. The main benefit of this program was that it enabled and supported an inmate in his/her efforts to secure employment. More men believed that this program was administered fairly perhaps because they used the sending institutions as their frame of reference. Inmates and staff had similar concerns about this program: lack of jobs due to the state of the economy; inadequate transportation; and, the 15% that inmates are required to pay the state out of their salaries.

It is unclear how many inmates have actually participated in the DLM Counseling Service, because there was some confusion between this program and the Social Service.

program. There were very mixed and very emotional responses to the questions on the counseling program.

Inmates generally responded positively to the cadre program and its members. Some did not know very much about this aspect of the institution, as this group of men seem to be set apart from other inmates.

In summary, inmates' perceptions of the furlough program and of the work and education release program were very positive; their perceptions of the cadre program were positive; and their perceptions of the counseling program were mixed. Also, it was clear that their general view of the coeducational correctional experience was an extremely positive one.

Recidivism Follow-up. The comparison between the expected recidivism rate (17.3%) and the actual recidivism rate (11.6%) revealed a substantial reduction in recidivism for the first 121 persons who were released from Framingham since it became a coeducational facility. The impact of the Framingham program on recidivism tended to be somewhat greater for women--from 19.6% (expected rate) to 12.8% (actual rate)--than it was for men--from 11.8% (expected rate) to 8.6% (actual rate).

An analysis of the relationship between background characteristics and recidivism was also carried out for the men and women, as well as for the total sample. On some factors, such as, institution committed to, offense, race, and drug usage, some interesting findings emerged. For example, none of the 14 men originally committed to Walpole were recidivists, while 14% of the 21 men originally committed to Concord were recidivists. This may reflect a more careful screening of the Walpole commitments. On offense, the recidivism rate of property offenders (26%) was significantly higher than that of all other offenders (7%). Although this pattern is consistent with previous studies, the unusually large difference is noteworthy here. On race, black inmates, both female and male, had a considerably lower recidivism rate (8%) than that of whites (15%). Finally, unlike the findings of previous studies, the recidivism rate of those with histories of drug usage was no higher than that of individuals with no histories of drug usage.

In conclusion, there seems to be a clear convergence of the data in support of the coeducational correctional program at MCI-Framingham. Although some negative issues were raised in the course of this study, the overall findings

of this research lead to the conclusion that the Framingham program is an effective and worthwhile correctional enterprise.

It is hoped that this research has contributed to a better understanding of the coeducational correctional experience, and that it will stimulate further study of this important area.

APPENDIX A

INMATE ASSESSMENT OF SOCIAL CLIMATE

PROGRAM DATA

BACKGROUND CHARACTERISTICS

INMATE ASSESSMENT OF SOCIAL CLIMATE

Social Climate Item	Percent Who Agree with Statement For Framingham: Female	Male	Total	For Sending Male Institution: Male
Communication/Information Flow:				
1. The staff members try to keep you informed about what's happening here at Framingham.	21% (5)	8% (2)	14% (7)	28% (7)
4. The staff makes changes without consulting the inmates.	75% (18)	69% (18)	72% (36)	88% (22)
5. If the inmates really want to, they can share in the decisions about how the institution is run.	67% (16)	46% (12)	56% (28)	32% (8)
19. Most of the rules here are clear to everybody.	25% (6)	23% (6)	24% (12)	40% (10)
Punishment:				
3. If an inmate messes up, the staff will punish him or her some way.	96% (23)	85% (22)	90% (45)	92% (23)
11. If an inmate screws up, other inmates here will punish him or her in some way.	16% (4)	15% (4)	16% (8)	60% (15)
14. Inmates in this institution usually tell another inmate when they think he or she has done something wrong.	67% (16)	54% (14)	60% (30)	60% (15)
Reward:				
7. The staff will reward an inmate for good behavior.	33% (8)	15% (4)	24% (12)	20% (5)

	Female	Male	Total	Male
8. Other inmates will reward an inmate for good behavior.	21% (5)	11% (3)	16% (8)	4% (1)
13. If an inmate does well here, the staff will personally tell him or her so.	79% (19)	58% (15)	68% (34)	24% (6)
18. If an inmate does well here, the other inmates will personally tell him or her so.	37% (9)	19% (5)	28% (14)	12% (3)
Negative Subculture:				
2. The staff here is concerned with keeping inmates under control.	54% (13)	92% (24)	74% (37)	96% (24)
6. The staff is concerned with helping inmates with their problems.	71% (17)	54% (14)	62% (31)	24% (6)
9. People here at Framingham are pretty much split into two different groups, with staff in one, and inmates in the other.	75% (18)	81% (21)	78% (39)	96% (24)
10. The inmates here have their own rules on how to behave that are different from those of the staff.	67% (16)	58% (15)	62% (31)	84% (21)
16. There are too many inmates here who push other inmates around.	46% (11)	8% (2)	26% (13)	76% (19)
17. Most inmates here are just interested in doing their time.	71% (17)	85% (22)	78% (39)	88% (22)

	Female	Male	Total	Male
Community Linkages:				
15. People on the outside look down on imates from MCI-Framingham.	67% (16)	35% (9)	50% (25)	72% (18)
20. The inmates of MCI-Framingham spend a lot of time outside in the community.	58% (14)	73% (19)	66% (33)	4% (1)
21. The staff here help the inmates get jobs outside, get into community groups, into educational programs, and things like that.	75% (18)	77% (20)	76% (38)	20% (5)
22. People on the outside don't help inmates in this institution get jobs outside, get into community groups, into educational programs, and things like that.	42% (10)	11% (3)	26% (13)	56% (14)
23. If an inmate really wants to plan his or her future out in the larger community, he or she can.	75% (18)	92% (24)	84% (42)	60% (15)
24. If an inmate from MCI-Framingham screws up out in the community, the people in the outside community will punish him or her in some way.	37% (9)	31% (8)	34% (17)	48% (12)
25. If an inmate from MCI-Framingham does well out in the community, people in the outside community will personally tell him or her so.	67% (16)	50% (13)	58% (29)	28% (7)
26. When inmates from MCI-Framingham go out into the larger community it's hard to tell them from other people.	92% (22)	96% (25)	94% (47)	84% (21)

	Female	Male	Total	Male
27. Inmates from MCI-Framingham have their own rules in the outside community that are different from those of the people who supervise them in the community.	46% (11)	42% (11)	44% (22)	60% (15)
28. People in the larger community are more concerned with keeping inmates from MCI-Framingham under control than with helping them with their problems.	62% (15)	27% (7)	44% (22)	68% (17)
29. People in the outside community generally hassle residents from MCI-Framingham.	21% (5)	0% (0)	10% (5)	12% (3)
Other Items:				
12. Other inmates usually try to help a new inmate get used to the institution.	92% (22)	81% (21)	86% (43)	64% (16)
30. Real friends are hard to find in this institution.	87% (21)	65% (17)	76% (38)	76% (19)
31. The staff deals fairly and squarely with everyone.	21% (5)	4% (1)	12% (6)	16% (4)
32. The institution is a very peaceful, orderly place.	17% (4)	58% (15)	38% (19)	8% (2)
33. A lot of the inmates here think they are too good for you.	42% (10)	11% (3)	26% (13)	20% (5)

	Female	Male	Total	Male
34. Some inmates here get away with a lot, while others can't get away with anything.	96% (23)	92% (24)	94% (47)	64% (16)
35. Almost all of the inmates here are friendly to you.	75% (18)	81% (21)	78% (39)	44% (11)
36. Almost all of the inmates here try to take advantage of you.	37% (9)	8% (2)	22% (11)	20% (5)
37. The inmates around here show good judgment.	29% (7)	38% (10)	34% (17)	32% (8)
38. Inmates here won't work together to get things done for the institution.	46% (11)	65% (17)	56% (28)	40% (10)
39. There are no real leaders among the inmates here.	58% (14)	69% (18)	64% (32)	32% (8)
40. Other inmates here give you a bad name if you insist on being different.	58% (14)	35% (9)	46% (23)	60% (15)
41. Inmates here will help a new inmate get along.	75% (18)	77% (20)	76% (38)	56% (14)
42. Inmates here, as a whole, mind their own business.	37% (9)	50% (13)	44% (22)	68% (17)
43. There are a few inmates here who run everything.	50% (12)	23% (6)	36% (18)	72% (18)

	Female	Male	Total	Male
44. Inmates around here usually get on your back for no reason.	37% (9)	0% (0)	18% (9)	32% (8)
45. Most inmates here will fight you to get what they want.	42% (10)	8% (2)	24% (12)	56% (14)

Program Data	Framingham Female N	Framingham Female (%)	Framingham Male N	Framingham Male (%)	Total N	Total (%)
1. Been on Furlough?						
Yes	15	(62%)	24	(92%)	39	(78%)
No	9	(38%)	2	(8%)	11	(22%)
2. Furlough Prog. Admin. Fairly?						
Yes	12	50%	18	69%	30	60%
No	11	46%	7	27%	18	36%
Unsure, Don't Know	1	4%	1	4%	2	4%
3. Furloughs: Right or Privilege?						
Right	4	17%	8	31%	12	24%
Privilege	18	75%	17	65%	35	70%
Both	1	4%	1	4%	2	4%
No Answer	1	4%			1	2%
4. Been on Work Release?						
Yes	8	33%	8	31%	16	32%
No	16	67%	18	69%	34	68%
5. Been on Education Release?						
Yes	1	4%	3	11%	4	8%
No	23	96%	22	85%	45	90%
No Answer			1	4%	1	2%
6. Work/Educ. Rel. Admin. Fairly?						
Both Admin. Fairly	13	54%	20	77%	33	66%
Work Rel., Yes; Educ. Rel., No	0	0%	1	4%	1	2%
Work Rel., No; Educ. Rel., Yes	2	8%	0	0%	2	4%
Neither Admin. Fairly	8	33%	1	4%	9	18%
Unsure, Don't Know	1	4%	3	11%	4	8%
No Answer	0	0%	1	4%	1	2%

	Female		Male		Total	
	N	(%)	N	(%)	N	(%)
7. Work/Ed. Rel.: Right or Privilege?						
Right	10	42%	10	38%	20	40%
Privilege	12	50%	11	42%	23	46%
Both	0	0%	1	4%	1	2%
Unsure, Don't Know	2	8%	2	8%	4	8%
No Answer	0	0%	2	8%	2	4%
8. Been in Counseling?						
Yes	15	62%	17	65%	32	64%
No	9	38%	9	35%	18	36%
9. Most Important Programs						
Furloughs	6		5		11	
Work Release	8		8		16	
Education Release	2		5		7	
Counseling	2		6		8	
Computer Program	8		11		19	
Cadre	0		2		2	
Institutional Education	9		2		11	
Readjustment Program	0		2		2	
Avocation	1		1		2	
Photography	0		2		2	
Pottery	0		1		1	
Religious Activities	0		1		1	
Community Service	0		1		1	
Institution Job	2		0		2	
Institution Council	0		1		1	
Athletic Activities	1		0		1	
Drug Programs	2		0		2	
Mass. Rehabilitation	1		0		1	
None	3		1		4	

Background Characteristics	Female N	Female (%)	Male N	Male (%)	Total N	Total (%)
1. Race						
Black	11	46%	10	38%	21	42%
White	13	54%	16	62%	29	58%
2. Cadre Status						
Yes	2	8%	13	50%	15	30%
No	22	92%	13	50%	35	70%
3. Age						
24 or Younger	11	46%	3	12%	14	28%
25 - 29	10	42%	6	23%	16	32%
30 or Older	3	12%	17	65%	20	40%
3. Time at Framingham						
One Year or Less	15	62%	11	42%	26	52%
More Than One Year	9	38%	15	58%	24	48%
4. First Incarceration?						
Yes	13	54%	18	69%	31	62%
No	11	46%	7	27%	18	36%
Unknown	0		1	4%	1	2%
5. Total Time Served (Present Commitment)						
Up to Four Years	21	88%	8	31%	29	58%
Four Years or Longer	2	8%	18	69%	20	40%
Unknown	1	4%	0	0%	1	2%

APPENDIX B

CHARACTERISTICS AND RECIDIVISM RATES OF FRAMINGHAM RELEASEE SAMPLE

CHARACTERISTICS AND RECIDIVISM RATES OF FRAMINGHAM RELEASEE SAMPLE

Variable	Females N	Females %	Females Recid.Rate	Males N	Males %	Males Recid.Rate	Total N	Total %	Total Recid.Rate
Total	86	(100)	13%	35	(100)	9%	121	(100)	12%
1. Institution Committed to									
Framingham	86	(100)	13%	-	-	-	86	(71)	13%
Concord	-	-	-	21	(60)	14%	21	(17)	14%
Walpole	-	-	-	14	(40)	0%	14	(12)	0%
2. Institution Transferred from									
Framingham (no transfer)	86	(100)	13%	-	-	-	86	(71)	13%
Concord	-	-	-	18	(51)	11%	18	(15)	11%
Walpole	-	-	-	5	(14)	0%	5	(4)	0%
Norfolk	-	-	-	12	(34)	8%	12	(10)	8%
3. Institution Released from									
Framingham	75	(87)	13%	33	(94)	9%	108	(89)	12%
Charlotte House	11	(13)	9%	-	-	-	11	(9)	9%
Boston State Pre-Release				1	(3)	0%	1	(1)	0%
Roxbury Multi-Service				1	(3)	0%	1	(1)	0%
Total	86	(100)	14%	35	(100)	9%	121	(100)	12%

Variable	Females N	Females %	Females Recid.Rate	Males N	Males %	Males Recid.Rate	Total N	Total %	Total Recid.Rate
4. Age at Release									
19 or younger	8	(8)	0%	2	(6)	0%	10	(8)	0%
20-24	33	(38)	18%	15	(43)	7%	48	(40)	15%
25-29	15	(17)	20%	5	(14)	20%	20	(17)	20%
30-34	12	(14)	17%	4	(11)	0%	16	(13)	13%
35 or older	18	(21)	0%	9	(26)	11%	27	(22)	4%
5. Offense									
Against person	22	(26)	9%	24	(69)	4%	46	(38)	7%
Sex	0	(0)	0	1	(3)	0%	1	(1)	0%
Property	23	(27)	22%	4	(11)	50%	27	(22)	26%
Other	14	(16)	7%	0	(0)	0	14	(12)	7%
Drug	27	(31)	11%	6	(17)	0%	33	(27)	9%
6. Minimum Sentence									
Indefinite	84	(98)	13%	20	(57)	15%	104	(86)	13%
5 years or less	2	(2)	0%	7	(20)	0%	9	(7)	0%
More than 5 years	0	(0)	0	8	(23)	0%	8	(7)	0%
7. Age at Incarceration									
19 or younger	17	(20)	6%	4	(11)	0%	21	(17)	5%
20-24	30	(35)	20%	18	(51)	6%	48	(40)	15%
25-29	13	(15)	15%	3	(9)	33%	16	(13)	19%
30-34	11	(13)	18%	7	(20)	14%	18	(15)	17%
35 or older	15	(17)	0%	3	(9)	0%	18	(15)	0%

Variable	Females N	Females %	Females Recid.Rate	Males N	Males %	Males Recid.Rate	Total N	Total %	Total Recid.Rate
8. Race									
White	43	(50)	16%	25	(71)	12%	68	(56)	15%
Black	43	(50)	9%	10	(29)	0%	53	(44)	8%
9. Marital Status									
Married	9	(10)	22%	14	(40)	7%	23	(19)	13%
Single	52	(60)	10%	17	(49)	6%	69	(57)	9%
Divorced	9	(10)	11%	4	(11)	25%	13	(11)	15%
Widowed	2	(2)	0%	0	-	-	2	(2)	0%
Separated	8	(9)	38%	0	-	-	8	(7)	38%
Unknown	6	(7)	0%	0	-	-	6	(5)	0%
10. Military Service									
Unknown	11	(13)	18%			0	11	(9)	18%
None	75	(87)	12%	23	(66)	4%	98	(81)	10%
Honorable Discharge	0	(0)	0	3	(9)	0%	3	(2)	0%
Other Discharge	0	(0)	0	9	(26)	22%	9	(7)	22%
11. Last Address									
Boston	44	(51)	14%	16	(46)	0%	60	(50)	10%
Other	42	(49)	12%	19	(54)	16%	61	(50)	13%
12. Socioeconomic Status									
Upper	0	(0)	0	0	(0)	0	0	(0)	0
Middle	24	(28)	21%	7	(20)	0%	31	(26)	16%
Lower	53	(62)	11%	27	(77)	11%	80	(66)	11%
Other	9	(10)	0%	1	(3)	0%	10	(8)	0%

Variable	Females N	Females %	Females Recid.Rate	Males N	Males %	Males Recid.Rate	Total N	Total %	Total Recid.Rate
13. Occupational Group									
Professional	1	(1)	0%	0	(0)	0%	1	(1)	0%
Semi-Professional	5	(6)	0%	1	(3)	0%	6	(5)	0%
Business	0	(0)	0%	2	(6)	0%	2	(2)	0%
Clerical	23	(27)	13%	1	(3)	0%	24	(20)	13%
Manual	13	(15)	23%	18	(51)	0%	31	(26)	10%
Service Workers	29	(34)	17%	11	(31)	27%	40	(33)	20%
Other	15	(17)	0%	2	(6)	0%	17	(14)	0%
14. Length of Time Most Skilled Job									
Up to 6 months	30	(35)	13%	9	(26)	11%	39	(32)	13%
6 months up to 1 year	15	(17)	13%	8	(23)	0%	23	(19)	9%
1 up to 2 years	13	(15)	15%	4	(11)	25%	17	(14)	18%
2 up to 5 years	9	(10)	22%	8	(23)	0%	17	(14)	12%
5 years or longer	4	(5)	25%	2	(6)	50%	6	(5)	33%
Unknown	15	(17)	0%	4	(11)	0%	19	(16)	0%
15. Longest Period on One Job									
Up to 6 months	27	(31)	15%	8	(23)	43%	35	(29)	14%
6 up to 12 months	14	(16)	14%	7	(20)	0%	21	(17)	10%
1 up to 2 years	16	(19)	13%	6	(17)	17%	22	(18)	14%
2 up to 5 years	10	(12)	20%	8	(23)	0%	18	(15)	11%
5 years or longer	4	(5)	25%	2	(6)	50%	6	(5)	33%
Unknown	15	(17)	0%	4	(11)	0%	19	(16)	0%

Variable	Females N	Females %	Females Recid.Rate	Males N	Males %	Males Recid.Rate	Total N	Total %	Total Recid.Rate
16. Last Grade Completed									
0-6	12	(14)	8%	4	(11)	0%	16	(13)	6%
7-9	26	(30)	15%	12	(34)	0%	38	(31)	11%
10-11	27	(31)	19%	5	(14)	0%	32	(26)	16%
12	17	(20)	6%	12	(34)	25%	29	(24)	14%
13 or higher	4	(5)	0%	2	(6)	0%	6	(5)	0%
17. Drug Use									
None	38	(44)	13%	20	(57)	10%	58	(48)	12%
Yes (not spec.)	5	(6)	0%	2	(6)	0%	7	(6)	0%
Heroin	35	(41)	14%	10	(29)	0%	45	(37)	11%
Other than Heroin	7	(8)	14%	2	(6)	0%	9	(7)	11%
Marijuana	1	(1)	0%	1	(3)	100%	2	(2)	50%
Yes (combined)	48	(56)	15%	15	(43)	7%	63	(52)	13%
18. Age at First Arrest									
15 or younger	21	(24)	14%	16	(46)	0%	37	(31)	8%
16-20	35	(41)	11%	12	(34)	17%	47	(39)	13%
21-25	19	(22)	16%	5	(14)	20%	24	(20)	17%
26-30	4	(5)	25%	1	(3)	0%	5	(4)	20%
30 or older	7	(8)	0%	1	(3)	0%	8	(7)	0%

Variable	Females N	Females %	Females Recid.Rate	Males N	Males %	Males Recid.Rate	Total N	Total %	Total Recid.Rate
19. Number of Court Appearances									
1-5	31	(36)	13%	11	(31)	0%	42	(35)	10%
6-10	15	(17)	7%	11	(31)	18%	26	(21)	12%
11-15	14	(16)	29%	6	(17)	0%	20	(17)	20%
16-20	10	(12)	10%	5	(14)	0%	15	(12)	7%
21 or more	16	(19)	6%	2	(6)	50%	18	(15)	11%
20. No. Offenses vs. Person									
None	38	(44)	16%	5	(14)	40%	43	(36)	19%
1	19	(22)	0%	11	(31)	0%	30	(25)	0%
2-3	18	(21)	22%	9	(26)	0%	27	(22)	15%
4 or more	11	(13)	9%	10	(29)	10%	21	(17)	10%
21. No. Offenses vs. Property									
None	18	(21)	17%	5	(14)	0%	23	(19)	13%
1-5	50	(58)	8%	20	(57)	10%	70	(58)	9%
6-10	7	(8)	29%	5	(14)	0%	12	(10)	17%
11 or more	11	(13)	18%	5	(14)	20%	16	(13)	19%
22. No. of Narcotic Offenses									
None	43	(50)	12%	23	(66)	13%	66	(55)	12%
1-5	27	(31)	19%	10	(29)	0%	37	(31)	14%
6-10	7	(8)	0%	2	(6)	0%	9	(7)	0%
11 or more	9	(10)	11%	0		0%	9	(7)	11%
23. No. of Drunkenness Charges									
None	60	(70)	12%	20	(57)	5%	80	(66)	10%
1-3	18	(21)	22%	12	(34)	8%	30	(25)	17%
4 or more	8	(9)	0%	3	(9)	33%	11	(9)	9%

Variable	Females N	Females %	Females Recid.Rate	Males N	Males %	Males Recid.Rate	Total N	Total %	Total Recid.Rate
24. No. of Escape Charges									
None	74	(86)	12%	33	(94)	6%	107	(88)	10%
1 or more	12	(14)	17%	2	(6)	50%	14	(12)	21%
25. No. of Juvenile Incarcerations									
None	69	(80)	13%	24	(69)	13%	93	(77)	13%
1 or more	17	(20)	12%	11	(31)	0%	28	(23)	7%
26. No. of House of Correction Incarcerations									
None	57	(66)	12%	24	(69)	4%	81	(67)	10%
1 or more	29	(34)	14%	11	(31)	18%	40	(33)	15%
27. No. of State Incarcerations									
None	48	(56)	8%	30	(86)	10%	78	(64)	9%
1 or more	38	(44)	18%	5	(14)	0%	43	(36)	16%
28. Total No. of Prior Incarcerations									
None	30	(35)	7%	16	(46)	6%	46	(38)	7%
1-3	41	(48)	17%	12	(34)	8%	53	(44)	15%
4-25	15	(17)	13%	7	(20)	14%	22	(18)	14%
29. Length of Present Incarceration									
1-6 months	26	(30)	8%	5	(14)	0%	31	(26)	6%
7-12 months	17	(20)	6%	12	(34)	25%	29	(24)	[illegible]
13-24 months	21	(24)	10%	3	(9)	0%	[illegible]		
25-36 months	10	(12)	30%	10	(29)	0%			
37 or more	12	(14)	25%	5	[illegible]				

Variable	Females N	Females %	Females Recid.Rate	Males N	Males %	Males Recid.Rate	Total N	Total %	Total Recid.Rate
30. Type of Release									
Parole	69	(80)	13%	34	(97)	9%	103	(85)	12%
Discharge	17	(20)	12%	1	(3)	0%	18	(15)	11%

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Caldwell, Morris, "Types of Informal Prison Groups," in Clyde B. Vedder and Barbara A. Kay, eds., Penology: A Realistic Approach, Springfield, Ill.: Charles C. Thomas, 1964.

Carney, Francis J., "Predicting Recidivism in a Medium Security Correctional Institution," The Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology, and Police Science, vol. 58, no. 3 (1967), pp. 338-348.

_____, "Evaluation of Psychotherapy in a Maximum Security Prison," Seminars in Psychiatry, vol. 3, no. 3, (August, 1971), pp. 363-374.

Chaiklin, Harris, Final Report: The Community Reintegration Project, University of Maryland School of Social Work, Baltimore, Md.: Division of Corrections, 1973.

Chandler, Edna Walker, Women in Prison, New York: Bobbs Merrill Co., Inc., 1973.

Clemmer, Donald, The Prison Community, (reissued edition), New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1958.

Cloward, Richard A., "Social Control in the Prison," Theoretical Studies in Social Organization of the Prison, New York: Social Science Research Council, 1960.

Coates, Robert B., Miller, Alden D., and Ohlin, Lloyd E., "Preliminary Analysis of Initial Data in a Longitudinal Study of Youth in the Community Based System of the Massachusetts Department of Youth Services," Center for Criminal Justice, Law School of Harvard University, Dec., 1973.

Cohn, Alvin W., "The Failure of Correctional Management," Probation and Parole, no vol., no. 5, 1973, pp. 8-17.

Cressey, Donald R., "Adult Felons in Prison," in Lloyd E. Ohlin, ed., Prisoners in America, Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1973.

Day, Sherman R., Craddick, Ray A., Matheny, Kenneth B. "Inmate Change Following Human Relations Training for Non-professional Correctional Personnel," Georgia Journal of Corrections, vol. 2, no. 1, 1973, pp. 36-40.

deRahm, E., How Could She Do That?, New York: Clarkson N. Potter, 1969.

Dillon, Victor, "Inside the Prison Clique," in Robert Minton, Jr., ed., Inside Prison, American Style, New York: Random House, 1971.

Fox, Vernon, "Analysis of Prison Disciplinary Problems," in Clyde B. Vedder and Barbara A. Kay, eds., Penology: A Realistic Approach, Springfield, Ill.: Charles C. Thomas, 1964.

_____, Introduction to Corrections, Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1972.

Garabedian, Peter G., "Social Roles and Processes of Socialization in the Prison Community," Social Problems, vol. 11, (Fall, 1963).

Giallombardo, Rose, Society of Women: A Study of a Women's Prison, New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1966.

_____, "Social Roles in a Prison for Women," Social Problems, vol. 13, no. 37, 1966, pp. 268-288.

Glaser, Daniel, The Effectiveness of a Prison and Parole System, New York: Bobbs-Merrill Co., 1964.

Goffman, Erving, Asylums, Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Co., 1961.

Griggs, Bertram S., McCune, Gary R., "Community Based Correctional Programs: A Survey and Analysis," Federal Probation, vol. 36, no. 2., 1972.

Grosser, George H., "External Setting and Internal Relations of the Prison," Theoretical Studies in Social Organization of the Prison, New York: Social Science Research Council, 1960.

Grusky, Oscar, "Organizational Goals and the Behavior of Informal Leaders," American Journal of Sociology, vol. 65, no. 1, (July, 1959), pp. 59-67.

Halleck, Seymour L., Psychiatry and the Dilemmas of Crime, Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1967.

Harris, Sara, Hellhole, New York: E. P. Dutton & Co., 1967.

Heffernan, Esther, Making it in Prison: The Square, The Cool and the Life, New York: Wiley-Interscience, 1972.

Hopper, Columbus B., Sex in Prison, Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1969.

_____, "Sexual Adjustment in Prisons," Police, vol. 15, no. 3, 1971, pp. 75-76.

Informatics, Inc., Pennsylvania Community Treatment Services: An Evaluation and Proposed Evaluation Information System, Rockville, Md., 1972.

Irwin, John, "The Prison Experience: The Convict World," in Robert M. Carter, Daniel Glaser and Leslie G. Wilkins, eds., Correctional Institutions, New York: J. B. Lippincott Co., 1972.

_____, and Cressey, Donald, "Thieves, Convicts and the Inmate Culture," in D. Arnold, ed., The Sociology of Subcultures, Berkeley, Cal.: Glendessary Press, 1970.

Jeffrey, Robert and Woolpert, Stephan, "Work Furlough as an Alternative to Incarceration: An Assessment of its Effects on Recidivism and Social Cost," Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology, vol. 65, no. 3, (Sept., 1974), pp. 405-415.

Keith, Charles R., Stamm, Richard A., "The Use of the Prison Code as a Defense," Bulletin of Menninger Clinic, vol. 28, no. 5, 1964, pp. 251-259.

Korn, Richard R. and McCorkle, Lloyd W., Criminology and Penology, New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1959.

_____, and McCorkle, Lloyd W., "Resocialization Within Walls," The Annals, vol. 293, (May, 1954).

Markley, Carson W., "Furlough Programs and Conjugal Visiting in Adult Correctional Institutions," Federal Probation, vol. 37, no. 1, 1973.

Massachusetts Department of Correction, "Department of Correction Philosophy," Dept. Order no. 1000.1, Sept. 12, 1973. (mimeo)

Massachusetts Department of Correction, "Monthly Statistical Report of the Furlough Program," January, 1975. (mimeo)

Massachusetts Department of Correction, "Monthly Statistical Report of the Work and Education Release Program," January, 1975. (mimeo)

Massachusetts Department of Correction, "Statistical Tables Describing the Characteristics and Recidivism Rates of 1971 Releasees from Massachusetts MCIs," Compiled by Daniel P. LeClair, August, 1974. (mimeo)

McCleery, Richard H., "Communication Patterns as Bases of Systems of Authority and Power," in Richard Cloward, ed., Theoretical Studies in Social Organization of the Prison, New York: Social Science Research Council, 1960.

_____, "The Governing Process and Informal Social Control," The Prison: Studies in Institutional Organization and Change, New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1961.

Miller, Martin B., "At Hard Labor: Rediscovering the 19th Century Prison," Issues in Criminology, vol. 9, no. 1, 1974, pp. 91-114.

Minton, Robert, Jr., ed., Inside Prison, American Style, New York: Random House, 1971.

Ohlin, Lloyd E., ed., Prisoners in America, Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1973.

_____, Sociology and the Field of Corrections, New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1956.

Powers, Edwin, The Basic Structure of the Administration of Criminal Justice in Massachusetts, (sixth edition), Boston: Massachusetts Correctional Association, 1973.

Raymond, Frank B., "To Punish or to Treat?", Social Work, vol. 19, no. 3, 1974, pp. 305-312.

Rudolf, Alvin and Esselstyn, "Evaluating Work Furlough: A Follow-up," Federal Probation, vol. 37, no. 2, 1973, pp. 48-52.

Schrag, Clarence, "Some Foundations for a Theory of Corrections," in Donald R. Cressey, ed., The Prison: Studies in Institutional Organization and Change, New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1961.

Schwartz, Barry, "Peer vs. Authority Effects in a Correctional Community," Criminology, vol. 11, no. 2, 1973, pp. 233-257.

Scott, Joseph C., "The Use of Discretion in Determining the Severity of Punishment for Incarcerated Offenders," Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology, vol. 65, no. 2, 1974, pp. 214-224.

Studt, Elliot, Messinger, Sheldon L., Wilson, Thomas P., C-Unit: Search for Community in Prison, New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1968.

Swanson, Richard M., Work Release: Toward an Understanding of the Law, Policy, and Operation of Community-Based State Corrections, vol. 2, Carbondale, Ill.: Southern Illinois University, Center for Study of Crime.

Sykes, Gresham M., "Corruption of Authority and Rehabilitation," Social Forces, vol. 34, (March, 1956), pp. 257-262.

_____, Society of Captives, Princeton, N. J.: Princeton University Press, 1958.

_____, and Messinger, Sheldon L., "The Inmate Social System," in Richard Cloward, ed., Theoretical Studies in Social Organization of the Prison, New York: Social Science Research Council, 1960.

Thomas, Charles W., "Toward a More Inclusive Model of the Inmate Contraculture," Criminology, vol. 8, no. 3, pp. 251-262.

Tittle, Charles, "Inmate Organization: Sex Differentiation and the Influence of Criminal Subcultures," American Sociological Review, vol. 34, no. 4, 1969, pp. 492-505.

Waldo, Gordon, Chiricos, Theodore and Dobin, Leonard, Community Contact and Inmate Attitudes: An Experimental Assessment of Work Release, Tallahassee, Fla., Florida State University, Southeastern Correctional Criminological Research Center, 73.

Ward, David A. and Kassebaum, Gene G., Women's Prison: Sex and Social Structure, Chicago: Aldine Publishing Co., 1965.

Wenk, Ernst A. and Frank, Colin, "Some Progress in the Evaluation of Institutional Programs," Federal Probation, vol. 37, no. 3, 1973, pp. 30-37.

Wheeler, Stanton, "Role Conflict in the Correctional Community," in Donald R. Cressey, ed., The Prison: Studies in Institutional Organization and Change, New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1961.

Whelan, Carol S., and Gross, Margery L., Work Release: The N.Y.C. Program, A Preliminary Public Policy Paper, New York: Community Service Society and Youth and Corrections Committee, 1974.

END