Federal Probation

DECEMBER 1986

Federal Probation

A JOURNAL OF CORRECTIONAL PHILOSOPHY AND PRACTICE

Published by the Administrative Office of the United States Courts

VOLUME L DECEMBER 1986 NUMBER 4

This Issue in Brief

Estimates of Drug Use in Intensive Supervision Probationers: Results from a Pilot Study.—Authors Eric D. Wish, Mary Cuadrado, and John A. Martorana present findings from a pilot study of drug use in probationers in the New York City Intensive Supervision Probation (ISP) Program, a study prompted by ISP staff need for on-site urine testing of ISP probationers. Confidential research interviews were conducted with 106 probationers in the Brooklyn ISP program, 71 percent of whom provided a urine specimen for analysis. The urine tests indicated a level of drug use strikingly higher than the level estimated by probation officers, who depended upon the probationers to tell them about their drug use. The authors contend that the costs of reincarcerating drug abusers who fail probation are substantial when compared with the costs of a urine testing program. They conclude that ISP programs, with their small caseloads and emphasis on community supervision, provide a special opportunity for adopting systematic urine testing and for learning how best to intervene with drug abusing offenders.

Felony Probation and Recidivism: Replication and Response.—As a result of the Rand report on felony probation in California, probation supervision is attracting close attention. In the present study, author Gennaro F. Vito examines the recidivism rates of 317 felony probationers from three judicial districts in Kentucky and makes some direct comparisons to the Rand report. The general conclusion that felony probation supervision appears to be relatively effective in controlling recidivism rates is tempered by the limitations of both studies. The author stresses the need to closely examine the purpose and goals of probation supervision.

CONTENTS

111881

The Butner Research Projects: The First 10 Years

BY CRAIG T. LOVE, JANE G. ALLGOOD, AND F. P. SAM SAMPLES*

Introduction

THE FEDERAL Correctional Institution at Butner, North Carolina has a controversial yet rich history. It emerged from a stormy 20-year planning period to become an internationally known institution visited by corrections officials worldwide and emulated on nearly every continent. Corrections experts consider it to be a model prison with a uniquely calm atmosphere. This article presents the results of 10 years of research and operations at this institution.

At the time the institution was opening and receiving inmates, Levinson and Deppe[1] described the mission as being: "(1) to provide intense psychiatric care for severely psychotic and acutely suicidal male and female federal offenders; (2) to provide an opportunity to develop and evaluate a variety of treatment approaches; and, (3) to provide a staff training center for middle management and executive level correctional personnel."[2] The training center never became a reality nor did treatment of psychotic female offenders, but the rest of the mission did come about and was subsequently described by Ingram[3] as consisting of two areas: "(1) to provide a facility for severely psychotic and acutely suicidal Federal offenders and (2) to develop and evaluate a variety of treatment (program) approaches."[4] Ingram described two of the populations housed in the institution: the mental health population and the research population. He discussed the optional programming aspect of the institution for the research inmates and the effect greater personal choice for the inmates had on the entire institution. At the end of the first decade of operation, it is fitting to explore the effect optional programming had on not only "in prison" behavior, but also on recidivism and employability after release.

The first project undertaken in the Butner research program was the implementation and evaluation of a model of imprisonment proposed by Professor Norval Morris.[5] Morris suggested that our society has an investment in preserving the rights, freedom, dignity, and individuality of all its members, including prisoners. To the extent that prison reflects the values of society, it is important that correctional practitioners limit the restrictions placed on prisoners to those necessary to safely confine them. According to Morris, "(p)rison is, in practice, the ultimate power the democratic state exercises over a citizen."[6] The essential principle in his model is to use the minimum coercion necessary to confine the prisoner for the period of time prescribed by the courts. The function of prison staff, beyond the basics of confinement, is to exercise the least amount of necessary control over the daily lives of prisoners and to assist in the protection of their rights, freedoms, and dignity.

Professor Morris explained this concept with four basic principles:

1. Self-help programs must be offered but not required. Special care must be taken to avoid even the appearance of available incentives outside the value of the programs offered.

2. Prisoners must have a predetermined length of stay at the institution. This is one of the mechanisms by which potential staff manipulation is removed.

3. The institution program must include a gradual testing of the prisoner's suitability for release. The gradual release procedure must be unrelated to the inmate's program participation and must be established shortly after the inmate arrives at the institution.

4. "The general pattern of life within the institution should be as similar as possible to the ordinary working life of a citizen in the community."[7] This was to be manifest in such forms as private rooms, personal clothing, and freedom of movement about the institution.

---

*Craig T. Love and Jane G. Allgood are with the Research Department and F. P. Sam Samples is warden at the Federal Correctional Institution, Butner. The opinions expressed in this article are the authors' and do not necessarily express the opinion of the Bureau of Prisons.

[1] Dr. Levinson was administrator, Inmate Program Services, Bureau of Prisons, Washington, D.C. and Dr. Deppe was warden, Federal Correctional Institution, Butner, North Carolina.

[2] Robert B. Levinson, Ph.D. and Donald A. Deppe, Ph.D., "Optional Programming: A Model Structure for the Federal Correctional Institution at Butner," *Federal Probation*, June 1976.

[3] Dr. G. L. Ingram was warden at the Federal Correctional Institution, Butner, North Carolina.

[4] Gilbert L. Ingram, "Butner: A Reality," *Federal Probation*, March 1978.

[5] Norval Morris, *The Future of Imprisonment.* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1974).

[6] *Ibid.*

[7] *Ibid.*

This model was offered at a time when "mainstream" correctional philosophy was undergoing a major upheaval. Martinson's [8] widely distributed paper criticized studies that purported to support the rehabilitation model of corrections. Martinson's paper was interpreted by many in corrections as demonstrating that rehabilitation did not work. Thus, the program suggested by Professor Morris represented a departure from contemporary correctional philosophy and was offered during a period in correctional history that marked the initial decline of the rehabilitation model.

However, the proposed model did not represent a complete departure from the traditional rehabilitation approach. Professor Morris included therapeutic or "small living groups" in the model. They were to include intensive therapeutic sessions in which inmates were encouraged to review their lives and discuss their own involvement in criminal activity. These groups represent the only exception to the voluntary programming feature of the model.

Professor Morris strengthened the utility of his model by specifying the design in which it could be tested. The institution in which the model would be tested must be relatively small (200 inmates) and comprised entirely of participating inmates. Participants would include only inmates who were: 18-35 years of age (to avoid "burnout"); repeat and violent offenders; within 1 to 3 years of release from incarceration (to permit a reasonably timed follow-up); and randomly selected. Selected inmates would be randomly assigned to experimental and control groups. An "opt-out" procedure was prescribed to allow experimental inmates to return to their former institution without any negative consequences. This was offered as an ethical compromise to the requirement that randomly selected inmates be moved to Butner. Morris also stipulated that the study was to be conducted by a group administratively independent of the prison.

According to Morris, the major dependent measures for comparing the randomly assigned experimental and control groups must include: post-release behavior; cost of operating the model; humaneness of the institution; effect of the program on the rest of the prison system; and its effect on staff attitudes and careers. These specifications required a study of the model with difficult and sophisticated inmates and it included a unique approximation of an experimental design. The adaptation of this model and design in an ongoing prison could offer a major contribution to corrections if it could be shown that prisons housing difficult offenders could function without major incidents. It would also be of interest to the correctional community to demonstrate that the Morris model resulted in reduced recidivism rates.

STUDY I: INSTITUTION PERFORMANCE: A University of North Carolina (UNC) research team, under the direction of Professor Lee Bounds, began the project in July 1976. Data included in the study report[9] were limited to inmates released after January 1, 1977. Problems in implementing the study required the elimination of data from inmates released prior to that date.

Bounds et al. defined their mission as the assessment of the effects of the model prison on inmate behavior and on the administrative management of that institution. The UNC team also assumed the task of identifying the elements of the model that were actually implemented. It is important to note that the model was assessed within the total institution environment, and the impact of each element of the model was not separately assessed.

Morris specified his model of imprisonment with the Illinois State Prison System in mind. As a result, he assumed the model prison would operate within the administrative and philosophical confines of that system. Differences between the Illinois State Prison System and the Federal Prison System were addressed in making modifications to the model when implementing it at FCI Butner.

One of the major differences from the model noted by Bounds et al. was the fact that only two of seven living units included participants in the research program. That is, the entire institution was not included in the program. Nonetheless, the institution, at the time of the study, accommodated individual housing for 340 inmates and was relatively small in comparison with other Federal prisons. FCI Butner has the physical design of most new Federal prisons including separate administrative buildings with individual housing units surrounding a central compound offering support functions and program facilities. This is quite similar to the arrangements envisioned by Morris. Most other deviations included composition of staff and a few differences in Bureau furlough policies. The remaining characteristics of the model specified by Professor Morris were, in fact, implemented at Butner.

Method

Subjects: Participants were randomly selected from a pool of all eligible male inmates in the custody of the Bureau of Prisons from July 1, 1976 through May 1, 1979. They were randomly assigned to the

[8] R. L. Martinson, "What Works? Questions and Answers about Prison Reform," *Public Interest*, 35:1974, p. 22-34.

[9] V. L. Bounds et al., *Evaluation Study of a Model of Imprisonment Tested at the Butner FCI: Final Report.* (Chapel Hill: Institute for Research in the Social Sciences, 1979).

experimental treatment at Butner (n = 460) or remained in their respective institutions serving as the control group (n = 258). However, because of initial difficulties in establishing the project, only 687 prisoners were included in the study (438 Butner experimental and 249 controls).

Bounds et al. maintained the distinction between release status groups. The experimental and control groups were roughly equivalent in distributions of: CTE—inmates whose sentences were continued to expiration (64.4 percent); FPD—inmates assigned fixed parole dates by the U.S. Parole Commission (23.0 percent); and IRH—inmates assigned release dates by the U.S. Parole Commission shortly after being selected for participation (12.7 percent). The sample included in the Butner experimental group was reduced by 93 Butner experimental inmates who exercised their option to return to their former institution ("opt-outs") and 10 control FPD inmates who were not informed of their parole dates. The resulting sample included 584 prisoners comprised of 345 experimental and 239 control prisoners.

All Federal prisoners were eligible who:
- — had one or more prior convictions and/or
- — had a conviction for a violent offense.
- — were between 18 and 35 years of age.
- — had a release date within 1 to 3 years of selection.
- — did not require special mental or physical care beyond that offered in any Federal prison.
- — were not involved in notorious crimes or members of militant groups.
- — had a release residence in the Southeast part of the United States.

Procedure: Members of the experimental group were transferred to FCI, Butner from their previous institutions. They were informed by the unit team that they would have 90 days in which to decide whether they would remain at Butner or return to their previous institution (i.e., "opt-out"). They were also told that they would maintain this "opt-out" privilege throughout their stay at Butner. After the 90-day period, each inmate had a formal meeting with the unit team during which he expressed his decision. Inmates who chose to remain at the facility were given graduated release plans that specified dates of furlough eligibility, town trips, and dates of release to a half-way house. It was also specified that their program participation would not affect these dates, and they were encouraged, but not required, to participate in the small living groups. The control inmates were not informed of their participation in the project and only central file data were collected from them.

Inmates in the Butner group were interviewed on arrival (Phase I) and during the middle portion of their stay (Phase II). Staff members at Butner were also interviewed periodically during the course of the study. Central file data were collected from institution records of both the experimental and control groups. These data provided information on program participation, incident reports, work assignments, and visitation.

Results

Descriptive Characteristics: Bounds et al. reported no statistically significant differences between the Butner experimental and control groups (See table 1). The greatest difference was found in comparisons of the two groups on longest prior sentence. The experimental group served an average of 36.4 months, but the control group had served an average of 28.0 months. This difference is in question because data were not available from nearly one-third of the total population (101 cases missing from the experimental and 74 from the control groups).

TABLE 1. COMPARISONS OF BUTNER RESEARCH PARTICIPANTS AND "OPT-OUTS" AND CONTROL GROUP INMATES*

Variable	Butner		Other Instituions
	Research Groups		Control Group
	Remained (n = 345)	*"Opt-outs"* (n = 93)	(n = 249)
Race			
nonwhite	180 (53.4%)	40 (41.7%)	120 (52.2%)
white	157 (46.6)	56 (58.3)	110 (47.8)
Marital Status			
married	109 (35.7)	26 (28.9)	80 (37.9)
single	92 (30.2)	32 (35.6)	73 (34.6)
other	104 (34.1)	32 (35.6)	58 (27.5)
Mean Age	34.9	34.8	34.5
Mean Education	9.9	10.1	9.9
Mean Age at First Arrest	17.8	17.8	18.0
Total Number of Prior Arrests	11.6	10.0	11.8
Total Number Prior Commitments of 6 or more months	3.3	3.0	3.0
Longest Prior Sentence	36.4	36.6	28.0
Length of Current Sentence	80.1	52.8	73.6
Severity of Offense	3.9	3.8	4.2
Salient Factor Score	4.7	5.1	4.6

*Adapted from data provided by Bounds et al.

Other characteristics of the two groups suggest a sophisticated criminal population. For example, the combined mean age at first arrest (17.9 years) reflects the large number of offenders (23.1 percent) who were first arrested while 5 to 14 years of age. Nearly half (47.8 percent) were arrested for the first time during their 15th to 19th years.

The 93 inmates who "opted-out" differ from the remaining experimental inmates only in terms of the length of their current sentence. That difference was statistically significant ($p = .01$). The "opt-outs" had an average of 52.8 months to serve, and the balance of the research inmates had an average of 80.1 months to serve in their total sentence. They did not differ on any other variables.

Inmate Adjustment: Complete data were available for 345 Butner research inmates and 239 control inmates. In general, Butner research inmates committed slightly fewer incidents than did their control group counterparts. More Butner inmates had zero incident reports attributed to them (68.7 percent) than did the control group (64.9 percent) during the 3-year observation period. Further, the control group included a slightly greater number of inmates with more than one incident report (17.9 percent) than did the experimental group (14.2 percent). However, the mean number of incidents (adjusted for exposure time) per Butner research inmate (.610) did not differ significantly from the control group rate (.775). The distributions of the two incident rates is highly skewed (nearly two-thirds of the scores in each group are zero) and may mask any differences that exist.

Mean severity levels of incidents, adjusted for time of exposure to the respective Butner or control facilities, showed no significant differences between the experimental and control groups. The severity levels of infractions committed by the control group were slightly higher (adjusted mean = 1.57) than were infractions committed by the experimental group (adjusted mean = 1.26).

Incident reports are a function of several factors in any given institution including: inmate behavior; expectations of staff regarding inmate behavior; and the institution policy and philosophy of rule enforcement. One general basis for differentiation of these factors is security level of the institution. For example, a light punch on the arm by one inmate on another might be viewed differently by staff at a camp than it would at a level 5 penitentiary. The Security/Custody Classification program provides a means of identifying institutions and inmates in terms of security levels provided and needed, respectively. Love and Ingram[10] used this approach to compare the Butner research inmates at each security level with inmates of matching security levels in other institutions. Inmate-on-inmate assault rates at Butner (0.15 assaults per 100 inmates per month) were found to be more comparable to the rate of level 2 inmates (0.12) than level 3 (0.27) or 4 (0.28) institutions. This is a significant finding since more than 70 percent of Butner's research inmates are classified in the higher security levels (3, 4, and 5).

Program Participation: Data used in these analyses were drawn from the Inmate Program Reporting System (IPRS) which Bounds et al. noted has limited reliability. The IPRS data monitors inmate enrollments, withdrawals, and completions of programs in vocational training and education, recreation, counseling, psychology, and release programs.

Based on available data, it is reasonable to assume that the two groups were exposed to roughly equivalent program opportunities. Program offerings at Butner were not substantially different from those of any other institution in the Bureau of Prisons. Further, frequencies of incomplete records, pending programs (ongoing or reports not yet complete) were no different between the control and experimental groups, according to Bounds et al.

Butner experimental inmates enrolled in and completed more programs than did the control group inmates. The mean number of program enrollments (adjusted for time in residence) for the experimental group (3.48) is more than double the control group enrollment rate (1.46). A similar difference occurred with occupational and educational programs. The adjusted mean number of experimental group enrollments (1.93) is more than twice that of the control group (0.98). Overall completion rate differences are even stronger. The experimental group completed more than three times as many total programs as the control group (adjusted means = 2.73 and 0.93, respectively). Educational and vocational programs showed similar differences. All differences are statistically significant.

Inmate Perceptions of Butner: Staff of the UNC team interviewed Butner research inmates from 60 to 90 days (Phase I) and 6 or more months (Phase II) after their arrival at the institution. These data were included to provide an additional subjective perspective of the effects of the Butner model. Nearly all (98 percent) of the inmates approached consented to participate in both interviews.

The type of institution from which the inmates came appears to have influenced their attitudes toward the two institutions. In general, the higher the security level of the inmate's previous institution, the more likely he would expect to like Butner and less likely he would want to return to his previous institution. A vast majority of camp and level 1 in-

[10] C. T. Love and G. L. Ingram, "Prison Disturbances: Suggestions for Future Solutions," *New England Journal of Prison Law*, 8: 1982, p. 393-426.

mates liked their previous institution (84.3 percent) and few (12.5 percent) expected to like Butner. Exactly half of these inmates planned to return to their previous institutions. This contrasts with the reported attitudes of inmates from higher security institutions. Only 9.8 percent of the penitentiary inmates expected to return to their former institutions with 42.8 percent reporting they liked their previous institution.

Inmate perceptions of Butner were usually formed before the inmates arrived and tended to have a positive bias, according to the interviews. Most inmates expected to like the facility, and this expectation was colored by the type of institution from which they came as well as Butner's reputation among inmates and Bureau of Prisons staff. The UNC research team noted that these factors were not related to ratings of specific aspects of the Butner model. Nor did the manner in which they were transferred, housing status changes, or program offerings influence inmates' ratings of other aspects of the institution. There is little support to the argument that these factors had any lasting influence on the behavior or attitudes of the Butner research inmates.

Research inmates did not perceive program offerings at Butner to be much different from those at other institutions. When asked to identify differences between Butner and their previous institution, 12.1 percent of the inmates claimed Butner's programs were better and 5.3 percent claimed they were worse. Further, one of the major reasons given for inmate opt-outs was to return to a program available at their previous institution (14.6 percent) but not available at Butner. Others chose to return to their previous institutions because of a general lack of programs available at Butner (7.3 percent). The most positive aspect of programs at Butner mentioned by the inmates was that they were voluntary (9.2 percent).

At the end of the initial 90-day waiting period, inmates were offered their first opportunity to return to their former facility (i.e., to opt-out). The Phase I interview was scheduled to coincide with the inmate's decision to stay or leave. One specific question dealt with the basis for the inmate's decision. The 334 inmates who chose to stay listed several factors which influenced them, including: "hassle going back" (24.0 percent); "closer to family" (20.0 percent); "programs" (19.2 percent); "living conditions" (16.8 percent); "release opportunities" (16.5 percent); and "better staff" (10.5 percent). The major reasons given by the 82 (19.1 percent) inmates who opted to leave included: "further from family" (53.6 percent); "release opportunities" (15.8 percent); "programs at previous institution" (14.6 percent); and "prisoners worse at Butner" (14.6 percent).

Inmates were asked to rate, on a four-point scale, their satisfaction with several identified features of Butner. The five features most frequently rated in the highest (most positive) category were: "inside appearance of Butner" (95.4 percent); "cleanliness of unit" (93.2 percent); "safety of unit" (93.0 percent); "newness of Butner" (92.3 percent); and "physical layout" (87.7 percent).

Inmates Perspective Regarding Butner after 6 or More Months: Phase II interviews were conducted on all inmates who had served at least 6 months at Butner. Of the 135 inmates eligible for interview, 6 were not available for various reasons and 3 declined to be interviewed. This represented a 98 percent acceptance rate which is similar to the acceptance rate for Phase I interviews. The participating inmates included 46 percent white and 54 percent nonwhite. Custody status at the time of the interview was 53.9 percent with "community" custody, 28.6 percent "out" custody, 12.7 percent "in" custody, and 4.8 percent "close" custody. This represents a reduction in custody for 76.2 percent of the inmates, an increase for 3.9 percent, and no change for 19.9 percent. A majority of the inmates were in single-bunked rooms (70.6 percent) with 19.8 percent being in double-bunked rooms and 9.6 percent in open bay areas.

Inmates reported being satisfied with their units with "safety" being the most highly rated with 94.4 percent of the inmates rating it as satisfactory. The other items included: "friendliness" (93.6 percent); "cleanliness" (86.1 percent); "fellow prisoners" (76.1 percent); "quietness" (64.9 percent); and "staff" (61 percent). Approximately 84 percent reported liking their jobs within the institution.

Table 2 shows factors inmates felt made it either easy or hard to do time at Butner. The responses to

TABLE 2. INMATE-GENERATED DESCRIPTIONS OF WHAT MADE IT "HARD TO DO TIME AT BUTNER" AND "EASY TO DO TIME AT BUTNER"
(Responses listed represent the 5 most frequently given responses to each item)

Things that made it hard to do time at Butner		Things that made it easy to do time at Butner	
Response	*Percent of Respondents*	*Response*	*Percent of Respondents*
Nothing	30.1%	Safe and Relaxed	32.5%
Boredom	23.8	Loose Security	27.7
Poor Prisoners (snitches, mental health, etc.)	17.5	Living Conditions	25.4
Staff Playing Games	11.9	Open Communications	25.4
Bad Attitudes of Staff	6.3	Voluntarism in Programs	17.5

what makes it easy are in keeping with the Morris model. The safe and relaxed atmosphere, loose or seemingly relaxed internal security, and open communications are all areas Morris wanted achieved with his model.

The elimination of coercion in program enrollments is a central feature of the Morris model. When asked about the influence program participation had on staff helpfulness toward them, 53 percent of the inmates felt it affected staff, 42 percent felt it did not affect staff, and 5 percent were undecided. The perceived effect program participation had on custody changes was similar with 47 percent of the inmates feeling it affected custody changes and 48 percent feeling it did not. This also held true for perceived effect on furloughs with 40 percent feeling program participation affected furloughs and 54 percent feeling it did not.

An additional major feature of the Morris model is the Graduated Release Plan. The plan is designed to provide inmates a systematic testing of their release readiness and to establish eligibility dates for furloughs, town trips, and half-way house transfers at the outset of their stay at Butner. Most respondents (69.1 percent) felt they had no input in their programs and 12.2 percent thought they had a lot of influence. Nonetheless, a majority (52.8 percent) were satisfied or very satisfied with their plans and 41 percent were dissatisfied or very dissatisfied with the plans provided. A frequently cited reason for their satisfaction is that they liked the certainty established by the plan. This level of satisfaction is surprisingly strong in light of the report that 56.1 percent of the inmates were not consulted prior to the assignment of the program and only 39.8 percent did participate in the development of the plan. The remaining respondents did not remember whether or not they talked with the staff before the team meeting.

Staff Perspectives about Butner: The staff members at Butner were surveyed in 1977 and again in 1979 for their perceptions of how the institution was operating and how well the institution was accomplishing its mission. The Correctional Institution Environment Scale[11] was used in both years along with an instrument titled "Butner Staff Survey" developed by the UNC team to assess management styles and issues. The focus of the UNC team was highly theoretical and did not yield many of the facts commonly found on survey instruments used by the Bureau of Prisons.

The staff survey showed a generally positive attitude toward Butner as an institution and toward the programs offered. Approximately 75 percent of the staff members were satisfied with the level of personal safety they felt they had on the job in the 1977 survey and in 1979. They were nearly unanimous in their approval of the degree of open communication between inmates and staff while being aware of the inherent danger in familiarity between inmates and staff. The physical layout of the institution was acceptable to 60 percent of the staff and 75 percent of the staff members were satisfied with the level of cleanliness of the institution.

Before arriving at Butner, approximately 75 percent of the staff expected to like the institution and their jobs within the facility. In both 1977 and 1979, approximately 40 percent of the correctional officers felt they were involved or very involved in their jobs. The unit staff members had 60 percent feeling high involvement in their jobs during the 1977 survey and only 33 percent feeling they had high involvement in 1979. When asked if they would still come to Butner if they had that decision to make again, 50 percent stated they would again decide to come to this facility.

STUDY II: FOLLOWUP EVALUATION: Witte, Woodbury, Smith, Barreto, and Beaton[12] reported the effects of the Butner model on post-release behavior of the inmates in Study I. They predicted that the noncoercive features of Butner would result in better post-release performance among the experimental group than the control group. The authors concluded from a review of the Bounds et al. study that the initial similarities of the Butner experimental control group inmates in the random assignment procedure allowed the assumption to hold that differences in post-release performance between the two groups could "be unambiguously attributed to program participation."[13] Post-release performance was measured in terms of rearrest, conviction, and other criminal behavior variables, as well as economic and labor performance data.

Method

All experimental and control inmates identified in the Bounds et al. study were eligible to participate in this portion of the study. There were a total of 724 experimental and control inmates for whom an attempt was made to collect data. There was no significant difference between the experimental and control inmates in number of missing cases.

---

[11] R. Moos, *Evaluating Correctional and Community Settings*. (New York: John Wiley, 1975).

[12] A. D. Witte et al., *The Effects of a Less Coercive Internal Prison Environment and Gradual Reintegration on Post-Release Performance: An Evaluation of Morris' Model of Imprisonment as Implemented at the Federal Correctional Institution at Butner, NC*. (Chapel Hill: Institute for Research in the Social Sciences, 1983).

[13] Bounds et al., p. ii.

Parole data were available on 396 of 418 individuals who were on parole. Income data were provided by the Social Security Administration in clusters, providing salary levels for groups of 4 or 5 inmates at a time. These data were available for 691 of the 724 eligible inmates. Post-release performance of inmates released through 1979 was monitored during 1980 and 1981.

Results

During the followup period, approximately 58 percent of the experimental group and 52 percent of the control group were arrested with 65 percent of those arrested in the experimental group being convicted and 60 percent of those from the control group being convicted of a new offense. When the number of new offenses was examined, it was found that the experimental group had an average of 1.3 arrests and 0.6 convictions during the followup period as compared to 1.1 arrests and 0.5 convictions for the control group. The experimental group included 40 percent of its members arrested for a crime against persons and 30 percent for a crime against property while the control group included approximately 30 percent arrested for a crime against persons and 45 percent for a crime against property. The length of time from release to first arrest was also examined with the experimental group experiencing no arrests for approximately 16 months and the control group for 14 months.

The post-release labor market performance was based on data provided by the parole officers and the Social Security Administration. Overall, the control group individuals received a higher wage on their first job after release, but the experimental group individuals improved their hourly wage rate by more than did the control group. The control group averaged approximately $4.90 an hour as compared to $4.65 for the experimental group as starting wage with the experimental group members increasing their wage an average of $0.62 as compared to $0.40 per hour. The study by Witte et al. demonstrates no tangible differences between the two groups. Variance does exist on some variables but not at a level that has any real significance for correctional administrators. In her general summary of her study, she states it was neither a total success nor a total failure thereby indicating it neither hurt the two groups nor did it particularly help the two groups in post-release criminal activity and post-release employment.

General Conclusions

Program Implications: The results of the series of research studies have been mixed. On the one hand, it has been clearly demonstrated that a group of sophisticated and dangerous offenders can be successfully housed in an environment predicated on the concept of humane incarceration which includes emphasis on individual rights and freedom as part of the confinement. This population, which is usually difficult to manage, functions very well under these circumstances. When inmates were allowed to volunteer for programs, they not only participated in more programs, but also completed more programs. They also had fewer disciplinary problems and fewer assaults than is usually obtained from inmates of the same security level in other institutions. The failure to achieve a major breakthrough in the followup was disappointing but not surprising. The rates showed no difference, leading to the conclusion that the model has not done any harm nor has it resulted in any improvement in post-release criminal behavior.

The most important contribution of this research rests on its demonstration of a viable philosophy that leads to the successful management of prisoners. The model has resulted in a more positive environment and rendered a difficult, hardcore population of prisoners easier to manage.

Management Implications: One of the side effects of this type of prison environment is that traditional management techniques are not as effective and a new management philosophy is necessary. In fact, prison administrators from around the world have made the common observation that correctional institutions have a personality of their own. Although there are many obvious features about FCI, Butner that contribute to its relaxed atmosphere, one must consider the institution as a total milieu in addition to understanding the functions of its individual parts.

The clearly and consistently expressed multiple missions of FCI, Butner (research, mental health, and general population) differ in their goals and involve highly trained staff members from many different disciplines. These departmental staff members, nonetheless, are highly cooperative and very sensitive to each other

Management requirements of the institution are exceptionally complex, and to understand the institution and how it "works" is to understand the function of each organizational facet and its integration into the total organization. There are many power groups who demand optimum conditions to achieve their departmental goals. The major influences within the institution are centered on the executive staff and its subordinate functions, mental health staff, correctional services staff, living unit staff, and industries staff. The parameters of discretion among major centers of decisionmaking areas are delicately balanced and can be disrupted with the least amount

of change. The most important management tools for the continued success of this institution are communication and flexibility. Any slight change in operating policy for one staff group will probably affect other staff groups.

As a result, the warden of this type of institution is the goal-setter, the leader, and the referee. The warden has no greater responsibility than to ensure that every department head in the institution works within the administratively established parameters so that the many delicate power and responsibility balances are kept in near perfect harmony. The balancing act to assure that all institutional missions are being achieved has come about due to many factors, including the historical development of the institution's missions, the varying work environments required to carry out the missions, the philosophic and/or professional orientation of a large segment of staff, and dictates of Bureau of Prisons policy.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bounds, V. L. and A. G. Beza, G. Fernandez, K. A. Hardy, J. Carlson. *Evaluation Study of a Model of Imprisonment Tested at the Butner FCI: Final Report.* Chapel Hill: Institute for Research in the Social Sciences, 1979.

Grizzle, Gloria and A. Starmer, C. Koch. "Analysis of Categorical Data by Linear Models," *Biometrics* 25:1969 p. 489-504.

Ingram, Gilbert L., "Butner: A Reality." *Federal Probation,* March 1978.

Levinson, Robert B. and Donald A. Deppe. "Optional Programming: A Model Structure for the Federal Correctional Institution at Butner," *Federal Probation,* June 1976.

Love, Craig T. and Gilbert L. Ingram, "Prison Disturbances: Suggestions for Future Solutions," *New England Journal on Prison Law* 8:1982 p. 393-426.

Martinson, R. L. "What Works? Questions and Answers about Prison Reform," *Public Interest* 35:1974 p. 22-34.

Moos, R. *Evaluating Correctional and Community Settings.* New York: John Wiley, 1975.

Morris, Norval. *The Future of Imprisonment.* Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1974.

Witte, A. D. and D. Woodbury, S. Smith, H. Barreto, and R. Beaton. *The Effects of a Less Coercive Internal Prison Environment and Gradual Reintegration on Post-Release Performance: An Evaluation of Morris' Model as Implemented at the Federal Correctional Institution at Butner, NC.* Chapter Hill: Center for Research in the Social Sciences, 1983.