ERRATA: The volume number on the June and September 1983 issues of FEDERAL PROBATION is incorrectly shown as Volume XXXVII: 46 instead of Volume XXXVII: 47.

Public Relations in Probation—U.S. Probation Officer Eugene Kelly outlines the need of probation offices for public relations so that the community can be more aware of the philosophy that motivates probation workers. He also examines the role of the media—television, press, radio, college—and advocates a specific program for developing interns in parole and probation.

Academic and Practical Aspects of Probation: A Comparison—In the practical world of probation, probation officers emphasize logic or common sense, subjective criteria, rules and guidelines, a maximum caseload size, and processing defendants quickly and skillfully. The academic world of probation emphasizes knowledge for its own sake, objective data, and empirical research. Dr. James D. Davis of the New York City Department of Probation concludes that it may be dysfunctional to mix the academic and practical worlds of probation since each has its own role in criminal justice.

Profit in the Private Presentence Report—Four basic issues raise a question about the appropriateness of private presentence reports, according to U.S. Probation Officer Chester J. Kullas. They are: (i) whether the private sector has a legitimate role in a quasi-judicial function such as sentencing; (ii) whether private presentence reports thwart need of reform of the probation function and sentencing; (iii) whether private reports are truly cost-effective; and (iv) whether the private practitioner has an ethical tendency to compromise the sentencing process.

Reducing the Cost and Complexity of Probation Evaluation—Professor Magnus Soong of Loyola University of Chicago believes that, while evaluation is sometimes complex and expensive, it need not be. His article examines two misconceptions or myths.
there is no question that there is a great need for public relations in probation. Probation as a human service is a relatively new development in social services. It needs to be defined and identified, and its various services need to be explained. The community generally classifies probation with juvenile service. Little is known about the existence of even such a fundamental document as the presentence report. Editors of newspapers, as a general rule, eliminate reporting that a presentence report is being prepared. Some years ago one newspaper in Chicago used for its logo the slogan, "Abolish Parole." Frequently it has been said that probation officers are reluctant to discuss their job not because of confidentiality of reports but because of a feeling that there is not a socially acceptable profession in society. The probation officer as a member of the community is a second-class citizen. Moreover, probation is a public service and the community has a right to know what this office is doing just as they know about the role and function of the district attorney's office. Unless, therefore, he speaks out, all of the good that this service does will remain unknown.

Public relations is "developing reciprocal understanding and good will." It is also, "the conscious effort of an organization to explain itself to those with whom it has or would have dealings." Public relations is a generally well understood concept in most social organizations. Normally a private agency could not function without good and ongoing public relations. Most businesses know that they would have no customers and few full public relations and widespread knowledge of their product or services. Probation needs a special kind of public relations which differs with each "public" that is encountered. The first of the "publics" regularly contacted by probation officers is the clients. They may be called, "criminals," "offenders," a "case load," or just "the cases," but they are the human beings who, for a wide variety of reasons, find themselves convicted of a state or Federal offense which brings them into contact with the office of the district attorney or the probation officer, first as an investigator and then, in many cases, as a regular counselor. Public relations begins with this first contact with the client. Projecting himself as an interested, efficient, competent and well-informed public official dealing with his client in the first public relations function of the probation officer.

In addition to this key role, a probation officer encounters a number of other persons in the court and correctional system. These include judges, defense attorneys, prosecuting attorneys, social workers, hospital personnel, and jail personnel. Probation officers should as a matter of practice have an open door to all members of the "court family." This should incline him, for example, to give new judges and other lawyers a full explanation of the role of probation and the duties of the probation officer. This can be done formally by a full program outlining the probation officer's role or informally by office chats and exchanges of views. Both techniques service a specific function.

Probation officers, more than any other agency of state or Federal Government, unite what are described as human service functions and police duties. Each of these has a somewhat different role and a different philosophy. In reality they both offer a social agency service that, like probation, is often misunderstood. Police, although often defined differently, function as helping persons in many situations. Social service agencies often investigate clients in situations that sometimes are more difficult than the regular arrest. Probation officers share both these roles. Most probation officers can share the frustration of both agencies and may be able to bring to the task of each that is special to the probation function.

Probation has a special role in addressing the problem of the development of new community agencies. This brings into the system a number of different "publics" which must be managed in different ways. The probation officer as an investigator often knocks on doors and interviews people of different classes in society. He encounters the very poor, the middle class, and occasionally members of the upper classes. Perhaps, a Federal probation officer encounters more recreation leaders than other probation officers because of the various offenses that are special to Federal courts; nevertheless, all probation officers interview employers, landlords, school officials and
The Incidence of Sex and Sexual Aggression in Federal Prisons*

By Peter L. Nacr, Ph.D., and Thomas R. Kane, Ph.D.**

I. Introduction

Considerable outbreak of violence at the United States Penitentiary at Lewisburg, Pennsylvania, prompted the national investigation, by Federal Prison System researchers, of the nature of sexual aggression and homosexual activity that is described in this article. Normally a calm institution, Lewisburg experienced 8 inmate murders in a 26-month period, simultaneously, there were numerous inmate-on-inmate assaults warranting referral to the FBI for investigation. The assaults included violent stabbings and attempted homicides that fell just short of murder.

This study began as an effort to test receptivity to franchising as a means to prison industries improvements. The study findings go beyond this issue, however, in that the problems identified as limiting franchising can be expected to delimit most other industries' reform efforts as well. At the same time, our field work placed prison industry programs have been considerable in the past few years. In historical perspective these two findings are not contradictory because prison industry today is in a period of transition. Industries' historical dependency on the larger correctional agency which it serves seems to be lessening. Industries is gaining its own organizational identity through a combination of enabling legislation and institutional leadership. Every state visited had some unique program element, worthy of emulation by other states' industries.

The task now is to develop an industries organization that will synthesize these several models and offer a new approach to franchising. Those industries managers an emphasis on marketing was more important than prior reliance on franchising as a predictor of their receptivity to franchising. Those managers whose expertise was more in management or finance were less receptive than those with sales backgrounds. To some extent, these qualities also parallel willingness to take risks. At the same time, it should be recognized that management skills are necessary because marketing backgrounds are more dependent on outside expertise for the needed technical capabilities to implement new programs.

Franchising concepts' applicability to industries was generally accepted by industries managers and DOC directors. There seemed to be little commonality among those expressing caveats to any particular mode of interstate cooperation or coordination. While those characterized as risk-takers were highly enthusiastic, too were many of the more conservative respondents. In sum, there was no single or even several factors that distinguished those interested but with reservations about feasibility.

Summary and Conclusions

This study began as an effort to test receptivity to the introduction of franchising as a means to prison industries improvements. The study findings go beyond this issue, however, in that the problems identified as limiting franchising can be expected to delimit most other industries' reform efforts as well. At the same time, our field work placed prison industry programs have been considerable in the past few years. In historical perspective these two findings are not contradictory because prison industry today is in a period of transition. Industries' historical dependency on the larger correctional agency which it serves seems to be lessening. Industries is gaining its own organizational identity through a combination of enabling legislation and institutional leadership. Every state visited had some unique program element, worthy of emulation by other states' industries.

The task now is to develop an industries organization that will synthesize these several models and offer a new approach to franchising. Those industries managers an emphasis on marketing was more important than prior reliance on franchising as a predictor of their receptivity to franchising. Those managers whose expertise was more in management or finance were less receptive than those with sales backgrounds. To some extent, these qualities also parallel willingness to take risks. At the same time, it should be recognized that management skills are necessary because marketing backgrounds are more dependent on outside expertise for the needed technical capabilities to implement new programs.

Information and accomodation

The several franchising options studied here included both private-sector involvement and those with industries' programs. Explicitly and implicitly these options cover the gamut of modern industries reform proposals. Viewed in the context of more general phenomena, differences in receptivity may more represent how far different industries programs have come from franchising's likely potential for the future. From this perspective, however, receptivity was found to vary, occasion, the continuation of present trends toward the reduced prominence of prison industries.

In response to this outbreak of violence, Mr. Carlisle, Director of the Federal Prison System, convened a special task force to investigate problems at Lewisburg. The task force determined that among other things, Lewisburg accepted too many "management" problems than were transferred to other penitentiaries. Furthermore, there appeared to be an inordinate amount of violence linked to homosexual activity among inmates; 5 of the 8 homicides had sexual motivations, including sexpressing, unrequited love, and jealousy. A quarter of the major assaults were linked to inmate homosexuality.

Although the heightened level of violence at Lewisburg was abnormal, the general association of homosexual activity and prison violence is a well-known phenomenon in American prisons. In one calendar year 22 percent of inmate aggression in the California State System had homosexual undertakings, according to one authority, Hans Toch (1965). Another important investigation revealed that homosexual activity was the treated warrant for over one-third of inmate homicides in American prisons (Sylvestre, et al., 1977).

Questions needing resolution quickly were focused after the researchers surveyed the literature and discussed associated management issues with key administrators, correctional officers, and inmates. Clearly, homosexual activity and violence are related circularly. Homosexual activity produced violence at Lewisburg both as an incidental force as when there was strong affection between lovers and one partner acted out violently when spurned and, as a direct motive, e.g., the case of sexual assault—rape—of sex expressing that becomes a violent exchange. On the other hand, homosexual activity can be a byproduct of violence. Davis' (1969) account of
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*This is the first article of a two-part report on sex in Federal prisons. The second article on inmate involvement and employee impact will appear in the March 1984 issue of FEDERAL PROBATION.
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The survey was distributed to the inmates by a research associate who worked in the institution. Officer surveys were anonymous—there were no identifiers and they were mailed directly back to the Office of Research by the officer. These procedures facilitate honest responding.

### Results

#### I. MEASURE OF SAMPLE QUALITY

##### A. Sampling Representations—Sixty-four percent of inmates the interviewer contacted took the survey. Aggregate data were used to compare the average Federal inmate with the sample. There were very few differences except that the sample was slightly more criminally sophisticated (i.e., more arrests, more convictions and incarcerations). This probably occurred because halfway houses were not included in the study (but are in population statistics).

The argument that “hardened” inmates would not agree to be interviewed does not hold. Another analysis showed that the interviewees were not dissimilar from prisoners who were selected but who declined to be interviewed (noncooperators). The exception was that there were slightly more blacks and slightly fewer whites in the sample.

### SIX IN FEDERAL PRISONS

#### WHY INMATES PARTICIPATE IN HOMOSEXUAL ACTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Situation in the Social Psychological Environment</th>
<th>Participant's Sexual Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Isolation, deprivation, abundance of male cues, problems with important social others—especially family</td>
<td>Willing Participant in homosexual role; approval change toward endorsing horizontal involvement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isolation, deprivation, abundance of female cues, problems with important social others—especially family</td>
<td>Willing Participant in heterosexual role; approval change toward endorsing horizontal involvement.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### B. Actors in the Inmates' Environment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Situation in the Social Psychological Environment</th>
<th>Participant's Sexual Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target becomes a sexual aggressor/hostile prison guard</td>
<td>Compliant &quot;homosexual&quot; or situational homosexual: may suffer self-internalization when released for not having received environmental pressures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target becomes a &quot;fag,&quot; &quot;punk,&quot; or &quot;tranny&quot;</td>
<td>Target may be called a &quot;trick&quot; or &quot;punk.&quot; Often repudiated as &quot;homosexual&quot;—depreciated by inmates if mobile or unwilling to retaliate—may incur great psychological pain. May be killed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1. The 17 prisons were proportionately distributed across the level 5 to level 1 security system by population size.
II. Validity of the Instrument, and the Confirmation of the Features 

A. Level of Analysis

B. Survey Reliability—Statistical analysis of inmate survey reliability were performed to determine whether the instrument responded consistently. The results demonstrated convincingly that the survey is reliable. Other specialized analyses of validity, e.g., factor and cluster analyses, showed how much each subscale of items worked as a group to measure significant aspects of inmates' behavior. The analyses demonstrate the validity of the instrument and the confirmation of the functioning of Models I and II strongly support the experimental techniques used.

II. Inmate Sample

A. Demographics—A profile of the respondents was prepared. The average inmate is just under 34 years old. Forty-six percent are Black, 11 percent are Hispanic and 40 percent Caucasian + nonminimally. By comparison, 11.7 percent of the total U.S. population are Black and 6.5 percent are Hispanic, so these two groupings are highly overrepresented in the Federal Prison System. The sample's religious affiliation is predominantly Protestant (42%) followed by Catholic (34%) and Muslim (8%). The average height is 5'10" and weight is 174 lbs. The interviewer rated 51 percent of the inmates "muscular," 38 percent "stocky" and 12 percent "thin."

B. Incarceration—The average inmate has had 11 arrests, 2 felony convictions, has been in 4.6 different jails and 4 different correctional institutions. Five percent of the sample had spent 2 or more training schools before their 19th birthday. The average inmate had been confined 6 years of their life. They had been in their current institution just under 1.5 years. Five percent had been convicted of sex related offenses. Finally, the average sentence length of inmates sampled was 125 months.

C. Childhood—Family background of the sample typically involved frequent changes and incarcerations of parents (or absence of father altogether); however many inmates report that they had had a warm relationship with a significant parent figure. A third of the sample were raised by women alone and both parents were present in the home for 57 percent of the sample. Seventy-six percent said that the mother (or surrogate mother) was primarily responsible for child rearing.

D. Attitudes toward Sex—Altogether, inmates responded conservatively to 13 of 15 sex attitude items. The items were borrowed from other national surveys (Kinsey, et al., 1948; Reiss, 1967; Hunt, 1976). A comparison with the national samples is instructive and shows that compared with free males, the prison sample is more conservative (less accepting) regarding (taxable) adult males had had a homosexual experience in their current Federal Institution. To estimate the actual number of penitentiary "participants," it is better to use figures from a question that asked, "Have you had a homosexual experience in a prison as an adult?"—30 percent of the penitentiary inmates stated that they had. Assuming that the pressures to underreport (fear of detection, appearing unmanly) outweigh pressures to overreport (desire to legitimize the Federal system—liberalizing factors or pressure for conjugal visit program), the more general statement regarding sex. For a managerial perspective, the long standing lover relationship is especially dangerous; this occurs among 1.8 percent of the sample. Only 1 percent stated that he had had to protect himself from other prisoners by performing sex.

3. Problem behaviors associated with homosexual activity—Overall, 29 percent of Federal inmates had been propositioned in the past year (1/330) and only 7 percent were "seduced" by inmates bearing gifts or offering favors. Rate of prostitution was rather low—2 percent of the sample had taken money for performing sex. For a managerial perspective, the long standing lover relationship is especially dangerous; this occurs among 1.8 percent of the sample. Only 1 percent stated that he had had to protect himself from other prisoners by performing sex.

4. Sexual Aggression—A target of sexual aggression was counted if an inmate responded positively on an item that asked if anyone had forced or attempted to force him to perform sex. For an inmate to perform sex against his will (involving battery). Incidence characteristics are tabulated below:

Table 1—Victim-Reported Data

5. Prisoner characteristics were similar to the national sample. Among those who did not agree all the items were completed, hence, findings are informative but not conclusive. Table 2 shows the response patterns for some of these items:

Table 2—Circumstances Involving in Being a "Target"

5. Prisoner characteristics were similar to the national sample. Among those who did not agree all the items were completed, hence, findings are informative but not conclusive. Table 2 shows the response patterns for some of these items:
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Group Psychotherapy and Intensive Probation Supervision With Sex Offenders
A Comparative Study*  
BY JOSEPH J. ROMERO AND LINDA M. WILLIAMS, PH.D.**

The majority of programs in the United States treating sex offenders are less than 10 years old.1 As a result, measuring the effectiveness of these programs is still in its infancy. In addition, there is little empirical information available to provide the basis for making decisions as to the usefulness of these programs with sex offenders. The current study, a 10-year follow-up of sex offender correctional officers working in the same prisons as the sample, and discusses various strategies for reducing inmate homosexual activity.
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1966 NIH Research
In 1966, Dr. Peters and his staff were awarded a research grant from the National Institute of Mental Health to study the effects of group psychotherapy on probationed sex offenders. The research was designed to measure the effectiveness of group psychotherapy by a comparison of subsequent sex crime recidivism rates for two groups of probationed sex offenders. The treatment group further limited the validity of the findings. It was not randomized and differences between the treatment group and the control group may have been caused by the differences in the selection of the sample. A second report appears in the next issue of Federal Probation (March 1966). In the focus of the report, the basis for answering questions of immediate concern to corrections officials—the extent of inmate participation in the topic behaviors. The subsequent paper contains criminal and social "profiles" of inmates in the sample (participants and targets), describes the results of a survey administered to 600

The sample contained 231 males, which included 48 pedophiles, 39 exhibitionists, and 144 assaulters. For all 231 cases, 32.9 percent were white and 67.1 percent were nonwhite. Only three sex offenders reported having an education past the 10th grade, with 29.6 percent of the sample reporting at the time of the study having no more than 9 years of education. For the entire sample, 25.9 percent were married, 38.5 percent were never married, 38.5 percent were separated, 67.1 percent were divorced. The sample was predominantly young (see Table 3). Overall, half of the sample was under 25 and almost two-thirds of the assaulters were under 20. The listing of charges for which the sample were arrested (see Table 2) most often was those that were common charge. The sample had a fairly extensive history of arrests by the time they were admitted to the research (case table 3). Over one-third of the sample had between 4 and 7 arrests. Twenty seven percent
