The
Management
of
Correctional
Institutions

C. H. S. Jayewardene
D. J. N. Jayasuriya

The

Management

of

Correctional

Institutions

C. H. S. JAYEWARDENE
AND
D. J. N. JAYASURIYA

The Management of Correctional Institutions
© 1981 Butterworth & Co. (Canada) Ltd.

Printed and bound in Canada

Preface

The need for educating and training those who work in the criminal justice system has become more and more evident with the passage of time. The policeman on the beat and the guard in the jail, the probation officer and the parole officer, volunteers and community workers, all have been thought to be in need of education and training to help them perform better. In recent times, with the increasing emphasis on accountability and a stress on managerial sophistication, those in the upper echelons of the system have been considered to be as much in need of education and training as those in the lower.

The traditional approach to the education and training of criminal justice personnel has been to provide them with a theoretical base on which, it was hoped, they could and would fashion their action. The usual result of such education and training, unfortunately, has been to provide them with a vocabulary that permitted them to cloak their actions with a mystic sophistication that did nobody any good. The more recent applied orientation in education and training has made it increasingly evident that the goal of education and training of criminal justice personnel has been to provide them with a theoretical base on which, it was hoped, they could and would fashion their action. The usual result of such education and training, unfortunately, has been to provide them with a vocabulary that permitted them to cloak their actions with a mystic sophistication that did nobody any good. The more recent applied orientation in education and training has made it increasingly evident that the goal of education and training must not only be the teaching of theory but also the elucidation of the connection between theory and action. It becomes beholden on an instructor in a school of applied criminology not only to provide the student with the theoretical know-how but also to show him how that theory could be translated into action. The necessity for this translating activity has been made amply clear in the field of management where it has been made amply clear in the field of management where it has been made quite blatant that, for the education and training that is offered to be of any use, the

exposition of generic management principles must be associated with their articulation for a particular and specific setting.

In the actual management of a correctional institution, it becomes evident as the days pass by, that the principles of management developed for and utilized in private, profit making institutions are not always applicable, unchanged, for the management of public, non-profit making institutions. It also becomes evident that the day to day details of management used in one correctional institution are not always applicable for the management of another institution. For the efficient management of a correctional institution, the principles of management developed for the management of private, profit making institutions must be carefully studied and analysed and their suitability for use assessed considering the differences that exist between these two types of institutions. Then a strategy must be worked out for the particular institution taking into consideration its peculiar characteristics.

This book is the result of two experiments. The first involved the actual management of a penal institution. The institution concerned was, fortunately, a new one, but one that replaced a number of local jails and hence one that was compelled to take both the inmates and staff from all of them. With a diversity of interests, a diversity of needs and a diversity of expectations, among both the inmates and the staff, the problems of management presented themselves as calling for the identification of areas of managerial concern to which attention had to be paid so that the needs, interests and expectations of the diverse groups would be balanced. Existing and suggested techniques of management were explored for adoption and it was soon realized that if management were to be an activity performed through the application of knowledge rather than the development of skills, a managerial style had to be developed taking into consideration the constraints placed on the institution and facilities made available to it. It also became obvious that, in the development of this managerial style, the analysis of the situation and the formulation of the solutions had to be done with the application of managerial principles. This, we believed, would result not only in the efficient management of the institution concerned but also in the development of a body of knowledge that could be used in the management of penal institutions.

The second experiment involved the teaching of the principles of correctional administration to graduate students in a program of applied criminology. The problems that were encountered in our first experiment, the principles that were considered and the possible solutions that were formulated were discussed in these classes with the students developing a style of management for a "hypothetical" institution. The feasibility of alternative techniques and procedures developing from this second experiment were tested for practicality in our test institution and the theoretical as well as the practical pros and cons noted.

This book does not offer the manager of a correctional institution a sure and certain style of management. We do not believe that there is any one way of effectively managing each and every correctional institution. The peculiarities of the buildings, the peculiarities of the community in which the institution is located, the peculiarities of the inmates that are housed in the institution, the peculiarities of the staff working there together with the peculiarities of the manager himself go to make every institution unique. However, it is possible for a manager to consider these peculiarities and develop, for each and every institution, the style of management that best befits it. How he could do this is the information that this book seeks to provide.

The format that this book takes follows closely our line of thinking in the development of a strategy of management for our institution. The first task we undertook was the search for an already existing form of management that could be adopted. In this search we were compelled to study the rationale behind the method, the results of instances of its use, as well as the reasons that prompted its adoption. We were also compelled to examine the feasibility of adopting other models of management utilized in other spheres but not as yet adopted in the criminal justice system. With the examination of the rationale behind them, the results of instances of their use and the reasons that prompted their adoption, we were able to come to conclusions as to the problems that must be addressed in the development of a strategy of management. The information that we gathered in this stage is presented in the first chapter, "Managerial Perspectives."

With the primary task of the manager identified as the definition of objectives and their achievement through the execution of institutional activities designed to achieve them, our next task comprised defining the objectives and formulating the activities. These tasks we approached in the same manner as for the first chapter. What has been done? Why has it been done? How has it been done? and What should we be doing? were the questions that we asked ourselves in this connection. The information that we gathered in these enquiries are presented in the second and third chapters, "Defining Institutional Objectives" and "Strategic Planning and Programming."

Chapter 4 is entitled "Managerial Aspects of Management." It deals basically with the power of a manager - the power that has been given him to operate the institution, the power that he wishes to retain for himself and the power that he would want to pass on to others. In this distribution of power, we felt that the crucial question for a manager was how to allow people to do what they feel should be done but at the same time get them to do what the manager would have done if placed in those circumstances. This chapter indicates the shape and form that our quest took. Considerations of physical possibility apart from considerations of productivity im-

provement suggest that the manager should repose confidence in his staff and share his power and authority with them. In doing so, however, it behoves him to know what are the special managerial problems related to employees; this aspect is dealt with in Chapter 5, "The Managerial Concerns with Employees."

Frequently all the exhortations to managerial sophistication in the management of public institutions and the demand for managerial accountability from the managers of such institutions are premised on the assumption that private profit making institutions are efficiently managed and the application of the principles developed in that connection would promote the efficient management of public non-profit making institutions as well. The validity of this contention lies, of course, in the assumption that private institutions are not different from public ones in structure and function. This assumption is not literally correct because the structures and functions of one type of institution are different from the structures and functions of the other. However, it has been claimed that the structures and functions of the one are analogous to the structures and functions of the other. The forces operating on an institution and consequently influencing its structures and functions are basically: (1) the body that controls it, (2) the funds that are made available to it, (3) the community to which it caters, and (4) the product that it deals with. The nature of these forces as far as correctional institutions are concerned is examined in the next four chapters: Chapter 6: "Being Part of the Bureaucracy;" Chapter 7: "Financial Restraints on Institutional Activity;" Chapter 8: "Involving the Comunity;" and Chapter 9: "The Inmate."

We have entitled this book *The Management of Correctional Institutions*. It is not a blue print of what a manager should do to manage such an institution effectively. As we have pointed out earlier, we believe that not only does such a blue print not exist but also that it cannot exist. What we have done, however, is to analyze the aims and objectives of a correctional institution, the context in which it must operate, the material and human resources available for it to operate, using the framework of extant sociological and psychological theory, and to show how from this analysis an efficient program of activity could be derived using the framework of extant managerial theory. It offers no sure and certain style but it offers a plan that could be followed in the development of a style to fit the peculiar needs of a particular institution. It outlines a technique that was utilized in the development of a style of management for a penal institution and operationalized with encouraging results.

C. H. S. Jayewardene
D. J. N. Jayasuriya

Acknowledgements

Table of Contents

此为试读，需要完整PDF请访问：www.ertongbook.com

Chapter 1

Managerial Perspectives

1.1 Traditional Autocracy

Until recent times correctional institutions were considered purely custodial institutions whose efficient functioning depended on the ability of the staff to control and contain their wards. At a time when it was accepted by all and sundry that the threat and the use of physical force was not only the most efficient but also the most appropriate weapon to be utilized in the control of human behaviour, force played an important part in management not only of penal institutions but of almost all institutions. In the case of correctional institutions, there was an added factor justifying the use of force. As the criminal justice system depended heavily on the concept of deterrence for its philosophical underpinnings, this orientation and attitude to their management had the blessings of the existing law. Consequently, the efficient functioning of these institutions was thought dependent on the ability, both physical and emotional, of the staff to effectively use force.

The indiscriminate use of force, however, was likely to have caused problems. Hence, individual members of the staff were not given the right to make decisions regarding the time when, the persons on whom, and the extent to which the force was to be used. Actually, the exercise of this right by them was thought detrimental to efficiency, involving as it did, decisions that had to be made judiciously. The use of force, consequently, was on managerial dictation. Hence, the staff needed not only the physical and emotional ability to use force, they also needed the willingness to use it according to managerial dictates. Such a requirement called for absolute loyalty to the management and utmost confidence in their ability to make the correct decisions.

These conditions were characteristic of the military. Non-military institutions with such characteristics were called para-military institutions. In these institutions, efficiency was sought to be optimized by the use of men who had had their basic and initial training in the military. The managers of such institutions were persons who were assumed, because of knowledge

or experience, hard work or inspiration, genetic inheritance or cultural acquisition, whatever these may be, to be endowed with an omniscience which befitted their position. Their subordinates, on the other hand, did not possess this quality, at least at that time or to the same extent. In consequence, all decision making power was entrusted to the manager and all responsibility deposited in him.[1]

This type of management may be labelled *traditional autocracy*. It can be called traditional because it is supposed to have been the method of management from almost time immemorial. It can be called autocracy because it depended on the judgement and dictates of one single individual. When the operative managerial style is traditional autocracy, any problem the institution has gets itself traced to undesireable characteristics of the manager and the style itself tends to remain unassailed. Thus, the Royal Commission appointed to investigate the mismanagement of the Provincial Penitentiary at Kingston in 1849 recommended the dismissal of the then warden and a number of others appointed and promoted by him for their abuse of power but concluded that the system should continue with minor modifications if any. "It must be conceded", they claimed, "as a general principle of government in a penitentiary, that an arbitrary almost absolute authority should exist. . . . We arrive, therefore, at the conclusion that the safest depository of the power and responsibility attached to the government of the Provincial Penitentiary is the Warden."[2]

However, though in vogue for a long period of time, the management of penal institutions in this manner has now been found to be defective and its propriety is now being questioned. Part of the dissatisfaction stems from the increasing realisation that while society needs some measure of protection from errant individuals, the errant individuals themselves need some protection from the arbitrary exercise of authority. While the administration of the Provincial Penitentiary in Kingston during the period 1835–1849 demonstrates the existence of such a need, its existence is also evident in instances where traditional autocracy has resulted in what is considered a model of excellence. The administration of the Joliet and Stateville Penitentiaries in the United States of America by Joe Ragen during the period 1936–1961 is a case in point.[3] The excellence of his administration was apparently achieved not merely because of his administrative philosophy which claimed that if you stressed the small things of life, you would not have to worry about the big ones, or even because of his personal charisma, but because the authority conferred on him permitted him to cultivate an image of invincibility, develop such power that he was able to rise above the political patronage system, place his own people in crucial institutional positions and successfully develop a system where every one was against each other. He encouraged the staff to lay reports against each other not only with regards to defects in job perfor-

mance as petty as reading a newspaper while at work or failing to salute a captain but also with regards to their off-time activity such as frequenting houses of prostitution or spending time in taverns with unsavoury reputations. Violations of his code of behaviour also met with severe punishments as did failure to report such violations. Staff and inmates alike had absolutely no protection against Ragen's administrative actions.

Part of the dissatisfaction with traditional autocracy has been the result of growing sophistication in managerial activity in general which has not been without its effect and influence on prison management and which has permitted the attribution of prison riots and disturbances to managerial deficiencies. One of the most noticeable consequences of traditional autocracy, it has been claimed, is the relative tranquility of inmate populations. Referring to the administration of Joe Ragen, Bartollas points out: "there were no riots, not a single escape from behind the walls, and only two guards and three inmates killed during his twenty five year's tenure as warden."[4] This empirical evidence is given theoretical support by Polansky's contention that the harshness of discipline that traditional autocracy promotes, while increasing the negative feelings of both inmate and staff towards the management and widening the rift that exists between staff and inmates, places each individual in such a state of tension that it denies them both the opportunity and the ability to cooperate with each other to constitute a cohesive group capable of any concerted action.[5] While this may be true, there does exist both theoretical and empirical evidence that those conditions can generate prison disturbances.[6]

Perhaps the dissatisfaction is only a reflection of the change in times. The two seminal characteristics of traditional autocracy were the assumed omniscience of the manager and the need for blind loyalty of the staff. The integrity of these characteristics could best be ensured by recruitment practises which excluded from employment the more intelligent and the more educated, those who were likely to question both the actual and functional validity of the basic assumptions of the system. The widespread development of educational facilities has made such recruitment practises increasingly difficult.

1.2 Management by Objective

As a reaction to the dissatisfaction, attempts have been made to place prison management on a scientific basis. One such attempt has lead to the suggestion that the *management by objective* (MBO) technique be adopted.[7] This technique, originally developed by Harrington Emerson and more recently promoted by Drucker and by Odiorne, is output oriented. It stresses the need for management to set up appropriate objectives and organize institutional activities towards the achievement of these objectives. Since employees are involved in task performance, it also

stresses the need for employees to understand their role in the institution so that they may work towards a common end. The technique, however, does not entrust the task of role determination to the employee. It is the task of the management to clarify individual responsibilities, constantly evaluate performances and to alter task assignments when need be, giving direction to the program as a whole.[8]

The main argument proffered for adopting this managerial technique in penal institutions is that it affords a means of demanding from managers of such institutions, the strict accountability which has always been apparently demanded from managers of industrial and profit making institutions and from which demand, managers of penal institutions seem to have been singularly immune. If managers of penal institutions are made accountable to those whom they serve and from whom they obtain their funds, they, it is claimed, would be forced to seek out efficient means of operating the institution. More attention, it is claimed, would be paid by managers to improving rehabilitative techniques, to making maximal use of all resources available to them, and to lowering overhead costs, so that they would better achieve institutional objectives at greatly reduced costs. The system apparently operates through the elimination of waste, both of effort and resources.[9]

In the industrial world, management by objective has apparently increased productivity. In the evaluation of one such effort, it was found that the adoption of this technique altered a 0.4% per month decrease in productivity to a 0.3% increase. In addition to this, managers were found to be more aware of the institutional goals, were planning resource utilization better, and were pinpointing problem areas more accurately. There was also improved communication and mutual understanding between management and staff. What was even more encouraging was that all this occurred in spite of the fact that the technique was not properly understood by the staff and there was some managerial opposition because of the additional paper work involved.[10]

Management by objective, however, has not been enthusiastically received in the criminal justice system. Terwilliger and Adams tell us that this is partly because of the persistent conflict and confusion in society about the treatment of offenders and partly because of the lack of managerial sophistication of correctional personnel.[11] At the present moment there appears to be two separate and equally important goals in the criminal justice system – the custodial and rehabilitative. So frequent and so sudden are the shifts in focus that managers are unable to define objectives and organize activities with any degree of confidence. In consequence, management by objective in a penal setting gets itself reduced to a senseless game in which some short term objectives are defined and sought to be achieved without these objectives being placed in the long term perspective which endows them with meaning.

Recently the Corrections Division of the Department of Social Services of Saskatchewan has been formulating guidelines for the implementation of the living unit concept in a new correctional institution where management would use the MBO technique. In the formulation of the objectives they have focussed on the long term perspective as well as the short term goals. They have identified three major objectives for the institution spelling out in fair detail what these objectives entail in terms of day to day activity. The first of their objectives is "custody-control." It involves the prevention of escapes, the protection of life and property, the maintenance of internal order, the control of contraband and the monitoring of internal and external contacts. The second is "care-maintenance" and involves the provision of shelter, clothing and nutrition for the inmates, the care of their health, and recreation and religious programs for them to satisfy their physical and mental needs. The third is labelled "opportunities" and is concerned with the provision of programs of social development to reduce the negative socializing effects of incarceration, to promote the development of positive social attitudes and to maintain positive staff-inmate relations. In addition to this, this objective includes the organization and implementation of a number of other programs traditionally thought to foster rehabilitation. These objectives have been formulated after a team assuming responsibility for the direction of the institute consulted extensively with the staff, seriously considering their proposals. To ensure that all the prerequisites of MBO are present, the plan seeks to give the staff a considerable amount of autonomy even to the extent of allowing them to make decisions on minor disciplinary matters. However, to ensure that there is some modicum of uniformity in the activity of the staff, clearly defined rules and procedures are formulated to both guide the staff and to monitor their activity so that the autonomy that is being given them is a kind of guided one subject to strict scrutiny.[12] As the system has yet to be implemented, the details of the day to day activity have not been fully worked out and it would be premature to make any comments regarding its operation even on a theoretical basis. Nonetheless, the guidelines for the exercise of autonomy and the suggested system of performance appraisal strangely support Levinson's claim with regards MBO in general that the technique in operation merely utilizes a reward-punishment psychology to intensify the pressures on the individual to achieve objectives that are claimed to be, but are in no way related to his own personal work objectives. Management by objective, Levinson claims, is the greatest managerial illusion.[13]

1.3 Organization Development

A second attempt has resulted in the suggestion that the *organization development* (OD) model of management be adopted.[14] The model that has been suggested for correctional institutions is one that identifies individual

desires for growth and development and integrates these desires with the institutional goals and objectives. The integration apparently could be achieved by strengthening interpersonal relations and communications between the employees and getting them to constitute a team that is a productive, responsive and creative part of the institution. In the actual implementation of the model, the strategy adopted appears to have been one in which the values and attitudes of the employees were insidiously changed. They were involved in the decision making process, slowly and often without their being aware of it, through formal and informal discussions in which they provided input information and learnt the manner in which the information was utilized in decision making. This involvement moved the employees slowly towards an orientation that was similar to that of management. In addition, employees were encouraged to seek career development in the form of promotions and towards this end were provided with education and training which again helped change their orientation. The whole process has been termed *unconscious motivation* defined as a "process of commitment by an individual achieved through involvement and interest cultivated as a result of the exposure to a new experience."[15]

The theoretical base for organization development was originally provided by McGregor who claimed that the apparent need to motivate or coerce people, to direct and to control them, using a system of rewards and deprivations so that their activity would result in the achievement of institutional goals stemmed from a view of man that assumed him to be inherently irresponsible, lazy, passive, self-centred, lacking in ambition and resistant to change. This, he points out, is not the factual situation. Men are problem solving individuals, desiring growth, seeking responsibility and creativity. If we were to look upon men as such, then managerial efficiency could only be achieved by the institutional adaptation to human nature rather than by the human conformation to institutional structure. The task of management, in these circumstances, reduces itself to alteration of the environment for the satisfaction of individual needs. Referring to this type of management as management by self-direction and self-control, McGregor contends that the task of the manager should be confined to creation of those organizational conditions whereby people can direct their own efforts towards goals that they set for themselves.[16]

In more recent times, Argyris has arrived at a similar conclusion. Utilizing the research findings in the area of mental health, he claims that healthy mature people have psychological needs which demand that they look upon themselves as independent and self determining individuals capable of analysing and studying complex situations and making correct decisions. Formal organizations designed for maximum efficiency are made clear cut and logically tight with more and more jobs becoming more