

Correction Officer Pre-Service Training,
Results of an Opinion Survey

Prepared by:

Linda K. Holt
Senior Researcher

Massachusetts Department of Correction

Michael V. Fair
Commissioner

June, 1981

Publication: #12449-57-250-6-81-C.R.

Approved by: John J. Manton, State Purchasing Agent

Abstract

A questionnaire was sent to a random sample of correction officers working for the Massachusetts Department of Correction. Various aspects of pre-service training were explored including their opinions on various training models, evaluations of the training that they received and questions about the most important and useful things learned in training. The results of this questionnaire are presented here. Officers generally rated their training as adequate but expressed a desire for a more careful integration of training and work assignments. Officers generally felt that the training model they were trained under was the best.

Table of Contents

Title	Page Number
Abstract	1
Table of Contents	2
Introduction	4
Correction Officer Training History and Description	6
Methodology	7
Training Experiences of the Respondents	11
General Opinions on Pre-Service Training	12
Correction Officer Opinion on Training Issues	19
Correction Officer Ratings of Training Curriculum	27
Summary	30
Table 1 A Comparison Between Original Random Sample and Respondent Group, a Test for Response Rate Bias	32
Table 2 Items that Correction Officers Found Most Useful From Their Training and Items That Correction Officers Would Include in Future Training Programs	33
Table 3 Correction Officer Opinion on Overall Training Adequacy	38
Table 4 Correction Officer Opinion on On-The-Job and Academy Training	39
Table 5 Correction Officer Opinion on Time Devoted to Classroom Instruction	40
Table 6 Correction Officer Opinion on Benefits of Residential Programs	41
Table 7 Correction Officer Opinion on Residential Program and Personal Life	42

Table of Contents

Title	Page Number
Table 8 Correction Officer Opinion on When Training Should Occur	43
Table 9 Correction Officer Opinion on Institutional Placements	44
Table 10 Correction Officer Opinion on Institutional Placements and Rank in Class	45
Table 11 Correction Officer Opinion on Training Academy Location	46
Table 12 Correction Officer Opinion on Co-educational Training	47
Table 13 Correction Officer Ratings of Curriculum Content, All Respondents	48
Table 14 Correction Officer Ratings of Curriculum Content by Training Academy Attended	49
Appendix I Correction Officer Opinion Survey, Questionnaire and Cover Letter	50
Sources	56

Introduction

Over half of the employees of the Massachusetts Department of Correction (DOC) are protective service workers. This includes correction officers, senior and supervising correction officers and prison camp officers. This group of employees provide the majority of the direct contact between the Department and the inmate population. Providing for the adequate training of the protective service staff is a priority of the Department.

The Training Academy is responsible for training all DOC staff. The largest program of the Training Academy is the pre-service training of new correction officers. It is important for the staff of the Training Academy to know how their programs are received by officers who graduate and work in the institutions. This study attempts to measure the opinions of correction officers currently working for the Department regarding various aspects of the pre-service training program.

There are currently under consideration several changes in the nature of pre-service training received by correction officers. At this time it is important to know the opinions of officers about the proposed changes and to know what they feel should be stressed in a training program. This study is an attempt to measure how officers evaluate the training programs in which they have participated and how they feel an ideal training program should operate and what that ideal program would teach.

I would like to thank all the correction officers who participated in the survey, without their effort the study could not have been done. I would also like to thank Ruth Averill, Cheryl Chase and Pamela Francisco for their able assistance in this project.

Correction Officer Training: History and Description

Correction Officers generally receive two types of training from the Department: pre-service and in-service. The emphasis in this study is on the pre-service training received by officers. Typically this training occurs before an officer is placed in an institution. It is an intensive and lengthy training, currently taking six weeks of full time effort. The training covers many areas of an officer's job and has as its goal the adequate preparation of an individual to work in an institution. In-service training can take place at any time during an officer's career with the Department. It is generally of short duration and covers only a limited content area.

Formal training programs for correction officers began in April of 1956. Training programs lasted from six to eight weeks and were conducted at the Training Academy located at MCI-Bridgewater (Powers, 1973). Significant changes in correction officer training occurred after the passage of the Correctional Reform Act of 1972. The length of training was left to the discretion of the Commissioner. In 1974 the site of the Training Academy was changed from MCI-Bridgewater to MCI-Framingham. Programs for new officers were from 4 to 6 weeks in length. Like the programs at Bridgewater, training occurred during the day and trainees commuted to the academy. In 1978 the site of the Training Academy was changed again to the grounds of MCI-Shirley. This transition was also

accompanied by a change to a para-military residential program where trainees only returned home on weekends.

There have been significant variations in the type of training received by correction officers over the last decade. Training could occur before institutional work experience or after; training could be a para-military residential program or a civilian day program; training could occur at any number of distant sites; training programs lasted from four weeks to eight weeks; training could be co-educational or sex segregated; and finally some officers received special training while others received none. Currently each of these variables is being evaluated to see how future training programs should be structured. Input of officers should be useful in evaluating the various training options available to department staff.

The various training programs offered by the department include a large number of specific content areas. The curriculum of the various training programs has also varied over time. It is important to know both how officers would structure a training program and what content areas they feel are important to include and emphasize in such a program.

Methodology

A mailed opinion survey was selected as the method of data collection. Mailings were done to the home addresses of a sample

of correction officers working for DOC. This method was selected to ensure maximum privacy in responding to the questions and to ensure that the sample was random over all institutions and shift assignments.

The Questionnaire

A questionnaire and cover letter were developed, pre-tested and mailed to a sample of correction officers. The questionnaire covered various aspects of pre-service training issues. A copy of the questionnaire and cover letter appears as Appendix I. The mailing was done on March 20, 1981.

The first part of the questionnaire established the pre-service training experience of the respondent by asking where the officer was trained, when the training occurred and how they would describe the training. The second part of the questionnaire contained two open-ended questions about what they valued most from their own training and what they would stress in future training programs. The third part of the questionnaire contained ten statements regarding various training issues and asked respondents whether they agreed or disagreed with the statements. The fourth part of the questionnaire asked the officers to rate their training in specific curriculum areas. The final part of the questionnaire asked the officers for some background information and for any

additional comments they might have.

The Sample

A fifty percent random sample of all correction officers currently employed by DOC was drawn (N=733). From this sample 2 individuals were deleted because they were promoted, 8 were deleted because they terminated their employment and 8 were deleted because address information was not available. Questionnaires were then mailed to the home addresses of the remaining 715 officers.

Of these 715 mailed surveys, 90 were returned as address unknown. These questionnaires were then forwarded to the institution where the officer is currently working. Of these 90, 14 were returned a second time and no additional mailings were attempted. In summary, it is assumed that there were 701 successful mailings.

Response Rates

About one-third of the questionnaires were completed and returned (N=236). Three were received too late for inclusion in most of the data analyses. On three different variables a check was made for randomness of response rates: sex, institution and job rank. Comparisons were made between the original random sample and the respondents. On all three variables the two groups are very similar indicating no bias in responses on these three dimensions.

The statistical comparison between the sample and the respondents is shown in Table 1. No direct follow-up was possible to increase this rate. About half of the responses were returned through departmental mail and half through U.S. mail. Almost half of the respondents made further comments on their forms. Some of those comments are used for illustrative purposes.

Analytic Methods

Standard methods of analysis were used to examine the responses received. These techniques include discussions of frequency distributions (usually summarized by use of a mode or a mean) and comparative statistics (usually accompanied by a Chi-Square or an F test statistic). In any cases where a test statistic was used it was evaluated at the .05 level of significance. A statistically significant test statistic indicates that differences between groups are large enough that it is very unlikely that they occurred by chance.

Generational Problems

Several comparisons were made between graduates of various training programs. While comparisons between officers trained under various models are interesting, the results should be treated carefully. Officers were assigned to one or another training program due to historical rather than any randomly

distributed factors. An earlier study found that longevity on the job was associated with a decrease in the opinions that officers held about their training (Carkhuff, 1979). It is expected that comparisons between graduates of various training programs will be comparisons among very different officer cohorts.

Training Experiences of the Respondents

Respondents were asked three questions regarding the pre-service training program that they went through. First they were asked where their training took place. Second they were asked if the training was residential, day or on-the-job training. Third they were asked if they were trained before or after some work experience in a prison.

Of all respondents, 75 (32%) were trained at the Bridgewater Training Academy. Almost all of the Bridgewater graduates, 95 percent, described this as a day program, the remaining 5 percent described it as on-the-job training. Most of the Bridgewater trainees, 79 percent, were trained after they had some work experience in an institution.

There were 46 graduates of the Framingham Training Academy, 20 percent of the sample. Again 96 percent of these graduates described the program as a day program. A large proportion, 85 percent, of these graduates were trained before working in any institution.

There were 66 graduates of the Shirley Training Academy, 28 percent of the entire sample. Of these graduates 89 percent described their training as residential and 6 percent described it as a day program. Almost all of the Shirley graduates, 91 percent, were trained before working in any institution.

Seventeen officers reported being trained in other programs. In most cases their training was supplied by the State Police Academy or at a special program at MCI-Walpole. Half of this group described their training as a day program, half of the group described it as on-the-job training. In most of these cases training took place after work experience in an institution.

Twenty-eight officers (12%) reported receiving no training. Whatever training they received was on-the-job and hence after they started working in an institution.

The respondents to this questionnaire represent a broad spectrum of training experiences. It should be remembered that these training experiences are dependent on the time when an officer was hired by the department. Any differences that appear in these groups are dependent on generational factors as well as training experiences.

What Correction Officers Valued in Their Training

Correction officers were asked to respond to two open-ended questions regarding pre-service training. The first was to list three things that they found particularly useful from their own

training and the second was to list three things that they thought are important for a new officer to know before working in an institution. In general the answers to both of these questions fell into one of five general categories: job skills, correction officer behaviors, inmate/officer relations, the criminal justice system and training techniques. These five areas will be discussed in general first and then each area will be looked at more closely. Table 2 shows the frequency with which these responses are given.

When asked what they remembered as being very useful from their own training, over half of the responses were a specific job skill that they had been acquired during the course of their training. These are the basic skills such as counts or searches that an officer has to know to carry out his/her duties while in an institution. In response to the second question, these answers were also frequently given. Officers also responded that they had learned certain officer behavior traits that help them to do their jobs. Some of the respondents called this "acceptable conduct for an officer" while others gave specific traits of character that might be important for an officer to have or certain maxims that might be useful to remember while carrying forth one's duties in an institutional setting. Officers found things that they had learned about the inmate population to be very useful to them and important for new officers to know as well. These include both general ways in which an officer should relate to inmates, including training in communication, human

management and words of wisdom that were learned from their time in institutions. Less frequently officers mentioned that knowledge of the criminal justice system was useful to them.

This area was mentioned even less frequently when they were commenting on what was important for a new officer to know. Officers also remembered certain training experiences that were useful. These items were mentioned infrequently when commenting on what it was important to teach a new correction officer. In summary, when recounting the most useful things learned or experienced during their own training courses officers overwhelmingly pointed to some very concrete and specific job skills that they had acquired. When commenting on what things it was important for a new officer to know, the respondents also felt that these specific job skills were still very important but that other aspects of correction officer behaviors and inmate/officer relations were perhaps more important.

In discussing the specific skills that correction officers should acquire there were more than twenty skills that the respondents listed. The five skills mentioned most frequently were report writing, firearms training, searches of people and cells, self defense and use of restraint equipment. The other skills mentioned include a wide variety of skills including different equipment and procedures that an officer must know to carry out his/her job responsibilities.

In commenting on correction officer behaviors there were three general areas of concern: acceptable conduct, conditions of employment and personality traits. Officers were most often concerned with the training received in the general conduct of an officer or "acceptable conduct for an officer". An officer states in regard to an emphasis on officer conduct,

.....the training should be more directed toward teaching the officers on how to handle themselves in any given situation. True it's important to know the history and goals of the department, but when handling inmates does the history or goals stop him from being hurt.....

The respondents were also concerned with recruits knowing the chain of command to follow, to know that orders should be carried out and that officers should work as a team. There are certain personality traits that officers mentioned as important to have and to develop: common sense, self-discipline, leadership, patience, ambition, tact, consistency, courtesy, attitude, discretion and good judgement. A Concord officer states,

The officers should be given a more realistic point of view as to what their jobs are really about..... not confusing their roles with treatment and social workers and that we should all work together as well as possible. New officers should learn common sense which is 90% of the job. They should learn not to over react to situations and learn how to make objective decisions in dealing with inmates and staff...

There was also a fair number of officers who gave words of wisdom about how their jobs should be done. Fair but firm was the one most commonly given. Others include: listen, ask questions, think before you act, and expect the unexpected.

There were a large number of responses that focuses around three general job issues. The first is knowing your legal rights and the conditions of your employment. The issues addressed by these comments include a large number of questions about job benefits, union contracts and an officer's rights against inmate suits. A Bridgewater officer stated,

Officers are little informed of their rights and protections against law suits by inmates, rights under Civil Service and what the Department of Correction really expects of them as officers... Correction Officers careers are the most looked down on job in civil service and receive little credit for the tough job they must do each day, the public does not care, except in times of riot; the politicians are more interested in inmates rights and votes; the Administration would rather publicize when a patient graduates from some school... officers graduate from college but this never gets into the newspapers....

The second job issue was that of stress coming from job conditions, boredom and surviving the dangers and risks of the job. Officers felt that this should be made part of the training of new officers. Reflecting on the knowledge that a fellow officer had recently succumbed to a heart attack, a Norfolk correction officer stated,

My correction officer training placed great emphasis on physical conditioning, and yet when I started my job as house officer at MCI-Norfolk, I found that my duties here are basically sedentary in nature. I feel that the combination of "stress" and lack of physical conditioning can lead to all sorts of problems....I strongly recommend that a structural form of continuous physical training be made available to officers....

Third, there was also a number of comments reflecting a general sense of dissatisfaction and bitterness against the working

conditions and administration of the department that is felt directly by these officers.

Officers also felt that an important part of their training and an even more important part of every new correction officer's training should be the development of a better understanding of the population of inmates with which they will be working. Officers asked for training in communication skills, in how to relate with inmates, managing inmates, counseling inmates, care for inmates and controlling that population. Officers stressed the need for knowledge of prison reality before going into the institution and of prison culture. Officers also gave a few advisory comments to new officers such as: never lie to an inmate, don't "lug" for an inmate, don't trust an inmate and don't get personal with an inmate.

Less frequently officers reported that certain things they had learned about the criminal justice system were useful to them. These were infrequently mentioned as being important for a new officer to learn. These included learning about the Department of Correction including its structure and goals. Specific parts of the criminal justice system were mentioned as well, particularly as things that were learned during their pre-service training that had been useful to the officer while carrying out their job responsibilities.

Specific training experiences that officers found particularly useful were largely connected with touring institutions, talking with experienced officers, and learning on-the-job experiences included in their pre-service training. Particularly important

among these is the desire for some institution specific training. Several officers mentioned that it is particularly important for new officers to know some of the institutional differences that might be and to become familiar with their particular institution. A Shirley graduate now working at Walpole stated,

The Training Academy should deal more with the reality of prison life as it really is. New correction officers shouldn't have to worry about 2/3 sentences, cadre slots the like. they should know about drug abuse, murders and the real things that happen "inside".

In summary, the respondents felt that training should most emphasize those specific job skills that a correction officer needs to know in order to carry out their job responsibilities. These are the skills that will be used either frequently or rarely in the job but that are not likely to be acquired in any other place. Officers emphasized that new officers receiving training should develop some of the behavioral traits experienced correctional officers have found useful. More emphasis on understanding the population of inmates would also be useful. There were many aspects of their legal rights and working conditions that officers felt should be dealt with in training, including some of the problems of stress and dangers encountered in their work. Institution specific training should also be included in their training programs.

Correction Officer Opinion on Training Issues

The correction officers were asked to give their opinions to ten statements concerning various issues regarding the training academy programs. Responses to these statements will be discussed in this section. For each statement the responses of the entire sample will be discussed first. When appropriate, the response patterns of particular groups within the sample will then be considered separately. Tables 3 through 12 at the back of the report show fully the results discussed in this section.

Overall Evaluation of Training

Forty-six percent of all respondents agreed that the training they had received adequately prepared them to be correction officers. Thirty-nine percent disagreed that they had been adequately trained for the position.

Of the three Training Academy programs offered by the Department, Bridgewater trainees rated their program highly, 62 percent of the officers trained there agreed that their training was adequate. Graduates of the Framingham program were 46 percent in agreement that their training was adequate and graduates of the Shirley program were 34 percent in agreement. Over half of the officers not trained in an academy program felt that

they were not adequately trained for the job. These differences were statistically significant. Academy training was rated more highly than other training.

Training Academy vs. On-The-Job Training

Officer opinion was divided on whether the Training Academy model officer education was better than on-the-job training. In response to the statement, "Correction officer training could be done just as well on-the-job as in a special Training Academy", 48 percent of the respondents agreed and 45 percent of the respondents disagreed.

Responses varied depending on what training the officer had received. Those officers with no formal training tended to agree that on-the-job training could be just as good as academy programs, graduates of academy programs were not as likely to agree with the statement. Of the officers with on-the-job training 75 percent agreed with the statement. Differences among graduates of the different programs are not large enough to be considered statistically significant. One officer agreed that a recruit should have institutional experience before attending Training Academy sessions,

I feel the DOC could save a large amount of money by first assigning an officer to an institution. I feel the best training is on the job training. I worked in Walpole for two years before I went to the Academy. It's now going on nine years I've been at Walpole. Most of the officers who went to the Academy with me are still with the Department. By working on the job first, you are aware of what you're getting into....

Classroom Training

The respondents were generally in agreement that present training programs place too much emphasis on classroom training. In response to the statement, "the training program spent too much time in classrooms and not enough time in the institution", 61 percent of the sample agreed.

Responses varied, however, by the type of training that the officer had received. Eighty-one percent of the Shirley graduates agreed that they had spent too much time in the classroom while only 49 percent of the Bridgewater graduates and 68 percent of the Framingham graduates agreed with the statement. These differences are large enough to be considered statistically significant.

Residential vs. Day Program

Opinion was generally favorable on the effectiveness of a residential training program as compared with a day program. Over half of the respondents (55%) agreed with the statement, "a residential program, with live-in facilities, can provide better training than a day program with commuting trainees." Thirty-nine percent of the sample disagreed with the statement.

In general the opinions that individuals held about residential training programs were related to the type of training they had received. Eighty percent of officers trained in a residential setting agreed that it provided better training, while only 48 percent of those trained in a day program and 44 percent of those trained on-the-job agreed with the statement. These differences are large enough to be considered statistically significant.

Problems with Residential Program

Opinions were divided on the problems that a residential program may pose to an individual's personal life. Forty-four percent of the respondents agreed with the statement, "a residential program interrupts personal life too much to be worth it," and forty-four percent disagreed with the statement.

There were large differences of opinion on this issue between officers trained under different models. Significantly, only 13 percent of the officers trained in a residential program agreed with the statement while 54 percent of the officers trained in a day program or on-the-job agreed with the statement. Opinions about the problems associated with a residential program are linked to the training that the officer received. Perhaps someone who has not gone through the programs views the infringement on personal life as more important than an officer who has already

coped with that issue.

When Training Should Occur

There was general agreement with the statement that, "new correction officers should work at an institution for a while before beginning their course of training". Fifty-six percent of all respondents agreed with this statement, while 39 percent disagreed.

There were some differences among various groups in response to this statement dependent on when their own training had occurred. In general individuals who had institutional experience before their training found that an effective training model. While 48 percent of the respondents trained before working in an institution agreed with the statement, 63 percent of those trained after working in an institution agreed and 73 percent of those trained on-the-job agreed with this statement. These differences are not large enough to be considered statistically significant, however, a Walpole officer stated,

I had no prior training before I started working for the DOC. I had not even entered or toured Walpole prior to the day I reported for duty. I believe prior training is a must. However, I would like to see a trainee work at his assigned institution for 2 to 4 weeks of OJT prior to entering the academy, too many times I have talked to new officer fresh out of the academy and most say the academy staff painted an entirely different picture.

Institutional Placements

Almost two thirds of the sample agreed with the statement, "a correction officer should know what institutional placement he/she will receive before going into the Training Academy." Over a third answered strongly agree to this statement.

Answers to this statement were also considered by where the officer is currently working. Responses were numerically weighted from 1 (strongly agree) to 5 (strongly disagree) and the average response for each institutional group were compared. There were no statistically significant differences in responses to this statement by the institution where an officer is currently working.

Rank in Training Academy Class

Opinion was divided on whether a person's rank in their Training Academy class should affect institutional placements. Forty-five percent of the sample agreed with the statement, "a person's rank in their Training Academy class should affect institutional placements" and 47 percent disagreed with the statement.

Differences among officers currently working in different institutions were considered. There were no significant differences by job location on opinion to this statement.

Training Academy Location

There was general agreement that the Training Academy is located inconveniently. Fifty-five percent of the respondents agreed with the statement that, "The Training Academy is located too far away," while only 19 percent disagreed with the statement.

Co-educational Training Programs

A large majority of the respondents were in agreement with the statement, "Male and female correction officers should be trained together in the same program." Seventy-five percent answered either strongly agree or agree while twenty-one percent answered disagree or strongly disagree.

There was little difference in responses to this statement between male and female officers. Seventy-five percent of the male officers agreed with the statement compared with seventy-three percent of the female officers. Clearly there is a great deal of support for co-educational training programs among all officers. A female correction officer commented,

I feel it is important for males and females to be trained together because we must also work together. Male officers must learn to trust and feel confident working with a female correction officer.

Summary

In summary, the respondents noted that there was room for some improvement in the training program offered by the Department for new correction officers. Almost half of the respondents felt that they had been adequately trained for their jobs in the institutions. Opinions about the appropriate structure for the Training Academy program to take was related to the training that the officer had received. For example, an officer trained in an academy program was more likely to agree that academy training should continue than an officer trained on-the-job only. Officers emphasized the need for better integration of classroom instruction and institutional experiences. This included a desire to know your placement before entering the training program, to concentrate more on institutional training than on classroom training and to do some work in an institution before attending training sessions. Opinion was generally favorable on the residential training model, especially among those officers who had been trained under this model. There was a desire expressed for a more convenient location of the Training Academy, a desire for the training to take place near to people's homes and work sites. There was a consensus that male and female officers should be trained together since they will eventually have to work together and perform the same tasks.

Correction Officer Ratings of Training Program Curriculum

Correction officers were asked to rate the adequacy of their training in twenty-four different areas of the curriculum. The ratings were done on a scale of 1 to 10 where 1 is the lowest rating indicating inadequate training and 10 was the highest rating indicating excellent training.

The average ratings varied from a high of 7.04 for performing personal searches to a low of 3.88 for union contracts and employee rights. The average rating for all areas of training combined was a 5.68. The ratings for each of the twenty four contact areas is shown in Table 13.

Graduates of each training program were considered separately to see which areas they ranked highly. There was no difference between graduates of the three training academy programs in their overall rating of all the training programs. There were differences in the ratings of some of the specific content areas.

In the areas of performing personal searches, use of restraint equipment, control of contraband, acceptable conduct for an officer, first aid, appropriate use of force, organizational structure of the Department, criminal justice system in Massachusetts, use of chemical agents, sentencing and union contracts

and employee rights there was no difference in the ratings assigned by graduates of the three different Training Academy programs. In all of the other 13 areas there were some differences in the way in which the different groups rated the training that they had received in that area. Table 14 shows the ratings for each graduate group in each curriculum area.

In the area of performing cell searches, Bridgewater and Shirley graduates rated their training more highly than Framingham graduates. In the area of writing reports, Framingham and Shirley graduates rated their training more highly than Bridgewater graduates. In the area of CPR, Shirley graduates rated their training more highly than graduates of the other two programs. In the area of firearm use, Framingham graduates rated their training very highly followed by graduates of Shirley and then Bridgewater. In the area of interpersonal communication, Framingham graduates rated their training more highly than graduates of the other training programs. In the area of court structure in Massachusetts both Shirley and Framingham graduates rated their training more highly than Bridgewater graduates. In the area of goals of the department, Shirley graduates rated their training more highly than graduates of the other two programs. In the area of military drill procedure, Shirley graduates also rated their training more highly than graduates of the other two programs. In the areas of self defense, disorder control and prison culture, Bridgewater graduates rated their training more highly than graduates of the other two programs. In the area of the Department's classification system and the parole

system, Shirley graduates rated their training more highly than graduates of the other two training programs.

The training received by this sample of correction officers varied in the percent adequacy in which it trained people in a number of areas. High ratings were assigned to the areas of performing searches of persons and cells, writing reports, and firearms use. Low ratings were assigned to the training given in union contracts and employee rights, the parole and classification system, disorder control and officer self defense.

On the whole there was no difference in the ratings of all content areas between graduates of the three major Training Academy programs. In individual areas there were some differences however. Graduates of the Shirley program rated their training in the areas of performing cell searches, CPR, court structure in Massachusetts, goals of the Department, military drill procedure, department classification system and the parole system more highly than graduates of the other training programs. Framingham graduates rated their training in the areas of report writing, firearms use and interpersonal communication more highly than either Shirley or Bridgewater graduates. Finally Bridgewater graduates rated their training in the areas of prison culture, self defense and disorder control more highly than either Shirley or Framingham graduates. Tables 13 and 14 show the differences among the different curriculum areas and the different training programs.

Summary and Discussion

From the insights gained from consideration of the opinions of a random sample of correction officers who are currently working for the department it can be concluded that pre-service training of correction officers remains important to the adequate preparation of new officers. In particular there is a large number of skills that the Training Academy teaches that are not regularly taught in any other setting. Despite the variety of the training experiences of the officers considered in the study, these fundamental job skills were regularly mentioned as the most important things that the training programs should emphasize.

Correction officers wanted to see an increased integration of training and future job tasks. They wanted to see more emphasis on correction officer behavior and more emphasis on learning about inmates in the training academy curriculum. They expressed the opinion that more institutional training, more institution specific training and training after institutional work experience would be valuable additions to the training model used in the department.

The correction officers surveyed in this study expressed some serious dissatisfactions with their training and with their jobs. There was often a feeling of being forgotten by administrators, of having jobs with inadequate training and little support and of having jobs that are at best stressful and at worst dangerous. Officers also expressed a desire to perform their jobs well. This was reflected in the high response rate to the survey and to the

Careful consideration the officers took in assessing their training needs. An officer with many years of experience now working at a forestry camp stated,

"I'm getting close to retirement now and I meet inmates on the street in my home town and they greet me very friendly, I feel I must have done my job right to have gained this respect. I feel if your training school can show officers how to do their job and gain respect they will be a credit to the department and themselves, maybe even help inmates to stay on the street."

Appropriate training for correction officers that starts in the pre-service program of the training academy can help in the development of a corps of professional and effective officers in the institutions of the Department.

Table 1

A Comparison Between Original Random
Sample and Respondents Group,
A Test For Response Rate Bias

Characteristic	Random Sample		Respondent Group	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
<u>Sex</u>				
Male	699	(95)	220	(94)
Female	34	(5)	13	(6)
TOTAL	733	(100)	233	(100)

Chi-Square = .45 with 1 degree of freedom, n.s.

Rank

Correction Officer	568	(77)	169	(73)
Senior or Supervising	165	(23)	62	(27)
TOTAL	733	(100)	231	(100)

Chi Square = 2.48 with 1 degree of freedom, n.s.
Missing observations - 2

Institution

Bridgewater	181	(25)	60	(27)
Walpole	137	(19)	40	(18)
Concord/NECC	126	(17)	42	(19)
Norfolk/RDC	129	(18)	32	(14)
SECC	51	(7)	15	(3)
Framingham	28	(4)	7	(3)
Boston Pre-Release				
Lemuel Shattuck	25	(3)	5	(2)
Bay State	15	(2)	8	(4)
Gardner	9	(1)	0	(0)
Shirley/Lancaster	9	(1)	3	(1)
Medfield/Plymouth	8	(1)	3	(1)
Central Administra-				
tion	10	(1)	5	(2)
S. Middlesex/Warwick	5	(1)	4	(2)
TOTAL	733	(100)	224	(100)

Chi-Square = 14.38 with 12 degrees of freedom, n.s.
Missing observations - 9

Table 2

Items That Correction Officers Valued In
Their Training and Would Include
For New Officers

Response Category	What Respondent Valued From Their Own Training		What Respondent Would Teach A New Officer	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Correction Officer Job Skills				
Report Writing	53		53	
Firearms Training	49		28	
Searches (personal and cell)	39		29	
Self Defense	28		34	
Use of Restraint Equipment	37		21	
First Aid/CPR	31		18	
Contraband Control	18		16	
Security Procedures	13		16	
Disorder Control	9		15	
Transportation of Inmates	12		7	
Appropriate Use of Force	4		12	
Physical Fitness	9		3	
Counts	3		5	
Key Control	4		3	
Sanitation and Fire Safety	1		6	
OBservation Techniques	4		2	
Scott Air Pack	4		1	
Lock-ups Slams	1		2	
Chemical Agents	1		1	
Military Drill	1		0	
TOTAL	321	(56)	272	(41)

Table 2

Items That Correction Officers Valued In
Their Training and Would Include
For New Officers

Response Category	What Respondent Valued From Their Own Training		What Respondent Would Teach A New Officer	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Correction Officer Behavior				
Acceptable Conduct for an Officer	12		22	
Team Work, Comaraderie	12		9	
Chain of Command for Officer	1		10	
Carry Out Orders	3		10	
Personal Appearance	0		4	
Professionalism on the Job	3		11	
Maintain Discipline	2		7	
Self-Discipline/Main- tain Discipline	5		14	
Learn to Adapt, Cope or Survive	2		3	
Don't Sneak Around	0		1	
Listen	2		2	
Expect the Unexpected	2		2	
Don't Make Promises	1		1	
Think Before you Act	2		5	
Use Common Sense	3		14	
Be Fair but Firm	5		17	
This is Serious Business	0		4	
Be Yourself	2		3	
Ask Questions/Learn From Experience	3		5	
Aren't Always Easy Answers	1		0	
Be Alert	6		8	
Leadership	1		1	
Patience	1		3	
Ambition	0		2	
Don't Show Prejudices	0		2	
Tact	0		1	
Consistent	1		2	
Counseling	0		1	

Table 2

Items That Correction Officers Valued In
Their Training and Would Include
For New Officers

Response Category	What Respondent Valued From Their Own Training		What Respondent Would Teach A New Officer	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Correction Officer Behavior (continued)				
Good Attitude	2		0	
Job Benefits/Employee Rights	6		12	
Stress/Boredom/ Survival	2		7	
General Dissatisfaction with Job	2		7	
TOTAL	82	(14)	192	(29)
Inmates Behavior				
Interpersonal Communi- cation	23		30	
Prison Culture	3		14	
Relating With Inmates	4		12	
Inmate Behavior	9		10	
Prison Reality	0		8	
Treat Inmates with Respect	2		8	
Inmate Control	13		6	
Inmate/Officer Relations	4		5	
Never Lie to an Inmate	2		5	
Inmate Management	3		5	
Problem Inmates	3		2	
Don't Get Personal with an Inmate	1		4	
How to Deal with/handle Inmates	3		7	
Counseling & Guidance Skills	2		4	
Inmate Case	5		2	
What It's Like for an Inmate	1		1	
Don't "lug" for an Inmate	0		1	
Don't trust an Inmate	1		1	
Evaluating an Inmate	0		1	

Table 2

Items That Correction Officers Valued In
Their Training and Would Include
For New Officers

Response Category	What Respondent Valued From Their Own Training		What Respondent Would Teach A New Officer	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Inmates Behavior (Continued)				
Use Discretion in Handling	0		1	
TOTAL	79	(14)	128	(19)
Criminal Justice/Corrections System				
DOC Rules and Regula- tions	16		17	
DOC Structure	3		3	
DOC Goals & Philosophy	3		8	
Court System	2		2	
Classification/Programs	3		0	
Parole	2		1	
Sentencing	2		0	
Criminal Justice System	7		4	
Criminology	3		0	
TOTAL	41	(7)	35	(5)
Training Experiences				
Tours of Institutions	19		3	
On the Job in Institution	7		7	
Special Institutional Procedures	4		10	
Weekend Lockup in Conn.	3		1	
Block Operation	0		3	
Training w/experienced Officers	7		5	

Table 2

Items That Correction Officers Valued In
Their Training and Would Include
For New Officers

Response Category	What Respondent Valued From Their Own Training		What Respondent Would Teach A New Officer	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Training Experiences (continued)				
Discussion Periods	3		0	
Lectures/Classroom	1		1	
General Training Comment	2		1	
TOTAL	46	(8)	30	(4)

Table 3

Correction Officer Opinion of Overall
Training Adequacy

Statement: The training I received from the department adequately prepared me to do my job.

Opinion to Statement	All Respondents		Bridgewater Graduates		Framingham Graduates		Shirley Graduates		All Others	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Strongly Agree	15	(6)	6	(8)	4	(9)	1	(2)	4	(10)
Agree	92	(40)	41	(55)	17	(38)	21	(33)	13	(31)
Undecided	28	(12)	8	(11)	5	(11)	13	(20)	2	(5)
Disagree	58	(25)	15	(20)	15	(33)	21	(33)	7	(17)
Strongly Disagree	33	(14)	5	(7)	4	(9)	8	(12)	16	(38)
TOTAL	226	(100)	75	(100)	45	(100)	64	(100)	42	(100)

Chi-Square = 39.5 with 12 degrees of freedom, p = .0001

Missing observations = 7

Table 4

Correction Officer Opinion of
On-The-Job Versus Academy Training

Statement: Correction Officer training could be done just as well on-the-job as in a special training program.

Opinion to Statement	All Respondents		Bridgewater Graduates		Framingham Graduates		Shirley Graduates		Other		On The Job Training Only	
	N	(%)	N	(%)	N	(%)	N	(%)	N	(%)	N	(%)
Strongly agree	50	(22)	12	(16)	6	(13)	16	(25)	7	(39)	9	(32)
Agree	60	(26)	17	(23)	12	(26)	17	(27)	2	(11)	12	(43)
Undecided	15	(6)	5	(7)	3	(6)	4	(6)	1	(6)	2	(7)
Disagree	73	(31)	29	(39)	18	(39)	19	(30)	3	(17)	4	(14)
Strongly Disagree	33	(14)	12	(16)	7	(15)	8	(12)	5	(28)	1	(4)
TOTAL	231	(100)	75	(100)	46	(100)	64	(100)	18	(100)	28	(100)

Chi-Square = 22.8 with 16 degrees of freedom, p = .12

Missing Observations - 2

Table 5

Correction Officer Opinion Of
Time Devoted to Classroom
Instruction

Statement: The training program spent too much time in classrooms and not enough time in the institutions.

Opinion to Statement	All Respondents		Bridgewater Graduates		Framingham Graduates		Shirley Graduates	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Strongly Agree	67	(29)	15	(20)	11	(24)	34	(52)
Agree	74	(32)	22	(29)	20	(44)	19	(29)
Undecided	31	(13)	9	(12)	6	(13)	2	(3)
Disagree	47	(20)	26	(35)	8	(17)	9	(14)
Strongly Disagree	8	(3)	3	(4)	1	(2)	1	(2)
TOTAL	227	(100)	75	(100)	46	(100)	65	(100)

Chi-Square = 27.0 with 8 degrees of freedom, p = .0007

Missing Observations - 6

Table 6

Correction Officer Opinion on
Benefits of Residential
Programs

Statement: A residential program, with live-in facilities, can provide better training than a day program with commuting trainees.

Opinion to Statement	All Respondents		Day Training		Residential Training		On The Job Training	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Strpngly Agree	63	(27)	30	(23)	26	(44)	7	(17)
Agree	65	(28)	33	(25)	21	(36)	11	(27)
Undecided	12	(5)	8	(6)	2	(3)	1	(2)
Disagree	66	(28)	42	(32)	7	(12)	16	(39)
Strongly Disagree	26	(11)	17	(13)	3	(5)	6	(15)
TOTAL	232	(100)	130	(100)	59	(100)	41	(100)

Chi-Square = 22.0 with 8 degrees of freedom, p = .005

Missing Observations - 1

Table 7

Correction Officer Opinion On
Residential Program and
Personal Life

Statement: A residential program interrupts personal life too much to be worth it.

Opinion to Statement	All Respondents		Day Training		Residential Training		On The Job Training	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Strongly Agree	32	(14)	22	(17)	3	(5)	7	(17)
Agree	69	(30)	48	(37)	5	(8)	15	(37)
Undecided	28	(12)	15	(12)	9	(15)	3	(7)
Disagree	75	(32)	31	(24)	30	(51)	14	(34)
Strongly Disagree	28	(12)	14	(11)	12	(20)	2	(5)
TOTAL	232	(100)	130	(100)	59	(100)	41	(100)

Chi-Square = 32.0 with 8 degrees of freedom, p = .0001

Missing Observations - 1

Table 8

Correction Officer Opinion On
When Training Should Occur

Statement: New correction officers should work at an institution for a while before beginning their course of training.

Opinion to Statement	All Respondents		Trained Before Work in an Institution		Trained After Work in an Institution		On The Job Training Only	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Strongly Agree	72	(31)	26	(22)	36	(41)	10	(38)
Agree	59	(25)	30	(26)	19	(22)	9	(35)
Undecided	10	(4)	7	(6)	2	(2)	1	(4)
Disagree	49	(21)	30	(26)	16	(18)	3	(12)
Strongly Disagree	42	(18)	24	(20)	15	(17)	3	(12)
TOTAL	232	(100)	117	(100)	88	(100)	26	(100)

Chi-Square = 12.8 with 8 degrees of freedom, p = .12

Missing Observations - 1

Table 9

Correction Officer Opinion
On Institutional Placements

Statement: A correction officer should know what institutional placement he/she will receive before giving into the Training Academy.

Opinion	All Respondents		Institution	Institutional Groups	
	Number	Percent		Mean Response	Number
Strongly Agree	77	(33)	Framingham	1.9	7
			Norfolk	2.2	32
Agree	72	(31)	Walpole	2.2	40
			Concord	2.2	30
Undecided	16	(7)	Bridgewater	2.3	60
			NECC	2.4	12
Disagree	50	(22)	Pre-Release	2.5	6
			Bay State	2.6	8
Strongly Disagree	17	(7)	Forestry	2.8	6
			SECC	3.1	15
			Central Office	3.2	8
TOTAL	232	(100)	TOTAL	2.4	224

F = 1.24, p = .27

Missing Observations = 1

Table 10

Correction Officer Opinion On
Institutional Placements
And Rank in Class

Statement: A person's rank in their Training Academy class should affect institutional placements.

Opinion	All Respondents		Institution	Institutional Groups	
	Number	Percent		Mean Response	Number
Strongly Agree	50	(22)	Pre-Release	2.2	6
			SECC	2.3	15
Agree	58	(25)	Central Office	2.5	8
			Framingham	2.6	7
Undecided	16	(30)	Norfolk	2.8	32
			NECC	2.8	12
Disagree	69	(30)	Bay State	2.9	8
			Concord	3.1	30
Strongly Disagree	39	(17)	Bridgewater	3.2	60
			Walpole	3.2	40
			Forestry	4.0	6
TOTAL	232	(100)	TOTAL	3.0	224

F = 1.34, p = .21

Missing Observations - 1

Table 11

Correction Officer Opinion On
Training Academy Location

Statement: The training academy is located too far away.

Opinion To Statement	All Respondents	
	Number	Percent
Strongly Agree	76	(33)
Agree	58	(25)
Undecided	48	(21)
Disagree	35	(15)
Strongly Disagree	10	(4)
TOTAL	227	(100)

Missing Observations - 6

Table 12

Correction Officer Opinion On
Coeducational Training

Statement: Male and female correction officers should be trained together in the same program.

Opinion to Statement	All Respondents		Males		Females	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Strongly Agree	76	(33)	73	(33)	3	(27)
Agree	98	(42)	93	(42)	5	(46)
Undecided	10	(4)	8	(4)	2	(18)
Disagree	31	(13)	30	(14)	1	(9)
Strongly Disagree	16	(7)	16	(7)	0	(0)
TOTAL	231	(100)	220	(100)	11	(100)

Chi-Square = 6.2 with 4 degrees of freedom, p = .18

Missing Observations - 2

Table 13

Correction Officer Ratings of Curriculum
Content, All Respondents

Curriculum Area	Number	Mean Rating	Standard Deviation
Performing Personal Searches	221	7.04	(2.6)
Performing Cell Searches	217	6.94	(2.8)
Writing Reports	224	6.93	(2.5)
CPR	180	6.83	(3.2)
Firearms Use	224	6.80	(2.7)
Use of Restraint Equipment	223	6.69	(2.7)
Control of Contraband	219	6.47	(2.6)
Acceptable Conduct for an Officer	218	6.39	(2.5)
First Aid	217	6.28	(2.8)
Appropriate Use of Force	210	5.75	(2.7)
Organizational Structure of the Department	208	5.49	(2.7)
Criminal Justice System in Massachusetts	208	5.41	(2.6)
Interpersonal Communi- cator	199	5.31	(2.9)
Use of Chemical Agents	202	5.30	(2.6)
Court Structure in Mass.	210	5.13	(2.6)
Goals of the Department of Correction	202	5.09	(2.8)
Sentencing	203	5.08	(2.5)
Military Drill Procedure	179	5.02	(3.2)
Prison Culture	212	4.95	(2.5)
Self Defense	210	4.93	(2.8)
Disorder Control	208	4.91	(2.7)
Department Classification System	195	4.64	(2.6)
Parole System	192	4.08	(2.3)
Union Contracts & Employee Rights	186	3.88	(2.6)
TOTAL	229	5.68	(1.6)

Table 14

Correction Officer Ratings of Curriculum
Content by Training Academy Attended

Curriculum Area	Bridgewater	Framingham	Shirley
Performing Personal Searches	7.22	6.56	7.20
* Performing Cell Searches	7.07	5.75	7.19
* Writing Reports	6.59	7.59	7.49
* CPR	5.42	6.32	8.52
* Firearms Use	6.36	7.65	7.08
Use of Restraint Equipment	6.59	6.82	6.72
Control of Contraband	6.75	6.27	6.16
Acceptable Conduct for an Officer	6.19	6.62	6.52
First Aid	6.16	6.35	6.54
Appropriate Use of Force	5.51	5.50	5.74
Organizational Structure of the Department	5.10	5.52	6.05
Criminal Justice System in Massachusetts	5.19	6.02	5.73
* Interpersonal Communication	5.03	6.76	4.69
Use of Chemical Agents	5.79	5.19	5.20
* Court Structure in Mass.	4.75	5.76	5.89
* Goals of the Department	4.70	4.44	6.35
Sentencing	4.78	5.51	5.54
* Military Drill Procedure	3.87	4.61	6.76
* Prison Culture	5.32	4.55	4.35
* Self Defense	5.55	3.68	4.69
* Disorder Control	5.21	4.88	3.92
* Department Classification System	4.02	4.67	5.40
* Parole System	3.70	4.15	4.72
Union Contracts & Employee Rights	3.59	3.39	3.92
TOTAL	5.55	5.64	5.94

* $p < .05$

Appendix I

Correction Officer Training Opinion Survey,
Questionnaire and Cover Letter



LOUIS M. BERMAN

Commissioner

The Commonwealth of Massachusetts
Department of Correction
Leverett Saltonstall Building, Government Center
100 Cambridge Street, Boston 02202

March 20, 1981

Dear Correction Officer,

The Research Unit of the Department of Correction in cooperation with the Training Academy is conducting a study of the opinions that correction officers have about their training. The Training Academy is in the midst of making a number of decisions about the pre-service training program and your opinions will be valuable in shaping those decisions.

Your name was randomly selected from a list of all correction officers for inclusion in this study. Even though you may not have attended the Training Academy program, because of your experience as an officer your opinions about the best kind of training for officers are important.

You are asked to complete the enclosed questionnaire and return it in the self-addressed envelope through the department's mail within the next 10 days. This should take about 20 minutes of your time. The questionnaires cannot be identified in any way and you are not asked to give your name. Compiled responses for the entire sample will be published as a report from the research unit that will be available to you.

Many thanks for your cooperation in this important project.

Respectfully,

Francis J. Carney
Director of Research

FJC/cc
Enc.

CORRECTION OFFICER TRAINING - OPINION SURVEY

In this first section you are asked several questions regarding the type of training you received. Please answer these questions as completely as possible.

1. What was the location of your initial correction officer training?

_____ (1) Bridgewater Training Academy

_____ (2) Framingham Training Academy

_____ (3) Shirley Training Academy

_____ (4) Other (please specify) _____

_____ (5) No Training

2. Was your training residential, day, or on-the-job?

_____ (1) Day Program

_____ (2) Residential Live-in Program

_____ (3) On-the-Job

_____ (4) Other (please specify) _____

3. Was your initial training pre-service or in-service?

_____ (1) Pre-service, I was Trained before working as a correction officer

_____ (2) In-service, I was training after working for awhile as a correction officer

_____ (3) Not applicable, I received no Training

4. If you had correction officer training, what are the three most useful things you learned or experienced during your training?

1. _____

2. _____

3. _____

5. In your opinion, what are the three most important things a new correction officer should learn during pre-service training?

1. _____

2. _____

3. _____

In this section you are presented with ten statements about the training that correction officers receive. You are asked whether you strongly agree, agree, disagree, strongly disagree or have no opinion regarding these statements. Please circle the response which corresponds best with your opinion about these issues.

1. Male and female correction officers should be trained together in the same program.
Strongly agree agree undecided disagree strongly disagree
2. A residential program, with live-in facilities can provide better training than a day program with commuting trainees.
Strongly agree agree undecided disagree strongly disagree
3. New correction officers should work at an institution for a while before beginning their course of training.
Strongly agree agree undecided disagree strongly disagree
4. The training I received from the department adequately prepared me to do my job.
Strongly agree agree undecided disagree strongly disagree
5. A correction officer should know what institutional placement he/she will receive before going into the Training Academy.
Strongly agree agree undecided disagree strongly disagree
6. The training program spent too much time in classrooms and not enough time in the institutions.
Strongly agree agree undecided disagree strongly disagree
7. Correction officer training could be done just as well on-the-job as in a special training academy.
Strongly agree agree undecided disagree strongly disagree
8. The training academy is located too far away.
Strongly agree agree undecided disagree strongly disagree
9. A residential program interrupts personal life too much to be worth it.
Strongly agree agree undecided disagree strongly disagree
10. A person's rank in their Training Academy class should affect institutional placements.
Strongly agree agree undecided disagree strongly disagree

In this section you are asked to rate the training that you received in 25 different areas. The ratings go from 1 indicating inadequate training to 10 which indicates excellent preparation and training. None indicates you received no training in that area. Please circle the number that corresponds with your opinion of the training that you received.

Poor Training - Excellent Training

Parole System.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	None
Self Defense.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	None
Prison Culture.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	None
First Aid.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	None
Goals of the Department of Correction.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	None
Performing Cell Searches.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	None
Criminal Justice System in Massachusetts.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	None
Disorder control.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	None
Writing Reports.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	None
Firearms Use.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	None
CPR (cardio-pulmonary resuscitation).....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	None
Acceptable Conduct for an Officer.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	None
Department Classification System.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	None
Use of Restraint Equipment.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	None
Court Structure in Massachusetts.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	None
Control of Contraband.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	None
Military Drill Procedure.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	None
Use of Chemical Agents.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	None
Union Contracts and Employee Rights.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	None
Sentencing.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	None
Appropriate Use of Force.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	None
Performing Personal Searches.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	None
Organizational Structure of the Department.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	None
Inter-personal Communication.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	None

Answers to the following indicators of your personal background and job characteristics will be useful in compiling this information. Please check the appropriate category:

1. Sex: _____ (1) Male _____ (2) Female
2. Current Job Status: _____ (1) Correction Officer
_____ (2) Senior/Supervising Correction Officer
_____ (3) Other (specify) _____
3. What institution are you currently working in? _____

A report based on information gathered from these questionnaires will be published on or about May 1, 1981. Copies of this report will be available to you if you desire one. Notices will be placed in each institution when the report is available. Several copies of the report will also be sent to each institution. Personal copies of the report can be requested from the Research Unit at 727-3312 at the end of April.

Finally any additional comments you might have regarding pre-service training of correction officers are welcome. Please use this space and the back of the questionnaire for such comments and personal observations. Again thank you for your time and cooperation in this project.

Sources

Powers, Edwin, The Basic Structure of the Administration of Criminal Justice in Massachusetts, Massachusetts Correctional Association, Boston, 1973.

Carkhuff Associates, Inc., Policy Analysis Report on Training Academy Pre-Service Activities for Correction Officer Recruits of the Massachusetts Department of Correction, Carkhuff Associates, Inc., Amherst, Massachusetts, 1979.