

1966

Staff and Client Participation: A New Approach to Correctional Research

J. Douglas Grant

New Careers Development Project

Joan Grant

New Careers Development Project

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/nlr>

Recommended Citation

J. Douglas Grant and Joan Grant, *Staff and Client Participation: A New Approach to Correctional Research*, 45 Neb. L. Rev. 702 (1966)
Available at: <https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/nlr/vol45/iss4/6>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Law, College of at DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln. It has been accepted for inclusion in Nebraska Law Review by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln.

STAFF AND CLIENT PARTICIPATION: A NEW APPROACH TO CORRECTIONAL RESEARCH

J. Douglas Grant*

and

Joan Grant**

Research in corrections is no longer something done sporadically by sociology or criminology students working for advanced degrees. Professional research staffs are now permanent parts of most major correctional organizations and correctional research has become, as Glaser puts it, routinized.¹ A good deal of this change can be attributed to the demands of state legislators and other budget-controlling bodies for evidence of payoff in the programs they are asked to support.

We are now seeing pressures for correctional research developing on a scale that cuts across individual correctional systems. The President's Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice, the Law Enforcement Assistance Act, and the Correctional Manpower Bill are new expressions of this at the federal level. The National Institute of Mental Health has expanded correctional research opportunities by forming a Crime and Delinquency Center. Recent policy decisions have made Federal Department of Labor and Vocational Rehabilitation funds available for demonstrations and research in the correctional field. The Ford Foundation has just completed a survey of research and research potential among state correctional programs,² and the National Council on Crime and Delinquency is supporting an investigation of paroling policies throughout state systems.³ What this means is increased demands for systematic information to enable more rational planning and decision-making and more effective innovations in the prevention and treatment of delinquency and crime.

There are three crucial questions concerning this expansion:

(1) Where is the manpower coming from? Who will do the inno-

* M.A., Stanford University. Program Director, New Careers Development Project; Consultant to President's Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice.

** Ph.D., University of California. Co-program Director, New Careers Development Project.

¹ Glaser, *The Prospect for Corrections*, 1964 (paper prepared for the Arden House Conference on Manpower Needs in Corrections).

² Fosen & Campbell, *Common Sense and Correctional Science*, J. RESEARCH IN CRIME & DELINQUENCY (July 1966) (in press).

³ Gottfredson & Ballard, *Uniform Parole Reports—A Feasibility Study Conducted by the National Parole Institutes*, Dec. 1965 (mimeograph).

vating, the data collecting, evaluating, and monitoring necessary for effective research? (2) Who will determine what program innovations should be studied? and (3) How will we get correctional staff and their clients, the inmates, to use research findings to bring about meaningful program change?

These three questions can be treated as highly interrelated. A simultaneous solution for the three problems lies in the notion of participation of staff *and* inmates in research efforts. The argument for this solution is based upon the following assumptions:

1. Research manpower needs cannot be filled by available professionals, no matter how many of them are written into tables of organization.

2. Decisions on areas for innovation and study cannot be made by research staff working independently of administrative support nor by administrators who fail to grasp the logic of research methods.

3. Clients are not passive subjects in whom one injects treatments A, B, or C. Operations staff are not robots who blindly carry out administrative directives. Any reasonably well functioning inmate or staff system can effectively sabotage any new program, despite the brilliance of its conception or the support and sanction given it by administrators.

4. Effective innovation requires a commitment to change on the part of the people who participate in it. Commitment comes about through participation in planning and decision-making.

I. AN EXAMPLE

Two recent halfway house programs in California offer contrasting approaches to the participation issue. The first was set up by the Department of Corrections for newly paroled addicted offenders, with funding for research evaluation provided by the National Institute of Mental Health.⁴ Like other halfway house programs, this one was intended to ease the strains of transition back into the community. More important, the development of a supportive staff-peer culture (based roughly on a therapeutic community model) was seen as a way of preventing re-addiction and return to prison.⁵

⁴ GEIS, EAST LOS ANGELES HALFWAY HOUSE, March 1966 (report of a program conducted under a grant from the National Institute of Mental Health) (in press).

⁵ As used here, "community" refers to relatively small groups of people who share all or most of their daily activities in common. In this

The proposal for this study was developed by research and planning people who had no contact with the staff actually assigned to run the program nor with the offenders who were selected as the initial residents of the halfway house. Their concern with a therapeutic "climate" as a key to the program's success was communicated to the fund-granting agency but apparently not to the administrators responsible for approving house operation. This group, with other concerns than those of climate, selected the initial residents from men already on parole who were seen as making very marginal adjustments in the community. These men, faced with new restrictions on their freedom, perceived their assignment to the house as a punitive act. An initial climate of hostility was so established. The resulting moves and counter-moves of staff and residents occupied the entire two years of the study and replicated, in miniature, the repetitive and self-defeating custody-inmate interactions of California's large prisons. The project succeeded in demonstrating only that the same social phenomena can take place in a small, community-based correctional setting as in a large traditional institution.

At the same time, a somewhat similar resident facility was being established by San Diego County.⁶ In contrast to the Department of Corrections approach, county administrators were specifically concerned with the development of a supportive peer culture and took steps to develop it before the house was in operation. A therapeutic community consultant was hired to work for several

sense a living unit within a prison, a hospital ward, a halfway house, or a forestry camp can be a "community." "Therapeutic" denotes the treatment aim of activities within the community. In contrast to an individual psychotherapy model, which bases treatment on a one-to-one relationship between a patient and a therapist and in which the therapeutic relationship is limited, at most, to a few hours a week, treatment here is based upon the 24-hour-a-day shared living experience and involves all community members, both staff and clients participating in self-examination. The formal vehicle for this is the community group in which all members meet, usually daily, to discuss problems arising from their day-to-day interactions.

Such a community develops its own shared goals, its own set of values, its expected behaviors for community members, and its sanctions for violations of formal and informal rules—these can be called its culture—which are transmitted to new members by those who have been in the group longer. The latter are the "carriers" of the therapeutic culture. In the correctional settings described here, the aim of such programs is to develop a culture that values and reinforces non-delinquent behavior, which is shared equally by correctional staff and clients. This last is crucial, since it is from the delinquent person's peers that pressure for change is most likely to be effective.

⁶ Personal communication from Samuel D. Mock on the National Institute of Mental Health sponsored Crofton House, June 1965 (mimeograph).

weeks with a selected group of confined offenders and with future house staff to plan and prepare for the house program. The entire group was then moved into the community as the initial residents and the carriers of a therapeutic staff-client culture.

While the two programs and their clients are not comparable in many respects, the importance of social-psychological variables such as "initial climate" and the role of staff-client participation is well demonstrated. It is worth noting that the Department of Corrections program (no longer in the project phase) has shifted its approach by introducing a staff-resident committee system. Both house staff (parole officers) and residents (parolees) work together on orientation, employment, education, community relations, and recreation committees. Even the committee chairmanships are available to either group. This shared participation has reportedly had a positive effect on the climate of the house and has greatly increased the efficiency of the program.

II. MODELS OF PARTICIPATION

Several trends in correctional research suggest alternative ways of making active participants of our all too frequently passive clients and staff. The first two models are directed primarily to correctional clients; the second two, to joint efforts of clients and staff.

A. THE CLIENT AS SUBJECT-RESEARCHER

The participant methods used by Schwitzgebel in *Streetcorner Research*⁷ are being extended in a current study of the violent offender.⁸ Under a research grant from the National Institute of Mental Health, four Program Development Assistants, a graduate student in sociology, and an anthropologist are interviewing inmates and parolees with histories of violence. The interviews concentrate on the sequence of events, ideas, and feelings which preceded the violent incident, and the aim of the research is to discover whether or not consistent patterns appear over a series of incidents for a given offender.

So far this is a conventional approach to gathering data. The client—inmate or parolee—serves as a subject from whom information is to be obtained by the research staff. The unique part of the study follows the recording and coding of the interviews. At this

⁷ SCHWITZGEBEL, *STREETCORNER RESEARCH* (1964).

⁸ Grant & Toch, *A Typology of Violence According to Purpose*, June, 1965. (Proposal for National Institute of Mental Health Research Grant MH6970-02).

point the interviewee is asked to meet again with the research staff and with three other offenders who have histories of violence. This "study group" reviews his interview with him and together they try to clarify the sequence of events leading up to each incident and to detect possible patterns from one sequence to another. The client, originally a subject, has now become a researcher as well.

This method holds promise for participant exploration of many other questions in the correctional field. It may be particularly useful for highly subjective, but crucial, phenomena such as the dynamics of rehabilitation and recidivism. Offenders who have demonstrated changes in their behavior and value systems, for example, could conduct inquiries on their own change experiences; or offenders who have failed on parole, despite favorable personal assets and strong environmental supports, could be brought together to discuss the factors involved in the failure of the opportunity structure.⁹ The advantages of involving subjects in inquiries on their own behavior are great. On the one hand, we open up sources of new ideas and fresh insights from a group that has been traditionally hard to reach. On the other, we offer the offender a way of escaping from a role in which things are done to him "for his own good" into one in which he can make an active, meaningful, and unique contribution to finding solutions to the problems of which he is a part.

There is no reason why such methods should not be extended to correctional staff as well as clients. Lower level staff in most correctional systems suffer from the same routinization, loss of meaning, and lack of voice in decision-making as do their clients. They too might benefit by opportunities to turn passive endurance into active exploration, and they too might be expected to contribute to the development of new ideas.

B. THE CLIENT AS DATA PROCESSER

Another model is offered by the Research Service Center¹⁰ at the California Medical Facility. Here, fifteen inmates and two ex-

⁹ That is, the range of opportunities available to the delinquent person to satisfy his personal needs. It is often argued that delinquent acts result from failure of the environment to provide opportunities for personal gain and satisfaction through non-delinquent behavior and that delinquency will thus be reduced by changing the delinquent's environment, or expanding his opportunity structure. The point here is that providing a more favorable environment does not guarantee that the expanded opportunities will be used.

¹⁰ Gottfredson & Ballard, Research Service Center Users Manual, Jan. 1965 (mimeograph).

inmates work with two full-time professional research staff and part-time consultants to conduct or provide supportive services to eleven research projects. The Center develops research designs, codes data, processes it on its own punched card equipment, or prepares it for available computer programs. It also offers consultation in data interpretation and the preparation of reports.

The Center operates on a production-line basis, turning out large quantities of work at very reasonable cost (turning to advantage the economics of inmate and ex-inmate pay scales). More important, the Center has developed its data flow procedures to a point where it can accurately estimate the time and funds required to perform a variety of complex correctional studies. This continually available skill and procedural resource is the key to effective research. The problems of research evaluation would be completely insurmountable if each new study required recruiting professional research staff and the development of new procedures.

A research service center, by providing the essential know-how, allows administrators, operational and technical staff, and clients to subject their ideas to systematic study. A parole board, for example, wants to analyze its decisions. Therapy staff wants to look at the corollaries of non-participation in groups. Educators are interested in the attitudes and opinions of men who drop out of school. A state correctional system wants to chart its work load over crucial decision points. The National Council on Crime and Delinquency wants to develop a uniform parole reporting procedure across all states. Such studies, proposed by non-researchers, can be conducted by non-researchers with the support of a research service center.

In addition to its service functions, the Center provides on-the-job training for offenders and ex-offenders. Men trained here might well become a part of research service centers in other locations. An expansion of such centers throughout the country is not an impractical conception, but may in fact become an important solution to the manpower problems posed by expanding correctional research demands.

C. PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANTS

A third participation model is offered by a National Institute of Mental Health-sponsored study of the use of offenders in new types of professional roles.¹¹ This study is an attempt to meet the

¹¹ Grant, *New Careers Development in the Change Agent Field*, in 8 READINGS IN PLANNED CHANGE 102-110 (Schasre & Wallach ed. 1965) (Training series for social agencies).

issue of growing manpower needs in the field of program development. Its methods draw on the behavior change implications of participation as shown in such self-help movements as Alcoholics Anonymous and Synanon.¹²

Program Development Assistants are offenders trained to work on teams with professionals and graduate students. They participate in an eight-month developmental program—four months while still confined and four months following release—which emphasizes learning through doing and learning through teaching others. Part of the program involves conducting special projects: interviewing other offenders and institution staff in such areas as innovations in parole, group therapy, and medical services, or on offender participation roles in programs for the mentally retarded and the alcoholic. The other part of the program involves participation in “study groups” on interviewing, group dynamics, the problems of organizational change, research procedures, and current social trends and issues. The study groups are planned and conducted by trainee teams using the resources of a library, professional consultation, and “back-up men” (Program Development Assistants who have completed the institution phase of their training). A given trainee is part of a teaching team for one study group, then becomes a member of the class for the others while another team does the teaching.

The experimental method is made an integral part of the entire experience through the use of an expected-to-observed procedure. Each trainee states a change (an expected) he wants to bring about in himself or in his performance of a task. He also states the intervention he is going to use to bring about the change and a rationale for why the intervention will do so. After a period of time he gets feedback from the other trainees on the extent to which his expected change has come about. Discrepancies between expected and observed behavior are noted and discussed, the rationale appropriately modified, and a new intervention planned. This procedure for learning basic principles through experience offers a powerful alternative to the more rote-memory learning of the lecture, the classroom, and the textbook.

The participant approach to training used in this study has implications for the development of offenders for other kinds of roles and for the preparation of non-professionals generally. As education becomes increasingly important in developing human resources, we need to think about “screening in” approaches to

¹² Cressey, *Changing Criminals: The Application of the Theory of Differential Association*, 61 *AM. J. SOCIOLOGY* 116-20 (1955).

learning rather than our traditional "screening out" procedures. The expected-to-observed method, the use of role-playing and other simulation techniques, and the use of study cards¹³ for developing ideas and planning action are examples of new approaches to learning as we attempt to meet the manpower demands of expanding human services by screening more and different kinds of people into professional activities.

The job of the Program Development Assistant is to help other people actively participate in planning and developing their own programs. It includes collecting and presenting information needed for decision-making, helping groups formulate relevant questions for study, and planning for systematic program evaluation. The Program Development Assistant works with both staff and clients and is concerned with bringing the two together in joint decision-making efforts.

The Program Development Assistants developed in this study so far have been employed primarily on programs designed to create new job opportunities for the poor in the human service fields, programs funded by local and federal poverty funds. They have produced an occupational manual which gives information on 663 jobs which are providing or could provide employment for the poor.¹⁴ They have conducted a feasibility survey of job and career opportunities for the poor within California state agencies¹⁵ and the recommendations from this survey have become an integral part of

¹³ The method is intended for use with groups which meet to discuss problems and solutions for problems, or to make decisions about plans of action. It involves having each member of the group print on 5x8 cards his ideas about the problem, proposed solutions, or proposed actions to be taken. As each card is written it is pasted at random on a wall of the meeting room. The group, under the guidance of an expediter, then collates and classifies the ideas presented in this fashion, grouping together those that seem to be similar. This method has been tried in a variety of professional and nonprofessional settings and works equally well in either. It has the advantage of cutting down on the inevitable repetition of group (committee or board meeting) discussions. It provides group visibility for each member's ideas, which seems to make it easier for him to listen to and consider the ideas of others, and it offers a way of grasping the relationships among ideas and dealing with them systematically that is often impossible in purely verbal discussions.

¹⁴ Reference Catalogue and Classifications of Occupational Titles and Job Descriptions for Sub and Non-professionals, Oct. 1965 (mimeograph) (Report prepared for the California Office of Economic Opportunity by the New Careers Development Project).

¹⁵ Job and Career Development for the Poor, Oct. 1965 (mimeograph) (Report prepared for the California Office of Economic Opportunity by the New Careers Development Project).

the state's program to build career opportunities for the poor within state service. They have conducted a similar survey in the Los Angeles area¹⁶ and are working there with parole, probation, employment, and community development agencies and with youth institutions to help plan for implementing the use of nonprofessionals in these areas. They have participated in an education research-demonstration project which employed 32 nonprofessionals—residents of a deprived rural community—as teaching assistants in a special summer school program.¹⁷ They are working at present with neighborhood councils in Sacramento to develop training programs for new jobs for the poor, with State Departments of Public Health and Vocational Rehabilitation to assist in developing job specifications and training for home health and rehabilitation aids, with the State Department of Employment to develop job opportunities for older youth within state service, and with a private agency to develop a community recreation center for teenagers.

Program Development Assistants, as ex-offenders, should be of particular value in working with correctional staff and clients in developing new correctional programs. Paradoxically, it is just these agencies that are most reluctant to hire and work with the products of their own rehabilitation programs and that are most cynical about the potential within offender groups for constructive contributions to correctional problems. It is still an empirical question whether or not this cynicism is justified. To the extent that it is, correctional systems should be investing heavily in program evaluation and innovation and should be the most concerned about the expansion of their program development staff.

D. SYSTEMATIC SELF-STUDY

Self-study means looking at where you are trying to go and what you are doing to get there. Systematic self-study means collecting information that enables you to assess the consequences of your actions and to make more rational decisions about effective ways of reaching your goals.

Any agency, including a correctional one, can and should engage in ongoing self-study of its operations. It can do it systematically to the extent that it has the resources necessary to collect and

¹⁶ Job and Career Development for the Poor in the Los Angeles Area, March 1966 (mimeograph) (Report prepared for the Economic and Youth Opportunities Agency of Los Angeles by the New Careers Development Project).

¹⁷ New Careers for Non-professionals in Education (1965) (Final report, Office of Economic Opportunity Research and Demonstration Project, Cal. Cap 896-1).

feed back information on what it is doing. The research service center idea discussed above and the Program Development Assistants are examples of such resources.

Self-study which involves the joint participation of staff and clients offers a way of merging the goals and functions of client treatment, staff training, and new program development. Maxwell Jones, who did much of the original work on the therapeutic community concept¹⁸ that has become the vogue in correctional programs, now speaks of the importance of setting up "living-learning" situations. In his hospital, the day-to-day experiences of staff and patients in the hospital wards and in the therapeutic community meetings are studied by the participants in post-meeting review sessions.¹⁹ Harry Wilmer, another pioneer in the therapeutic community field,²⁰ is currently using closed circuit television and video tape recording for this kind of participant self-study.²¹

The expected-to-observed procedure described above for individual training could readily be adapted for total agency self-study. Visualize an agency in which program innovations are tried systematically and with the active participation of staff and clients. Such self-study would require a systematic statement of the intervention to be tried and the results to be expected by its use, collection of data on the actual effect of the intervention and consideration of the discrepancies between observed and expected results. These expected-to-observeds as well as quality control information on the nature of the intervention would be fed back regularly to agency staff and clients to be used as the basis for necessary modification of the intervention and for the development of modified expecteds.

The following is a first approximation to a procedure for involving both staff and clients in continual program development. In this model, the agency (here, a correctional institution) would have a central planning group which would initiate the issue to be considered by presenting (perhaps on closed-circuit television) a fifteen-minute presentation by three appropriate members of the institution. This panel could discuss from the inmate's, the operational staff's, and the administrator's points of view such issues as having inmates and correctional staff together as students in classes for group counselors to be conducted for college credit at

¹⁸ JONES, *THE THERAPEUTIC COMMUNITY* (1953).

¹⁹ Jones, *Therapeutic Community Practice*, May 1965. (Paper presented at the American Psychiatric Association Annual Meeting, New York).

²⁰ WILMER, *SOCIAL PSYCHIATRY IN ACTION* (1958).

²¹ Personal communication from Harry A. Wilmer, Sept. 1965.

the institution. After the panel discussion—used primarily to stimulate interest in and understanding of the topic—the entire institution would convene in stratified groups of approximately twenty each. Inmates and each level and kind of staff would participate in each group. These groups would continue the discussion, recording the issues and areas of agreement or disagreement. Notes from the discussions would be fed back to the central study group which would clarify areas of overlap and then use this material in presenting the panel discussion for the following week. An expansion of the basic procedure would be to have special study groups, each including all relevant kinds of staffs and clients, to concentrate on specific areas of concern within contemplated new program innovations. At the same time, a corps of Program Development Assistants could be developed, largely from custodial personnel and inmates, to conduct the discussion groups, to prepare the notes on the proceedings of the groups, and to collect and feed back to the groups relevant additional information.

These four participation models—involving clients as researchers, or as data processors, using trained offenders or staff as Program Development Assistants to help staff-client groups participate in decision-making, and implementing a continuous self-study process in an organization or institution—are rough approaches to building staff and clients into correctional research. There is still a third participant group to be considered.

III. PUBLIC OPINION AND SOCIAL POLICY

Corrections is vitally concerned with the public—with public opinion and with the social policies resulting from public opinion. A major step in applying research to these concerns is being taken by the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice. The Commission is reportedly applying stratified sampling survey techniques to the estimation of the effects of crime on the population at large.²² Public opinion type polls will be used to provide estimates of both the number of victims and the extent of victim harm in different identifiable groups within the population. This will allow, for the first time, systematic study of crime rates and rate changes based upon reliable estimates of the cost of crime to the public.

Corrections' concern with public opinion has been limited largely to the public as victim or potential victim of the offender. The inclusion of the public in systematic study of correctional problems has much wider implications however. Other groups within the

²² Personal communication from Lloyd Ohlin, May 1966.

general public are emerging who are having a voice in social policy. It is apparent that the future will require the correctional administrator to deal with many components of the public besides those whose persons and property he is called upon to protect. The recent policy concerns with the Black Muslims, the court decisions on Synanon in California,²³ the increasing attention given to the civil rights of such offender groups as the chronic alcoholic, and the demands for both staff and inmate racial integration are but early expressions of the kinds of groups which will have a voice in the social policies which will determine correctional procedures.

Corrections is also concerned with the development of social policy, and to this extent it must think of appropriate interventions to influence and modify public opinion and action. These interventions will be successful to the extent that they are based upon systematic study of public needs and to the extent that they involve a continuous dialogue between the concerns of the community and of the correctional administrator. The National Council on Crime and Delinquency, an organization whose mission is to develop effective methods of modifying public opinion and social policy, could well take the lead in such activity. Each NCCD regional office as well as each parole and probation office could build systematic self-study methods into its efforts to build effective community relationships.²⁴

Innovation is by definition deviancy. With the increasing pace of demands for social change, we are seeing increased pressures for

²³ *In re* application of Faucette, No. HC111502, Super. Ct. L.A., Cal., Jan. 16, 1966.

²⁴ We do not need to be limited to the more traditional interventions of informational brochures, luncheon speeches, lectures, and the formation of citizen action groups. A very exciting lead for reaching particularly those segments of the public who have been largely ignored until now is the concept of the community talkback theater. Baumann, Actors Repertory Theatre, Inc.: Year of Discovery 1964-1965 (mimeograph). This concept includes an informal neighborhood center in which both professional and amateur (local resident) actors produce skits related to issues of immediate neighborhood concern followed by discussion of the skits between actors and audience. The topics for the skits are drawn from information obtained from the community (perhaps in informal streetcorner interviews) and the skits themselves provide a way of feeding back to the community a cross-section of its own attitudes. The discussions following the theatrical presentation provide further information on attitudes and may well lead to plans for community action. This method, intended originally as an approach to total community concerns, could well be adapted to dealing with such correctional issues as delinquency, drug use, and client participation.

optimizing the expression of deviancy—the innovating of the new—at the expense of procedures for inhibiting deviancy expression—the conserving of the old. This conflict between innovating and conserving forces is not new, but is intensified by the rapidity of the changes in our culture and the resulting strength of innovative (deviant) movements. The social ferment appearing on campuses, in civil rights groups, and in the efforts of the poor to have a voice in programs for the poor are examples of such deviant behavior. This kind of personal participation in social change may represent one solution to the problem of finding purpose and meaning in a changing world in which old ways of behaving are no longer appropriate or satisfying. Other, less organized kinds of deviant behavior—the increasing use of LSD and other psychedelic drugs, for example, or the delinquent acts of many young people—may also be efforts to find purpose and meaning in life (or reactions to their absence) and thus attempts to handle the realities of a changing society. To argue only for control of deviancy is to ignore the inevitability of change and the fact that deviancy, in itself, is not necessarily either good or bad, but is a condition for the culture's growth.

As one segment of the culture, corrections too—in both its practice and research—may find it necessary to turn from a deviancy controlling to a deviancy enhancing model. The question will become how to obtain a maximum amount of deviancy expression for a given amount of personal harm or how to develop minimax solutions for personal harm and deviancy expansion.²⁵ Such a solu-

²⁵ These are essentially statements of the probability or risk levels a culture is willing to tolerate in order to maintain a given level of freedom for its members. Check forgery might be eliminated by putting all money transactions on a cash basis, robbery reduced by limitations on the acquisition of private property, juvenile gang violence less probable by curfews for all youth, but solutions of one aspect of a problem only raise new ones in their turn. A similar point has been made recently in a report on traffic fatalities by Richard Goen, a mathematician at Stanford Research Institute. Reduction of speed by 20%, automated enforcement systems, compulsory safety designs for cars and highways, and revocation of driving licenses of both the young and the old as well as other high risk drivers could save many of the nearly 50,000 lives now lost annually in traffic deaths. Rather than proposing specific solutions to the problem, Goen's study was intended to ". . . serve as a rational basis for choosing between the current level of deaths and injuries and safety programs." *San Francisco Chronicle*, April 29, 1966, p. 20, cols. 1-2.

Our culture has a growing number of such social policy decisions to make, many of them related to correctional practice. It is more rational to have such decisions made consciously, on the basis of systematic evidence of the risks involved and systematic assessment of

tion may be the definition of a healthy culture.

A cue in our quest for solutions is that no one is intent on inflicting personal harm all the time. Rather than concentrating on controlling "bad" individuals (offenders), we should be looking rather for ways of assessing good or bad situations or climates. Further, although working to minimize personal harm, we should remember that there are more devastating consequences than the risk of harm to the individual. There is also the risk of rigidifying our entire culture.

IV. CORRECTIONS AS A LABORATORY FOR SOCIAL CHANGE

In a sufficient number of ways to cause concern, our correctional institutions are pilot demonstrations of tomorrow's great society. There is the guaranteed meeting of the basic needs for food, shelter, and clothing, and there is the mounting problem of idleness and the use of leisure time. A paramount question for corrections—and for society in general—is how to build purpose and meaning into such a "guaranteed" culture.

Correctional research should be exploring the dynamics of effective living in a changing society. What better way is there for the offender to contribute (if necessary, "pay his debt") to society than to help develop its self-understanding. In addition to its social contribution, there is growing evidence that such participation can provide purpose and meaning to the offender's life.²⁶

But we are not concerned with the offender in isolation. He is part of a system that includes correctional staff and the public at large. If correctional research is to be other than the routine and essentially meaningless reporting of incidence figures, if it is to help meet our needs for rational social change, it is imperative that the client, staff, and public become joint participants in the innovating, evaluating, and feedback inherent in research.

Let us return to the three questions raised at the beginning of this paper. We have available a tremendous pool of unused manpower in our correctional clients, and in our correctional staff. A minimum of resources, including the nonprofessional resources of

public reaction to this evidence, than to have decisions made unconsciously, by default, or on the basis of emotional and uninformed appeals to a mythical public opinion.

²⁶ GRANT, "The Offender as Participant, Not Recipient, in the Correctional Process," in *RECENT DEVELOPMENTS IN CRIMINOLOGY AND CORRECTIONS* (in press).

research service centers and Program Development Assistants, can put this manpower potential to effective work. The program innovations to be studied should come out of the joint concerns of staff and clients—and, we would add, of relevant segments of the public. The participation of staff, clients, and public in program innovation and evaluation is our best lead so far for using research to bring about meaningful program change.