

THE BILL BLACKWOOD  
LAW ENFORCEMENT MANAGEMENT INSTITUTE OF TEXAS

A Survey and Analysis of Correctional Officers Working in  
Traditional and Direct Supervision Systems

A Research Project  
Submitted in Partial Fullfillment of the  
Requirements for the Professional Designation  
Graduate, Management Institute

by  
James Abshire

Jefferson County Sheriff's Department  
Beaumont, Texas  
October, 1995

#266

## STATEMENT OF RESEARCH PURPOSE

The purpose of this paper will be to examine the attitudes of Officers that have worked both Traditional and Direct Supervision Jails. The principles of Direct Supervision were first drafted in 1982 to explain the concept. The principles were developed from observations of officers working in Direct Supervision facilities.

The purpose of the paper/research is to examine the Correctional Division Officers' attitudes toward the Direct Supervision concept.

The concept of Direct Supervision versus the concept of Traditional Jails is very different. Correctional Officers that have worked Traditional Jails had but one main job assignment. That assignment was to "lock up" inmates behind bars and make rounds to check on inmate status.

In a Direct Supervision facility, more responsibility is placed in the officer to keep control of the area that they are assigned. Therefore the officers must never be restricted from entering any part of the facility due to safety concerns.

## REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The main source for my paper will be interviews conducted with Correctional Officers from the Jefferson County Sheriff's Department. Also I will obtain information from the National Institute of Corrections, the National Institute of Criminal Justice, and the American Correctional Association.

This research will contribute to the Jefferson County Sheriff's Department by getting opinions from the Correctional Officers that work with the Direct Supervision practice. By doing this research we can analyze what problems the officers are having and how they view this concept.

## STATEMENT OF PROPOSED METHODOLOGY

The method of research I will use is the traditional approach. I will review several reference materials obtained from different sources for an actual base line of the Direct Supervision practice.

The questionnaire conducted with the Correctional Officers should give me enough information to determine if the principles of Direct Supervision have had any type of impact in corrections.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

- I. INTRODUCTION
  - II. HISTORY OF CORRECTIONS
  - III. A COMPARISON OF PRACTICAL DIFFERENCES BETWEEN DIRECT AND INDIRECT MODELS
    - A. Lack of supervision
    - B. Increased assaults by inmates
    - C. Need for alternative means of incarceration
  - IV. DIRECT SUPERVISION PRACTICE
    - A. History of Direct Supervision/Indirect Supervision
    - B. Control of inmates
    - C. Accountability behavior of inmates
    - D. Manageable number of inmates/officers
  - V. LOGISTICS OF DIRECT SUPERVISION
  - VI. THE STAFF
  - VII. QUESTIONNAIRE FOR OFFICERS
    - A. Officer input
    - B. Analyze outcome of Questionnaire
    - C. Organizational response to officer needs
  - VIII. CONCLUSION
- APPENDICES
- A. Officer Survey

A SURVEY AND ANALYSIS OF CORRECTIONAL OFFICERS WORKING IN  
TRADITIONAL AND DIRECT SUPERVISION SYSTEMS

INTRODUCTION

For over two hundred years, the American Justice System has struggled with the question of what works and what doesn't. For the most part, what has been learned is that so far what has been attempted has not worked with much success. Since society cannot just throw up its hands and admit defeat, we must continue to try new concepts and systems.

During the last fifty years, correctional professionals have tried to concentrate on programs which would reduce, to some degree, the high rate of recidivism. However, due to the staggering increase in numbers of criminals into the system, there is often little time to devote to possible rehabilitative programs. Trying to keep up with the housing increase takes all the time, energy, and money that could be directed towards such programs.

The purpose of this paper will be to contrast two methods already in place in terms of their ability to reduce the amount of problems which correctional officers must contend with, and at the same time, best encourage an atmosphere where rehabilitation can take place when desired by an inmate. We, as a society, can

only hope to better the actions of criminals while they are in our custody, and hopefully relay to them some of the basic skills that they have failed to develop elsewhere in their lives.

In traditional facilities across the country, they have sought to lock up inmates and "throw away the key". This type of system has proven to be the least effective, in regards to safety for inmates and officers and in regards to recidivism.

In my personal observations, I have observed that inmates who are placed with other more experienced and aggravated inmates, are, upon release, angrier and more prone to criminal behavior than when they entered the system.

#### THE HISTORY OF CORRECTIONS

Society gives the Correctional Division of the Criminal Justice System the duty of keeping convicted, and some accused, criminal elements separated from law abiding citizens. Two hundred years ago, justice was swift, severe, and not always just. A person could be apprehended, convicted, and sentenced all in one afternoon.

Local Sheriff's many times doubled as Justices of the Peace and were therefore responsible for apprehending and then sentencing of the accused.

It has only been during the last couple hundred of years that the Criminal Justice System has been organized in the system that we know today as the separation of the law enforcement agencies, the courts, County Jails and the State and Federal Penitentiaries. These three distinct systems, law enforcement, the judicial system, and the correctional system have gone through many changes throughout the years.

Changes have not been just legal but have also affected the physical design of the correctional facility. Going from almost inhuman conditions of dark, dank, individual cells as small as four feet by six feet, with no sewer system, to a modern dormitory type system which is now being adopted by many facilities. No longer do the different branches overlap into each other. Law enforcement agencies do not interpret the laws nor sentence for the courts.

The oldest style of housing inmates is referred to as providing "linear remote surveillance" . Linear remote surveillance cells are lined up in rows and officers look into them by patrolling along corridors or along "catwalks". Officers and inmates are physically separated, usually by bars. The officers have only intermittent views of inmate activity, with few opportunities for contact and communication with them.

The second generation, the "indirect surveillance" model, was developed in the 1960's. Cells became rooms and bars were replaced by solid doors. These rooms usually surround an open day room area for television viewing and other activities. Officers sit in secure, glass, enclosed, control booths from which they observe inmates; however, they rarely enter the living area and have only sporadic personal communication with the inmates.

In the third generation, "direct supervision", living areas may look much like second generation facilities, although they are often larger and more likely to use "softer" materials and fixtures. The critical difference is that there is no enclosed officer booth.



Officers spend their time in the housing module interacting with inmates. The focus is on active supervision in place of more passive surveillance. The officer's job is to know about, and be in control of, all activities, not just to observe them.

The officer's entire role has been redefined as a professional, rather than a "turnkey". Officers need skills in interpersonal communication, crisis intervention, and counseling.

They may see their role as a service provider and manager, rather than a strong-arm security agent. The primary functions of the correctional officer in the indirect supervision facility is to operate the control systems, observe inmate behavior, and provide limited intervention in response in the event of a major incident.

A COMPARISON OF PRACTICAL DIFFERENCES BETWEEN  
DIRECT AND INDIRECT MODELS

The overcrowding in today's correctional facilities has been felt by virtually all institutions across America, and other countries. The influx of criminals has put a strain on counties and states which must work within budgetary boundaries. Too many times, facilities are forced to accommodate unanticipated numbers of detainee and still remain within budgetary limits which were set several months earlier in the fiscal year.

It has often times become so difficult to anticipate the growing number of incarcerated persons. Facilities are strained to the point of being dangerously overcrowded and understaffed.

The downtown correctional facility of Jefferson County, in Beaumont, Texas (known as the Downtown Jail) is a traditional jail facility that has been in existence since 1981. Originally built to house a maximum of 505 inmates, this facility has had to house more than 800 to 900 inmates at various times over the years during my thirteen years of personal observations.

The Texas Jail Standards require one officer for every 48 to 60 inmates to be staffed on every shift. In the traditional jail setting, an officer routinely would make his rounds to the cells and the dorms where inmates congregate to watch television and eat meals.

After his inspection of the area, he would leave to inspect another part of the floor that housed other inmates. When he left an area, that is usually when criminal activity would occur. Since the officer was not in visual contact with the inmates, they could do just about what they wanted until he returned to their area.

This activity has occurred throughout the years and the layout of the traditional jails made it hard for an officer to see into the large day room areas with all the inmates standing around. Although officers do what they can to curtail criminal activity, they cannot be in visual contact with inmates in all areas at all times.

Due to this overcrowding, tension between inmates was at an all time high. Areas that were designed to hold 16 inmates were increased to 32, and on some occasions the number was even higher. Assaults on inmates by other inmates was also a major concern. The fact that inmates had no "personal space" directly resulted in increased assaults. Human beings are required a minimum of personal space or they become defensive and reactive. Therefore, by doubling the original number of inmates in an area, hostility was to be expected.

An increase in the number of nonviolent offenders was becoming prevalent. For instance, the emphasis on the D.W.I. (driving while intoxicated) crackdown, like that of Jefferson County, has resulted in an increase in the number of persons being arrested for this charge.

This was a major example where the nonviolent person was arrested and when sober were cooperative and easily managed inmates. Therefore, these type of offenders could be housed in a different type of facility that would prevent any physical violence towards others and was safer for them.

The failure to correct existing problems with incarceration as well as the added pressures of overcrowding, has resulted in added pressures in developing new facilities and theories.

The theory of Direct Supervision was established by officers that were working in actual Direct Supervision settings. The principles were developed from observations of successful direct supervision practices and unsuccessful experiences in direct supervision.

Since the principles were developed from actual practices rather than just theory, they carried a high degree of validity. The direct supervision philosophy is best explained by contrasting it to earlier design/management styles.

In many facilities, using the indirect supervision system, the officers communicate with inmates using a public address or intercom system. Staff safety is provided by a physical barrier placed between them and the inmates. Inmate security is provided by the use of single cells and the ability of staff to muster a response team in the event of an incident.

## DIRECT SUPERVISION PRACTICE

The operational and physical environments of direct supervision facilities are designed for a different approach to management. They are designed to express the expectation of acceptable behavior by inmates. The physical design, in some cases, might be similar in overall configuration to indirect supervision facilities (with single cells arraigned around a day room), but also include added amenities such as carpeting, upholstered furnishings, several television spaces, game tables, and exercise equipment.

The added amenities represent the primary difference between direct and indirect facilities. Most importantly, correctional officers are stationed inside the living unit with the inmates, not separated from them by a barrier. Personal interaction with the inmates is one of the primary duties of the officers and is emphasized in the direct supervision facility.

Security is heavily dependent upon the ability of highly trained staff to detect and defuse potential problems. Officers walk through and control the entire living unit, eliminating inmate controlled territories.

Direct supervision dorms of 48 to 60 beds are not further subdivided; the officer can circulate among all the inmates without having to unlock doors. This also allows special use areas to be created within a much larger continuous day room space.

The larger living area contributes to normalization of the environment and increases the tendency of inmates to congregate into smaller, compatible groups. Physical conveyances have one of two purposes in the facility;

First, it allows inmates to fulfill basic needs independently. These are needs that officers would fill if the conveniences were not there, taking the officer away from the primary task of inmate supervision.

Secondly, it is used in setting up expectations of rational and cooperative inmate behavior. The combination of physical conveniences, and continual interaction between inmates and staff, facilitates the use of behavior management techniques.

If an inmate exhibits inappropriate behavior, the correctional officer's job is to recognize it and respond immediately.

Consequences can range from restricting privileges to removing the inmate from the direct supervision facility to the traditional facility where the atmosphere is more secure and their movement is restricted. Inmates who are cooperative and well-behaved enjoy the privileges of a nicer environment.

The ability to regain lost privileges gives inmates the motivation to improve their behavior. The power to manage the facility in the dorms, recreation yards and other areas of the institution is given to the correctional officers.

Management must actively assume responsibility for assuring that the correctional officers are successful in effectively supervising inmates. Supervisors and administrators should maintain a high visibility profile on the facility to assure that the officers are performing their duties properly.

The exercise of considerable independent authority by the dorm officers requires monitoring to ensure that this authority is not abused. Supervisors must also make sure the practices are consistent with each shift and their actions are fully supportable by management.



There is a natural tendency for supervisors to spend most of their time in areas that demand the most attention and to respond to incidents. The dorms, for the most part, can be expected to run smoothly and not demand a great deal of attention from supervisors. For this reason, supervisors will have to structure their visits to the dorms to assure that proper supervisory attention is being given to the job performance of the officers assigned to that dorm.

The supervisor should ensure that his or her actions do not undermine the dorm officer's authority. The aggressive supervisory approach is intended to proactively avoid problems resulting from inadequate supervision or operational inconsistencies that can develop between shifts. 34a

The officer who practices the correct techniques of supervision and leadership on a daily basis may soon become an expert in skills that are highly transferable. These skills may prove invaluable to the entire division if the officer is eventually promoted to a supervisory position.

One of the residual benefits of a direct supervision facility which practices the accepted techniques of effective supervision and leadership will be the movement of individuals into the supervisory and, eventually, command ranks.

When a correctional facility emphasizes the management of inmate behavior rather than simply physical containment, the effectiveness of staff is critical. For this reason, the key resource of a direct supervision facility is competent staff. Assignment to a direct supervision facility provides officers the unique opportunity to develop their full potential as inmate managers.

Therefore, when correctional officers see that they have the potential for added input into the management of inmates, the facility can utilize their officers to assist in helping to see that the Direct Supervision philosophy is carried out.

The officers are gaining experience through practice. Making the officer responsible for managing a certain amount of inmates, can prepare them for future and more demanding responsibilities.

In dealing with sometimes uncooperative inmates, officers gain experience on how to handle these people through guidance from supervisors and other officers that have already been working with the Direct Supervision practice.

As indicated previously on page 11, much negative inmate behavior is driven by efforts to fulfill human needs. An inmate's natural behavior is the need to communicate and have contact with family and friends. This need is particularly strong when incarcerated. The fulfillment of this need then becomes an important consideration in managing the dorm. The timing and conditions of the visiting area are all very important.

If contact visits are available to those who conduct themselves responsibly, the motivation for responsible behavior is greatly enhanced. The potential loss of privileges that affect an inmate's relations with his loved ones is one of the most potent forces that can be applied to achieve responsible inmate behavior.

Telephone access is likewise an important priority for the inmate. Through the telephone, he is able to keep in communication with the important people in his life. Therefore, another important ingredient for the dorm is sufficient phones to meet the population's telephone needs.

Television is an important part of contemporary life. Most inmates have been raised on it from infancy. As children they were conditioned to sit quietly in front of the tube for hours on end.

Considering how effectively television occupies an inmates time, it is one of the most economical devices we can obtain for this purpose. This is especially true in certain facilities where such equipment is purchased from inmate welfare or commissary funds.

Physical exercise is an effective way to release pent-up emotional tensions which accompany the stress of incarceration. The opportunity for exercise can ease tension with inmates when they can release frustration in a controlled manner. When the facility is designed to meet this need, tensions are reduced.

Inmate idleness still remains one of the leading management problems in a correctional facility. The introduction of educational and industrial opportunities can contribute significantly to the resolution of that problem. The income earned by the inmate's involvement in industrial activities provides significant motivation to become and remain eligible for these assignments. Inmates involved in constructive activity are seldom management problems.

Jefferson County presently uses both the Traditional method of incarceration at their downtown facility and the Direct Supervision method at their mid-county facility. Because both methods are being used in the county, there are several correctional officers who have worked both systems and can therefore make knowledgeable comparisons between the two methods.

A survey questionnaire was given to thirty-four (34) officers who had worked both systems. A systematic evaluation was taken of the answers and the results of the questionnaire were compiled and is explained in the following paragraphs.

The survey was not given selectively to officers with over one year's experience however, as it turned out none of the officer's had less than a year's experience with the majority having three to five years experience

There was no question as to the facility preferred by the overwhelming majority of officers. The Mid-County Facility with Direct Supervision was considered to have better working conditions for the officers.

Some of the reasons for the officer's preference could be due to the open atmosphere of the dormitory style housing units, rather than the tank, or cell, enclosures of the Downtown Facility. Whereas, the Downtown Facility allows little, if any, time for the officers and inmates to spend outside, at the Mid-County Facility the dormitories have windows, and covered outside walkways, on which inmates travel to chow, medication call, chapel services, and other activities.

The response to question three, in which 87% of the respondents preferred the Direct Supervision facility, affirms the result of question 2. Officers who have worked both types of facilities, feel that the overall atmosphere is better for officers and inmates in the Direct Supervision Facility.

Based on the officers' answers to question 4 regarding control of the inmates, once officer's adjust to the Direct Supervision dormitory style, they believe that they are in more control because they have more continual visual contact with the inmates.

There is actually more control over the inmate in the Direct Supervision facility. Officers know the whereabouts of every inmate at all times, the inmate is in visual contact at all times, and because inmates move from place to place for activities and services there are more rules governing attire and conduct.

The officers overwhelmingly (95%) agreed that the attitude of Direct Supervision inmates is much better than Indirect Supervision inmates based on personal interviews with the officers, the following reasons for this improvement in attitude were: a more open atmosphere, the sense of having more space, the responsibility of getting oneself to and from activities and services, and more trusty jobs being available.

The officers believe that these things give the inmates a better sense of control over themselves. There are more opportunities for work, exercise, and education.

The officers overwhelmingly agreed that inmates have too many privileges. It is still hard for many officers to adjust to new philosophies in corrections that advocate allowing inmates some reasonable control of their own activities.

Officers, especially those who have been trained to the Traditional Supervision method, feel the inmates have too many privileges when it comes to amenities such as television, video players, telephones, specialty foods, and other such conveniences. Based on interviews with the officers, they see the privileges of these amenities as coddling of criminals.

The majority of the officers believe that the reason most inmates prefer Direct Supervision is the increase in privileges. It would be illogical not to expect that inmates would prefer to be housed in a facility which does more than have them sitting in a cell for twenty three hours a day.

There would be serious need for concern if an inmate preferred the confinement and close quarters of the Traditional Supervision facility.

The response to question 9, concerning security at the Direct Supervision facility, was a little unnerving. Inmates at the Direct Supervision facility in Mid-County are permitted to work in the warehouse, which has easy access to all types of equipment and tools, contact with outsiders and vehicles with keys in them.



Also, those inmates who are in specialized programs and housed outside the main perimeter fence, have access to open gates, work release, wood shop tools, and paramilitary type clothing. For these and other reasons, some officers feel security is not as tight as it should be.

Based on the response to question 10, the officers believe that Direct Supervision requires more responsibility of the correctional officer. Because officers are in constant visual contact with inmates and are responsible for the whereabouts of all the inmates in their dorm, they must be diligent and prepared to react at all times.

Question number 11 referred to specialized programs available at the Direct Supervision facility. The majority of the officers believe that these programs are making a difference. These programs are, for the most part voluntary on the part of the inmate.

They are also given more freedom of movement and privileges. There are some correctional officers who feel that some of these privileges compromise security and treat inmates like they are in day camp instead of jail. Results of these programs are inconclusive at this time.

The officers stated that Direct Supervision placed more stress on the individual officer. With more responsibility, naturally there comes more stress. For some officers, just being alone among 48 to 60 inmates is very stressful.

Even though the officers felt that the facility may be more stressful and less secure, they still showed an overwhelming preference for the Direct Supervision facility.

It should be noted that on some questions the officer either did not answer, or gave more than one answer which was counted as a "no answer". As in question number 11, one officer wanted to state that the programs made a difference in attitude of the inmates, but did not believe it made a difference in recidivism. All such responses, although informative, had to be counted as a "no answer" in order to maintain the integrity of the survey.

## THE LOGISTICS OF DIRECT SUPERVISION

In April of 1987, the United States Department of Justice, National Institute of Corrections, conducted interviews with administrators of Direct Supervision jails from across the country. These interviews were combined and edited, then published for release through the U.S. Department of Justice's information center. 35

The publication supported many known attributes of the Direct Supervision method, and it also shed some much needed light on the logistics of planning, opening, and maintaining a Direct Supervision facility.

The administrators agreed on the importance of carrying the philosophy of the Direct Supervision method throughout all areas and stages of planning, and the necessity of training staff to understand the philosophy and the skills necessary for Direct Supervision before a facility was opened. The cruciality of accurately forecasting inmate population was the next most important factor mentioned by administrators.

For a Direct Supervision system to work properly, long range planning must be implemented. One aspect of this planning is the physical layout of the facility; this must be coordinated with the security surveillance system and the computer system. For the security of the dorm officers, surveillance cameras must be in every dorm, walkways, recreation areas, and other critical areas.

Each dorm officer should have access to a line computer. The computer is necessary for accessing and filing disciplinary reports. Careful thought must be given to such things as placement of officer rest rooms, support staff offices, and the central location of inmate support services. These include the infirmary, chapel, education classrooms, commissary, and the mail room.

In order to insure the success of a new Direct Supervision facility, it is best if administrators, and perhaps even some of the correctional officers who will be working in the new facility, be given the opportunity to visit an existing Direct Supervision facility.<sup>36</sup> There should also be adequate training time for officers to learn the Direct Supervision philosophy and procedures.

## THE STAFF

Because many, if not most, Correctional Officers trained and worked in Traditional method jails for so long, the transition to the Direct Supervision method can be a very stressful time for officers. Some administrators might say that some of their personnel cannot make the transition, and will eventually leave rather than adapt.

The Direct Supervision requires a completely different attitude and philosophy towards corrections on the part of the Corrections Officer. Many officers are at first concerned for their safety in the Direct Supervision jail because they are not used to being in the midst of inmates for long periods of time, and are not used to having only inmates to speak with.

No longer can the Corrections Officer see him/her self as strictly a "herder" or disciplinarian to inmates. They must change their demeanor to that of an overseer and adjust their attitudes to include such things as common courtesies towards inmates, if they are expected to receive such courteous behavior in return.

Considering that one Corrections officer must sit openly amongst 48 to 60 inmates, it is imperative that order and discipline be maintained in ways other than just by "strong-arm" tactics.

The Corrections officer must be able to utilize other means of relating to inmates, such as courtesy, diplomacy, and fairness. In order to achieve this goal, many agencies, such as the Jefferson County Sheriff's Department, and the Arlington Police Department, have implemented policies which require educational standards for their officers.

In the case of Jefferson County, an officer must have at least 60 college hours by the end of their third year of employment. Eventually, it will be required that all newly hired officers must already have the minimum 60 college hours when hired. Only college graduates are being hired on the Arlington Police Department's force.

Education for today's correctional officer is of utmost importance. Not because the inmates are more educated or brighter than they used to be, but because in Direct Supervision, officers must have more options for dealing with situations than just the physical alternatives, and the general belief is that education provides those options.

One officer, no matter how quick his back-up is to respond to his call, is nonetheless still one officer against 48 inmates. The officer must be able to react to different situations by using his head.

Education, if nothing else, affords an individual more alternatives when dealing with different, or unexpected situations. It offers enlightenment and paves the way to understanding.

## CONCLUSION

Any facility can be a success if the management is firmly committed to a truly professional operation. If the management is committed to professional quality, then the majority of the staff will act accordingly.

As with any correctional facility, the importance of education and development of its staff is of the utmost importance. The actions of a staff that does not have education and training available to them can produce unnecessary lawsuits.

The basic education in corrections is provided by the academy. A facility must build on this basic education, and teach its staff members the importance of the "how to" approach. Any county sheriff can tell you that the majority of the lawsuits against his department are filed from within the correctional facilities.

Inmates have twenty four hours a day to think of ways to make the system work for them, and the law-abiding citizens are paying the bill.



After thirteen years in the corrections field, I can attest to this problem. I have seen inmates go to the facility law library and spend hours researching law that can be used against the facility for not providing certain necessities granted to them by the courts.

Some inmates "prey" upon correctional officers who lack certain traits of professionalism. This lack of professionalism is not the fault of the officer in some circumstances, because of not having been properly instructed with the proper working knowledge and skills of a professional correctional officer. The basic academy could surely be expanded and thus reduce the risk of litigation.

The most important point of this entire comparison is the difference in level of responsibility given to officers in each type of facility. As proven in the questionnaire, when officers were asked, "at which facility do you think there is more responsibility for a correctional officer?", eighty eight percent (88%) of the officers answered that more responsibility is placed on the officers working the Direct Supervision facility.

The majority of officers surveyed have worked in corrections for the Jefferson County Sheriff's Department from three (3) to five (5) years.

The implications of this are that the officers have a good working knowledge of both facilities. In the officers opinion, the Direct Supervision philosophy requires the officers to be in direct contact with inmates at all times. This is the main reason we must educate correctional officers beyond what has in the past been the "norm" as to how an officer should deal with the inmate population.

Assaults on inmates by other inmates, and assaults on officers by inmates seemed to be less as compared to the Traditional Facility located downtown. Overall, the officers who filled out the questionnaire agreed that the Direct Supervision practice seems to be working.

When an inmate does not follow the rules set by policy, they are sent back to the Downtown Facility. The majority of inmates sent back to the Direct Supervision Facility, after their stay at the Traditional Facility downtown, prefer the Direct Supervision facility even though the rules are more strict and their behavior must be in accordance with the policies set by the Direct Supervision philosophy.

Officers must know what is expected from inmates to be eligible for acceptance to the Direct Supervision Facility.

Although their behavior, when released back into society, may not be acceptable, while in custody certain rules and regulations must be adhered to in order for the facility to run smoothly.

Departments that have adopted, or will adopt, the Direct Supervision practice must address the educational aspect for their officers working in this field. Referring back to the questionnaire, question number four stated "Given the fact that correctional officers are placed in the dorms with inmates at all times, does this make you feel uncomfortable or more in control?".

Eighty five percent (85%) of the officers felt that they had more control when placed in the dorm with the inmates. The primary result of being in a dorm with forty eight (48) to sixty (60) inmates at a time is that the officer is only responsible for these inmates that are in his dorm. In addition he can observe their actions and monitor any type of misconduct.

An inmate will, in most circumstances, not perform any type of misbehavior in front of an officer for fear of being reported to a supervisor or written up for disciplinary actions. In some instances, inmates could also risk obtaining additional criminal charges being filed against them while incarcerated.

Knowing an officer is watching them at all times while in the dorm is a good deterrent from criminal activity or misbehavior.

Although the Criminal Justice System can only try to keep up with the influx of criminals, corrections can use the Direct Supervision philosophy to its full advantage. Having had my doubts about the theory at first, after working with the concept since October 15, 1993, I can attest to the fact that the officers seem to enjoy their jobs a little bit more than when working the Downtown Facility (Traditional Jail).

There seems to be less stress on inmates and officers alike. The atmosphere of the whole unit is, usually, calm and organized. These factors might be the direct result of both officers new to the system, and the more experienced officers going back to further their education and learn how to deal with inmates rather than "lock them up and throw away the key".

In summary, the results of the questionnaire have opened my eyes to what the officers believe about Direct Supervision and how they feel about the Direct Supervision philosophy. Question number thirteen stated, " Overall, at which facility would you prefer to be assigned in the future?".

Ninety five percent (95%) of the officers questioned stated that they would prefer to be assigned to the Direct Supervision Facility. This is not to say that the Direct Supervision concept is the "cure all" for the corrections field.

In my opinion, these officers have provided a valuable resource to the paper. Without their help, I could not have completed the objective of my intention. That intention was to prove, somewhat, that the philosophy of Direct Supervision has a definitive place in today's correctional concept.

It is true that not every inmate can function in a Direct Supervision facility. Along with strict disciplinary measures and constant supervision by officers, the majority of inmates that I have been in contact with, express an appreciation to be located at the Direct Supervision facility instead of the Traditional facility.

Most inmates believe that they have better living conditions and more opportunities to have a somewhat limited amount of "freedom" inside the unit. As long as the inmates are content with the conditions of confinement, the unit can run smoother and therefore more time can be spent on educating officers instead of dealing with constant troublesome inmates.

As long as there is crime there will be jails and prisons to house those people who refuse to accept what is considered reasonable behavior by society. All that can be hoped for is that while these people are incarcerated, they can be held to a higher standard than what they are used to and hopefully somewhere along the line they will accept some of these standards and incorporate them into their own lives.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. **Babino, Catheryn, M.** Corrections Officer of  
Beaumont, Tx. Interview by author, 23 July 1995.
2. **Babino, Anthony, M.** Corrections Officer of  
Beaumont, Tx. Interview by author, 23 July 1995.
3. **Bailey, James, T.** Corrections Officer of  
Beaumont, Tx. Interview by author, 23 July 1995.
4. **Briggs, Kenneth, H.** Corrections Officer of  
Beaumont, Tx. Interview by author, 23 July 1995.
5. **Clark, Preston, A.** Corrections Officer of  
Beaumont, Tx. Interview by author, 23 July 1995.
6. **Chretien, Darrell, D.** Corrections Officer of  
Beaumont, Tx. Interview by author, 23 July 1995.
7. **Dotson, Jeannette, L.** Corrections Officer of  
Beaumont, Tx. Interview by author, 23 July 1995.
8. **Desormeaux, Donna, A.** Corrections Officer of  
Beaumont, Tx. Interview by author, 23 July 1995.
9. **Duhon, Daniel, D.** Corrections Officer of  
Beaumont, Tx. Interview by author, 23 July 1995.
10. **Grogan, Rhonda, L.** Corrections Officer of  
Beaumont, Tx. Interview by author, 23 July 1995.
11. **Hill, Joey, M.** Corrections Officer of  
Beaumont, Tx. Interview by author, 23 July 1995.
12. **James, Bryan, P.** Corrections Officer of  
Beaumont, Tx. Interview by author, 23 July 1995.

13. **Jackson, Lester.** Corrections Officer of  
Beaumont, Tx. Interview by author, 23 July 1995.
14. **Lovett, Kevin.** Corrections Officer of  
Beaumont, Tx. Interview by author, 23 July 1995.
15. **Lewis, Sharon, A.** Corrections Officer of  
Beaumont, Tx. Interview by author, 23 July 1995.
16. **Lang, Jody, D.** Corrections Officer of  
Beaumont, Tx. Interview by author, 23 July 1995.
17. **Lee, Angela, D.** Corrections Officer of  
Beaumont, Tx. Interview by author, 23 July 1995.
18. **Langley, Bennie, E.** Corrections Officer of  
Beaumont, Tx. Interview by author, 23 July 1995.
19. **Malvo, Vertis.** Corrections Officer of  
Beaumont, Tx. Interview by author, 23 July 1995.
20. **Morris, Charles, H.** Corrections Officer of  
Beaumont, Tx. Interview by author, 23 July 1995.
21. **May, Carl.** Corrections Officer of  
Beaumont, Tx. Interview by author, 23 July 1995.
22. **Mercier, Rose, M.** Corrections Officer of  
Beaumont, Tx. Interview by author, 23 July 1995.
23. **Patton, Cindy.** Corrections Officer of  
Beaumont, Tx. Interview by author, 23 July 1995.
24. **Parker, Tanya, A.** Corrections Officer of  
Beaumont, Tx. Interview by author, 23 July 1995.



25. **Pugh, Mitch.** Corrections Officer of  
Beaumont, Tx. Interview by author, 23 July 1995.
26. **Root, Shawn, M.** Corrections Officer of  
Beaumont, Tx. Interview by author, 23 July 1995.
27. **Rawlinson, Teresa, M.** Corrections Officer of  
Beaumont, Tx. Interview by author, 23 July 1995.
28. **Standifer, Joseph, F.** Corrections Officer of  
Beaumont, Tx. Interview by author, 23 July 1995.
29. **Stewart, William.** Corrections Officer by  
Beaumont, Tx. Interview by author, 23 July 1995.
30. **Theriot, Jeffery, D.** Corrections Officer of  
Beaumont, Tx. Interview by author, 23 July 1995.
31. **Williams, Brian, C.** Corrections Officer of  
Beaumont, Tx. Interview by author, 23 July 1995.
32. **Williams, Welona, A.** Corrections Officer of  
Beaumont, Tx. Interview by author, 23 July 1995.
33. **Wilson, Lester.** Corrections Officer of  
Beaumont, Tx. Interview by author, 23 July 1995.
34. **Williams, Jerry.** Corrections Officer of  
Beaumont, Tx. Interview by author, 23 July 1995.

- 34a. Heuer, G.F. " Direct Supervision." American Jail  
September-October 1993,57-58,60.
35. Werner, Richard. "Podular, Direct Supervision Jails"  
Information Packet. U.S. Department of Justice January  
1993,1,41.
36. W.Ray Nelson, Michael O'Toole, Barbara Krauth, and  
Coralie G. Whitmore, "Direct Supervision Models."  
Corrections Information Series. U.S. Department of  
Justice, National Institute of Corrections Information  
Center, May 1984, p.23.

## APPENDIX

A survey questionnaire was given to thirty-four (34) officers who had worked both systems, (Traditional and Direct Supervision). A systematic evaluation was taken of the answers and the following results were found for each question.

**Question 1)** How long have you been employed with the Jefferson County Sheriff's Department ?

A) 0-6 months	0%
B) 6-12 months	0%
C) 1-2 years	17%
D) 3-5 years	50%
E) 5-10 years	20%
F) over 10 years	13%

**Question 2)** As you compare the working conditions in the new Mid-County facility with the conditions at the Downtown facility, which do you prefer ?

A) Mid-County (Direct)	88%
B) Downtown (Traditional)	12%

**Question 3)** In Direct Supervision, do you think that the atmosphere in the Direct Supervision facility is better than in the Downtown facility ?

A) Yes	87%
B) No	13%

**Question 4)** Given the fact that corrections officers are placed in the dorms with inmates at all times, does this make you feel uncomfortable or more in control ?

A) Uncomfortable	13%
B) More in control	83%

(Two officers did not answer this question)

**Question 5)** Based on the concept of Direct Supervision, do you feel that the rules are more or less strict than in the Downtown Facility ?

A) More strict	37%
B) Less strict	62%

(One officer did not answer this question)

**Question 6)** Having worked both facilities, do you think the attitude of the inmates in the Direct Supervision facility is better or worse than the inmates in the Downtown facility ?

A) Better	95%
B) Worse	5%

**Question 7)** Do you think the inmates in the Direct Supervision facility have too many privileges ?

A) Yes	82%
B) No	17%

(One officer did not answer this question)

**Question 8)** Based on your concept that inmates in the Direct Supervision facility have too many privileges, do you think this is why inmates might prefer to be "housed" in the Direct Supervision facility ?

A) Yes	83%
B) No	17%

**Question 9)** Do you think there is adequate security at the Direct Supervision facility ?

A) Yes	18%
B) No	80%

(One officer did not answer this question)

**Question 10)** At what facility do you think there is more responsibility for a correctional officer ?

A) Direct Supervision	88%
B) Downtown facility	12%

**Question 11)** Do you think the specialized inmate programs available at the Direct Supervision facility are making a difference in inmate attitude and recidivism ?

A) Yes	54%
B) No	40%

Question 12) At what facility do you think there is more job stress for a correctional officer ?

- |                       |     |
|-----------------------|-----|
| A) Direct Supervision | 54% |
| B) Downtown facility  | 44% |

(One officer did not answer this question)

Question 13) Overall, at which facility would you prefer to be assigned in the future ?

- |                       |     |
|-----------------------|-----|
| A) Direct Supervision | 95% |
| B) Downtown           | 5%  |