DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 048 568 AC 010 158

AUTHOR Adams, Charles; And Others
TITLE The Volunteer in Washington State Adult Corrections.
INSTITUTION Washington State Dept. of Social and Health Services, Olympia.
PUB DATE May 70
NOTE 40p.

EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS Attitudes, Citizen Participation, *Correctional Rehabilitation, Corrective Institutions, Crime, Criminals, *Individual Characteristics, Interpersonal Relationship, *Motivation, Objectives, *Prisoners, Role Perception, Selection, Statistical Data, Surveys, *Volunteers
IDENTIFIERS *Washington State

ABSTRACT

A survey was made of the adult volunteers who are working in the Washington State rehabilitation program for offenders. A closed-end questionnaire was submitted to a sample of 220 volunteers to gather hard core data such as age, sex, marital status and also information on kind of work done, what their attitudes were toward the Washington correctional system, and why they were volunteers. Of the 124 respondents to the "Volunteer Poll," the majority (56%) were in the middle age group (35-49); 98% were white males; 92% Protestant; most had at least some college work, with many graduate degrees. They were largely professional salaried workers with incomes over $10,000. Most of the volunteers were working for altruistic reasons; they felt that reasons for criminal activities were lack of love and understanding, broken homes, and lack of moral guidance. Few had known much about corrections before volunteering and the screening they received was shown not to be uniform. The majority, working in institutions, were involved in sponsorship and visitation; those working in the community were involved in parole sponsorship and job placement. Most felt that the goal of corrections was rehabilitation and that their work was important toward this goal. (EB)

State of Washington

DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL AND HEALTH SERVICES

DIVISION OF INSTITUTIONS

OFFICE OF PROBATION AND PAROLE

Olympia

The Volunteer in Washington State Adult Corrections

by
Charles Adams, M.A.
Judith C. Smith, M.A.
Theodore Wiseman, M.A.
State of Washington

The preparation of this document was aided by the Washington State Planning and Community Affairs Agency through a Federal Grant from the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration of the U.S. Department of Justice, authorized under Title I, Public Law 90-351.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Our sincerest appreciation goes to those volunteers who took the time and the effort to answer the Volunteer Poll thereby making it possible to complete our examination of the volunteer program in Washington State adult corrections; Dr. John Schiller for his frequent assistance in the preparation of this thesis and Nancy LaPlante for her secretarial assistance in the preparation of the typed manuscript.

MAY 1970

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
LIST OF TABLES		v
Chapter		
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
	Statement of Problem	3
	Importance of Study	3
	Definition of Terms Used	3
	Scope and Limitations	4
	Methods Used	4
II.	WHO ARE THE VOLUNTEERS?	7
	Racial Composition	8
	Marital Status	9
	Religion	10
	Education	10
	Occupation and Income	11
	Organizational Affiliation	12
	Summary	13
III.	WHY ARE THEY VOLUNTEERS?	15
	Previous Volunteer Experience	15
	Perceptions of Usefulness to Corrections	16
	Volunteers' Attitudes Toward Crime	17
	Hesitations About Working In Corrections	19
	Summary	19
IV.	VOLUNTEER WORK IN CORRECTIONAL AGENCIES	21
	The Volunteers' Previous Knowledge of Corrections	21
	Initial Contact with Correctional Agency	21
	Screening Elements	22
	Current Volunteer Involvement	23
	Current Assignments	23
	Agency Requirements for Volunteers	23
	Orientation and Training for Volunteers	23
	Specific Volunteer Assignments	24
	Volunteer Supervision	25
	Summary	25
V.	VOLUNTEERS' ATTITUDES TOWARD CORRECTIONS	27
	Volunteer Perceptions of Agency Goals	27
	Volunteer Perceptions of Efficacy of Agencies' Programs	28
	Rating the Volunteer Program	29
	Volunteers' Relationship with Supervisors and Agency Staff	29
	Job Satisfaction	30
	Effective Use of Volunteers in Corrections	31
	Summary	32

Chapter		Page
VI.	SURVEY IMPLICATIONS FOR WASHINGTON ADULT CORRECTIONS	33
	Volunteer Demography—Present and Future	33
	Broadening the Scope of Volunteerism	34
	Training and Supervision of Volunteers	35
	Conclusion	35
BIBLIOGRAPHY		37

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
I.	Age and Sex of Washington and U.S. Volunteers, Adult Public and Correctional Personnel	7
II.	Racial Composition of Washington and U.S. Volunteers, Adult Public and Correctional Personnel	8
III.	Religion of Washington and U.S. Volunteers and U.S. Population	9
IV.	Educational Level of Washington and U.S. Volunteers and Adult Population	10
V.	Employment Status and Occupational Categories of Washington and U.S. Volunteers	11
VI.	Annual Income of Washington and U.S. Volunteers and U.S. Families	12
VII.	Specific Reasons why People Become Criminals or Delinquents—Perceptions of Washington and U.S. Volunteers, Adult Public and Correctional Personnel	18
VIII.	How Washington and U.S. Volunteers First Heard about Agency where They are Working	21
IX.	Initial Screening Elements Encountered by Washington and U.S. Volunteers	22
X.	Primary Goals of Correctional Agencies as Perceived by Washington and U.S. Volunteers	27
XI.	Goals Which Should Have Primary Emphasis as Perceived by Washington and U.S. Volunteers and U.S. Correctional Personnel	28

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The use of citizen volunteers in the correctional process is at least as old a concept as is that of corrections itself. In fact, as early as the eighteenth century such private citizens as John Howard were evidencing concern over the treatment of criminals. In Howard's case, the concern lay with the conditions to be found in the jails and workhouses of his day. Undertaking an investigation of these facilities throughout England and Europe at his own expense, Howard published his findings in a book entitled *The State of Prisons.* So appalling were the conditions reported by Howard that an active reform movement began which resulted in widespread change and eventually the establishment of the prison system basically as it is known today.

Prison reform, however, was not the only area of corrections to be affected by private citizens. It was a group of volunteers known as the "Philadelphia Society for Alleviating the Miseries of Public Prisons" who first conceived of providing supervision to individuals released from prison, a system not unlike that of today's "parole" system. This was in 1822. Similarly, it was a volunteer, John Augustus, who initiated the practice of placing individuals convicted of crimes under supervision in the community rather than in prison. A Bostonian shoemaker by trade, Augustus instigated this "probation" process in 1841 when he secured the release of a confirmed drunkard from the Boston police court by acting as the drunkard's surety. In so doing, he unwittingly became the nation's first probation officer.

It was largely through the efforts of such individuals as John Howard and John Augustus that the correction rather than punishment of criminals became a legitimate, formally recognized process. Ironically, as the various areas of corrections became professionalized, the role of the private citizen volunteer in that process was virtually eliminated. Indeed, by the middle of this century, professionals had almost completely assumed the positions previously held by volunteers.

With the decade of the 1960's, however, correctional practice has been brought to full circle. Volunteers who were previously viewed by correctional personnel as liabilities are now sought after as valuable assets to the correctional process. This increasing acceptance of citizen volunteers by professionals is attested to by a survey conducted by the Federal Joint Commission on Manpower and Training. According to the results of this survey, forty-one per cent of the personnel in adult correctional institutions and twenty-four per cent of those within field agencies reported that their agencies used volunteers.[1]

Not surprisingly, however, the Commission's survey also revealed that there still remain ambivalent feelings on the part of correctional personnel toward the use of volunteers. Specifically, while those agencies where volunteers were already being used saw the volunteers as making significant contributions to the correctional process, those agencies where volunteers were not being used were far from enthusiastic about undertaking any volunteer programs.[2]

In spite of many practioners' reluctance to use citizen volunteers, the Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training concluded that volunteers do, in fact, offer potential beneficial contributions to the correctional process. Not the least of these contributions is that of sheer manpower. A survey undertaken by the U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, for instance, revealed that an estimated 25,401 additional employees would be needed in correctional institutions by 1969 while the probation/parole systems would need an additional 35,983 persons by then.[3] This would be in addition to the number of people already on staff by 1969. The survey further noted that none of the existing professional schools would be able to provide the manpower necessary to fill this need, assuming, of course, that the

various governmental bodies would see fit to finance the hiring of so many additional employees. Clearly, if citizen volunteers could be used to supplement already existing staff, additional services and assistance could be provided to the offender that would otherwise be missing.

Another possible area of contribution to corrections is seen in the potential ability of the volunteer to gain public acceptance and support for correctional personnel themselves. This was amply documented in *The Public Looks at Crime and Corrections*, a report of a survey conducted by Louis Harris and Associates for the Joint Commission in November, 1967. In that survey a sample population was interviewed concerning attitudes and perceptions of crime and corrections in the United States today. One of the questions asked inquired where the respondent would like to see federal spending increased. Several alternative answers were possible including aid to schools, poverty programs and foreign aid. Of the population interviewed, only three per cent responded "correctional rehabilitation." Similarly, when asked if they would be willing to see taxes raised to pay for correctional rehabilitation programs, only thirty-three per cent responded that they would be, while fifty-nine per cent indicated they would not.[4] Nevertheless, while this survey revealed both apathy and apprehension on the part of the public toward corrections, it also revealed that approximately one-third of the individuals questioned would be willing to do volunteer work in corrections, if asked.[5] The key phrase here appears to be "if asked," for it implies that most private citizens are not willing to come forth and offer their services without a certain amount of coaxing on the part of correctional personnel. The conclusion reached by the Commission with regard to this was that a "concentrated campaign calling for volunteers could elicit a strong response." It was further felt that "the use of these volunteers could go a long way toward eliminating the community uneasiness expressed . . . and ease the re-entry into the community of the individual who 'has paid his debt to society.' "[7]

The tremendous need for community involvement in the correctional process is perhaps best expressed in the summation of the Commission's report, *Volunteers Look at Corrections*. As noted in this summary:

> Community understanding and support are perhaps even more important to corrections than to many other public services. For the ability of released offenders to fit into normal community life is the real test of whether corrections has succeeded or failed with them. Thus volunteers, as citizens who can help to smooth the ex-offender's way back to the free society, contribute not only to the welfare of individuals but also to the viability of corrections, now and in future.[8]

The need for community involvement in any successful correctional program is becoming more and more apparent by the very lack of it and the subsequent inability of the offender to find acceptance within the community. However, at least in the State of Washington, it has only been within the last three years that the utilization of citizens as volunteers in corrections has been seen as a means of bringing about such involvement. Previously, the citizen who offered his services voluntarily to corrections was viewed with some suspicion by the professional staff. In part, this suspicion had a valid foundation inasmuch as there was no attempt to either screen out the undesirable elements nor to train or support the desirable ones. Consequently, individuals obviously unsuited to correctional work became involved while those who were suitable "fell by the wayside" through frustration and lack of support. As a result the professional came to view the whole concept of volunteerism with a somewhat jaundiced eye.

The first concentrated attempt to both recruit and utilize volunteers in a constructive, but controlled manner, was initially made in Washington by a private corporation rather than public agency. Identified as the Job Therapy-M2 (Man to Man) program, this corporation recruited private citizens to act as "sponsors" to inmates confined at the Washington State

Reformatory at Monroe, Washington. As a sponsor, the volunteer was asked only to act as a friend and confidant to one inmate at a time on a "man to man" basis.

Begun by Richard Simmons, a Presbyterian minister, M2 sought to recruit and screen its applicants in a consistent manner. Areas of recruitment, for the most part, were those clubs, organizations, and churches with which the leaders of M2 were familiar, and as most of the leaders were church-oriented, their initial efforts were concentrated on churches and church-sponsored organizations. Although the M2 program made no effort to disguise its Christian emphasis, it did attempt to discourage individual evangelism unless it was sought by the inmate himself.

To say that the M2 program won immediate acceptance by adult corrections in Washington would be erroneous, for its acceptance was neither immediate nor whole-hearted. Nevertheless, after much perseverance by the volunteers, the professional staff began recognizing the very real need being filled by the volunteers. From that point it was not long before adult corrections began thinking in terms of a state recruitment program.

The first step taken by the state to legitimize the use of volunteers was to establish a staff position for a Community Coordinator within the Washington State Department of Institutions, Division of Probation and Parole, for the purpose of coordinating all private volunteer groups within adult corrections. Another duty assigned the Community Coordinator was that of planning for volunteer recruitment and training. As this work is written, the Division of Probation and Parole continues to develop both private and public volunteer resources.

Statement of Problem

While the use of citizen volunteers in the correctional process has been accepted by Washington state correctional agencies as a positive tool in the rehabilitation process, little is actually known about the volunteers themselves: who they are, why they are volunteers, what kind of work they do in a correctional setting, and what their attitudes are toward the Washington state correctional system itself. Although national research has been done by Louis Harris Associates on the character of the volunteer, none has been done on a statewide basis in Washington itself. Consequently the use of citizen volunteers in this state remains a virtually unknown quantity.

Because of the lack of knowledge about volunteers in adult corrections in general and specifically in Washington this thesis proposes to examine the volunteer program, dealing not only with the volunteers themselves but also their involvement in and attitudes towards the correctional system.

Importance of the Study

The importance of our survey of the volunteers is four-fold. First, the findings of this survey will hopefully provide a clearer understanding of the volunteer program in adult corrections in the State of Washington. Second, the results can provide a basis for further research into the volunteer program and such areas as the actual effectiveness of the volunteer as a rehabilitation resource. Third, it can serve as a guideline for further development of the citizen volunteer program in those correctional areas where it is now absent or deficient. Fourth, it may serve as a useful tool for those who wish to further involve the community in the correctional process by indicating which areas are presently under-represented in the volunteer program.

Definition of Terms Used

Volunteers. For purpose of this study, the volunteer is defined as an adult who

offers his services free of charge to one of the two adult correctional agencies within the Washington State Department of Institutions. Not included in this definition are those volunteers who work with correctional agencies on a local governmental level nor those who work with juvenile offenders.

Adult Corrections. The term adult corrections will be used in this work to designate the whole of the Washington state adult correctional process for felony offenders, beginning with probation and on through incarceration.

Division of Adult Corrections. Not to be confused with "Adult Corrections" the Division of Adult Corrections is one of the two adult correctional agencies within the Washington State Department of Institutions. The Division of Adult Corrections encompasses all penal institutions and honor camps in which convicted adult felons are confined. Hereafter, this division will be referred to only by title.

Division of Probation and Parole. Also within the Washington State Department of Institutions, the Division of Probation and Parole is the second of the two adult correctional agencies in the state. This division includes all field services providing for the supervision of adult felons (both probationers and parolees) in the community.

Scope and Limitations

The scope of our research has been limited to volunteers working with the two adult correctional agencies in the State of Washington. In dealing with adult correctional volunteers only, we were able to research a cohesive group which had experienced much the same recruitment and training processes. Because of this, it was felt that meaningful implications could be drawn in terms of future recruitment, training and research.

Methods Used

Having decided upon a research project which was descriptive in nature, it was determined that a written questionnaire with closed-end questions submitted to a random sample of the volunteers would elicit valid results in the most expeditious manner possible. It would also enable us to reach a larger portion of the population with the resources and time available. Of the questions posed, several of necessity dealt with hard core data such as age, sex, and marital status. No names were sought on the questionnaires as it was felt anonymity would encourage the respondents to be more open in their responses. Other questions on the questionnaire dealt with the kind of work done by the volunteers in a correctional setting, what their attitudes are toward the Washington correctional system and why they are volunteers. As it was our intention to use comparative data from the Louis Harris surveys conducted for the Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training, the questions were couched in such a manner as to make comparison possible.

Once all questions had been written and edited they were pretested on a group of 15 volunteers to determine whether or not the questions themselves would seem clear. Each of the volunteers was given the sample questionnaire individually and asked to report to the interviewer any apparent ambiguities so that the appropriate changes, if any, could be made.

Following this pretest and the final revisions of the questionnaire, it was submitted to the sample of the volunteer population. Excluded from this sample were all volunteers who had come into the program within the last two months because it was felt they would have had little experience on which to base their answers. Of the remaining volunteers, each third name was eliminated, leaving a sample of 220 volunteers, or approximately 66 per cent of the volunteer population, thus guaranteeing a more homogeneous sample. The questionnaire or "Volunteer Poll" was then submitted by mail to each volunteer along with a stamped,

self-addressed envelope and a letter explaining the purpose of the research and enlisting the volunteer's assistance in answering the questions.

Of the 220 volunteers polled, 124, or 56 per cent of the total sample responded. Their individual responses were then tabulated and constitute the figures to be used throughout this thesis.

FOOTNOTES

[1]Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training, A Time to Act, (Washington: The Commission, 1969), p. 39.

[2]Loc. Cit.

[3]Abraham Alcabes and Herman Piven, The Crisis of Qualified Manpower for Criminal Justice: An Analytic Assessment with Guidelines for New Policy, Vol. 2, (Washington: U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1969), p. 64.

[4]Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training, The Public Looks at Crime and Corrections, (Washington: The Commission, 1968), p. 10.

[5]Ibid., p. 18.

[6]Loc. Cit.

[7]Loc. Cit.

[8]Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training, Volunteers Look at Corrections, (Washington: The Commission, 1969), p. 28.

CHAPTER II

WHO ARE THE VOLUNTEERS?

TABLE I

AGE AND SEX OF WASHINGTON AND U.S. VOLUNTEERS, ADULT PUBLIC AND CORRECTIONAL PERSONNEL

	Washington Volunteers	U.S. Volunteers*	U.S. Population 21 Years & Over**	U.S. Correctional Personnel***
	%	%	%	%
21 - 34	21	35	26	25
35 - 49	56	40	30	45
50 and over	23	25	44	30
Sex				
Males	98	53	49	88
Females	2	47	51	12

Sources:

*Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training, Volunteers Look at Corrections, (Washington: The Commission, 1969), p. 6.

**Loc. Cit.

***Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training, Corrections 1968: A Climate for Change, (Washington: The Commission, 1968), pp. 27-28.

Of the 124 respondents to the "Volunteer Poll," the majority, 69 (56%), were in the middle age range of from 35 to 49 years of age. Twenty-six (21%) volunteers were under 35 but over 21 while 29 (23%) were 50 years of age or older. This is something of a contrast to the U.S. volunteers who show a larger portion of volunteers under 35, as well as the general U.S. population which has a larger portion over the age of 50.

With regard to sex, an overwhelming majority of the Washington volunteers are men. This is far different from the comparison populations but shows a closer relationship to U.S. Correctional Personnel. Certainly, at least in the past, it has been traditional to hire men to work with adult male offenders and women to work with female offenders. Although this tradition is giving way and women are supervising adult male offenders on probation and parole in Washington, this is still something of an exception rather than a rule.

Also to be considered in conjunction with the ratio of male-female volunteers is the fact that approximately 90 per cent of adult offenders confined or supervised in Washington are men and they are more likely to be given male sponsors than female. In spite of possible conflict with tradition, however, it does appear that the female population represents a vast, and relatively untouched, field for recruitment in Washington.

Other potential resource areas indicated by Table I are those individuals under 35 and over 50. Younger volunteers might be especially desirable as a large number of offenders are

themselves under 35 years of age and thus might be more responsive to a sponsor or volunteer counselor near their own age.

While both the female population and the population under 35 offer wider horizons for recruitment, there is also a potential for conflict with professional staff in just such recruitment for it is conceivable that the staff might have some difficulty in accepting and giving responsibility to volunteers who differ significantly from themselves, either in terms of age or sex. On the other hand, if such differences are to be considered of significant importance, it appears that the present proportions, with some variations, should be maintained, at least until such time as the volunteer concept wins major approval from the staff.

Racial Composition

TABLE II

RACIAL COMPOSITION OF WASHINGTON AND U.S. VOLUNTEERS, ADULT PUBLIC, AND CORRECTIONAL PERSONNEL

	Washington Volunteers	U.S. Volunteers*	U.S. Population 21 Years & Over**	U.S. Correctional Personnel***
	%	%	%	%
White	98	95	89.6	92
Negro	0	4	9.4	8
Other	2	1	1.0	Under .5%

Sources:

*Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training,

Sources:

Sources:

, *Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training, Volunteers Look at Corrections, (Washington: The Commission, 1969), p. 6.

**U.S. Bureau of Census, "Estimates of the Population of Voting Age for States: November 1, 1968, Current Population Reports," Series Page 25, Number 406, (Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1968), p. 2 includes persons 18 to 20 years of age in Georgia and Kentucky, 19 and 20 in Alaska, and 20 in Hawaii.

***Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training, Corrections 1968: A Climate for Change, (Washington: The Commission, 1968), p. 28.

One hundred twenty-two (98%) volunteers reported being white. Only two (2%) were of different racial background and, in this case, they were Oriental. No Negro volunteers responded at all to the survey. While the comparison populations also reported a majority of whites, the proportion of Negroes is considerably greater than that of the Washington

volunteers. This is undoubtedly partially due to a recruitment program which to date has been directed toward religious organizations and/or affiliations which are composed mainly of whites. Even so, the larger U.S. volunteer population also shows a disproportionately small percentage of Negro volunteers. This might suggest that either most volunteer recruitment programs are neglecting this portion of the population or the recruitment efforts amongst the black population to date have been relatively unsuccessful. In either event, the fact that Negroes have proportionately a significantly higher rate of arrest[9] and subsequent conviction, it would seem that an intensive recruitment effort should be directed toward that population on the basis that the Negro offender might be more receptive to assistance from a Negro than a white volunteer, especially in view of today's heightened racial consciousness.

Marital Status

When questioned as to marital status, the volunteer sample responded in the following manner:

	No.	%
Married	117	95
Single	3	2
Separated	1	1
Divorced	3	2

Of those individuals who reported to being married, separated, or divorced, 95 (77%) indicated that they had dependent children ranging in numbers from one through over five. Twenty-nine individuals responded that they had no dependent children, with many of this group falling in the over fifty age bracket.

From the figures quoted, it would seem that family responsibilities do not prevent married persons from accepting the additional responsibilities of volunteers' work. Indeed, as noted in a recent newspaper article, "Wives and children are important keys to the program, both parolees and couples said . . . children tend to accept the parolees without regard for their past record."[10]

Religon

TABLE III

RELIGION OF WASHINGTON AND U.S. VOLUNTEERS AND U.S. POPULATION

	Washington Volunteers	U.S. Volunteers*	U.S. Population 21 Years And Over**
	%	%	%
Protestant	92	67	66
Catholic	4	20	27
Jewish	0	7	3
Other	3	5	2
No Religion	1	1	2

Sources:

Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training, **Volunteers Look at Corrections**, (Washington: The Commission, 1969), p. 8.

**Loc. Cit.

Unlike the comparison sample, the majority of Washington volunteers, 114 (92%) are Protestant. Only five (4%) individuals reported to being Catholic with one reporting no religion and four having religion other than that listed.

As with other facets of the Washington volunteers' profile, the religious composition seems to be reflective of the recruitment program undertaken by private organizations prior to the state's participation in this responsibility. Taking into consideration the general U.S. population distribution as well as that of the U.S. volunteers, it would appear that further recruitment directed toward other religious groups should meet with some success.

Education

TABLE IV

EDUCATIONAL LEVEL OF WASHINGTON AND U.S. VOLUNTEERS AND ADULT POPULATION

Education	Washington Volunteers	U.S. Volunteers*	U.S. Population 25 Years And Over**
	%	%	%
11th Grade or less	5	6	49
High School Graduate	17	20	32
1-3 Years College	24	26	9
College Graduate	19	24	10
Some Graduate Work	19	10	NA
Masters Degree	14	10	NA
Doctors Degree	2	4	NA

NA – Not Available

Sources:

*Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training, Volunteers Look at Corrections, (Washington: The Commission, 1969), p. 7.

**U.S. Bureau of Census, Statistical Abstract of the United States: 1968, (Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1968), p. 110.

Washington volunteers appear to be better educated than either the U.S. volunteers or the general adult population. Whereas 27 (22%) volunteers reported being high school graduates or less, 29 (24%) had from one to three years of college, 24 (19%) were college graduates, 24 (19%) more had some graduate work, 17 (14%) had masters degrees, and three (2%) individuals had doctors degrees. Furthermore, of those volunteers who are college graduates, 11 (9%) reported having degrees in more than one field. The college degrees as indicated by the respondents were as follows:

	No.	%
Business	15	12
Education	14	11
Religion	7	6
Sociology	3	2

Psychology	2	2
Social Work	2	2
Other	36	29

It would appear that the largest single degree field amongst Washington volunteers is that of business with education closely following. Not surprisingly, religion has a relatively large number of degree holders amongst the sample population. Of those fields of degrees most closely related to the field of corrections, i.e. sociology, psychology, and social work, proportionately few graduates are involved in volunteer work. Whether or not this is a result of the recruitment program is not known. Nevertheless, it would seem that this is an area to begin exploring for qualified volunteers with skills that would be useful to corrections. The fact that present caseloads prevent correctional personnel from offering extensive counseling within the field would seem to make this type of recruitment especially desirable.

Occupation and Income

The relatively high degree of education attained by the majority of volunteers is reflected in their employment status and occupational categories as well as the total annual income of the volunteers' families.

TABLE V

EMPLOYMENT STATUS AND OCCUPATIONAL CATEGORY OF WASHINGTON AND U.S. VOLUNTEERS

Employment Status	Washington Volunteers	U.S. Volunteers*
	%	%
Wage Worker	15	8
Salaried Worker	60	44
Self Employed	17	15
Retired	NA	3
Housewife	2	26
Student	2	2
Other	4	2
Occupation		
Professionals	47	25
Executives	14	10
Writers, artists, other creative personnel	2	3
Sales Worker	4	6
Other White Collar Worker	11	13
Blue Collar Worker	20	7
Other	2	6

NA – Not Available

Source:

*Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training, **Volunteers Look at Corrections**, (Washington: The Commission, 1969), p. 7. (Error in column total occurs in the source data.)

The great majority of Washington volunteers sampled are either employed or in school. Of those employed, 74 (60%) are salaried workers, 21 (19%) are self employed, and 19 (16%) are wage workers. With regard to occupational categories, a large number, 58 (47%), are professional, 24 (20%) are tradesmen or blue collar workers, five (4%) are sales workers and two (2%) are involved in creative arts. Their total annual incomes are indicated in Table VI.

TABLE VI

ANNUAL INCOME OF WASHINGTON AND U.S. VOLUNTEERS AND U.S. FAMILIES

Income	Washington Volunteers	U.S. Volunteers*	U.S. Families**
	%	%	%
Under $5,000	2	9	28
$5,000 - $9,000	19	30	44
$10,000 - $14,999	45	37	28
$15,000 and over	34	24	***

Sources:

*Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training, **Volunteers Look at Corrections**, (Washington: The Commission, 1969), p. 7.

**Loc. Cit.

***Included within the category of $10,000 - $14,999.

Clearly, Washington volunteers represent an elite group of people even when compared to the U.S. volunteers. Undoubtedly influential in the communities in which they live and work, these individuals probably represent the best possible source for changing community attitudes towards crime and corrections. However, their suitability, when compared to the offender population which historically has come from a lower socio-economic background, might be questionable. Can the offender and sponsor communicate in spite of this chasm, for instance? Might not there be resentment on the part of the offender as a "have-not" toward the volunteer as a "have"? In either event, it might be well to place more emphasis upon recruitment from lower socio-economic groups. Certainly, the distribution of U.S. volunteers would seem to imply that individuals in the lower income brackets are also receptive to volunteer work.

Organizational Affiliation

Although it was anticipated that membership within either a fraternal organization or a religious organization other than a church would be rather high among the volunteers, this was not the case. In fact, of the 124 respondents only 23 (19%) stated they belonged to fraternal organizations while 15 (12%) related belonging to religious organizations other than a church. However, when asked "Do you belong to a church?", 115 (93%) responded in the affirmative. Thus, while the volunteers showed relatively little inclination towards forming secular

organizational affiliations, the majority did have definite religious ties. Furthermore, of the 115 belonging to a church, 79 or 69 per cent stated that they were involved in their church "a great deal" while those claiming to be not actively involved totaled only six (5%). Thirty volunteers reponded that they had "some" involvement.

Summary

The profile of the volunteer in Washington state adult corrections, as indicated by the foregoing, is that of a white, male, adult, between the ages of 35 and 50, who has a better than average education. As might be expected, with a better education our volunteer is likely to have a professional or executive job and will probably earn $10,000 or more per year. Although he is not a "joiner," he is typically a member of a Protestant church and very likely is actively involved in his church. In short, the volunteer is the type of individual who is usually highly respected within the community. As such, he can probably be very effective in obtaining community support for corrections. There are, however, other areas where he may not be so effective because of these very factors. Can he, for instance, gain the confidence of the parolee or probationer with whom he is working and who, himself, probably comes from a lower socio-economic background and is possibly of another race? Also, can he earn the confidence of correctional personnel who not infrequently view religiously oriented volunteers with some suspicion if not hostility?

In conclusion, while the present volunteer has a good deal to offer corrections and has done much already, there is still room for expansion of recruitment into areas hitherto overlooked.

FOOTNOTES

[9]Task Force on Assessment, **Task Force Report: Crime and Its Impact—An Assessment**, (Washington: The President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, 1967), p. 78.

[10]"Volunteers Aid Inmates, Parolees," **The Seattle Times** (Seattle), April 2, 1970. p. A-5.

CHAPTER III

WHY ARE THEY VOLUNTEERS?

Traditionally, corrections has been accepted by the public as a necessary evil to be shunned and ignored whenever possible. However, in spite of the antipathy generally displayed, it is obvious that sizeable numbers of the same public are willing to offer their time and services to the correctional process as citizen volunteers. Why? The reasons given by Washington volunteers are listed below:

	No.	%
Feel real need to help others	78	63
Life has been good to me, I want to give in return	53	43
Help make this a better community	54	44
Like doing something constructive	47	38
My duty as a citizen	34	27
Find work interesting	25	20
Volunteers have personal qualifications not found in professionals	13	10
Not enough full time professionals	11	9
Like being with other people	7	6
Have special skills	7	6
Good way to become part of community	7	6
Feel sense of importance	3	2
Chance to learn new skills	3	2
Want to keep busy	1	1
Keep up with my field work	0	0

Clearly, the majority of volunteers responding to the survey, became volunteers for altruistic reasons. Chief among these was a personal need to help others, and a desire to in some way "repay" life for being good to them as individuals.

The feeling of responsibility to the community is also strongly emphasized by the volunteers as indicated by their response to the categories "help make this a better community," and "like doing something constructive."

Surprisingly few volunteers, on the other hand, volunteered because they felt they had "personal qualifications not found in professionals" while an even smaller number volunteered their efforts because there are "not enough full time professionals." This is noted with surprise because these two categories do, in fact, represent very real reasons for corrections to seek volunteers.

From the results of the Volunteer Poll, it appears that one of the most desirable approaches to recruiting volunteers would be that of appealing to the individual's sense of altruism. Obviously a majority of the volunteers feel that this is a legitimate need within their own personal lives which is best met by volunteer work.

Previous Volunteer Experience

Of the total number of responding volunteers, 73 per cent have apparently worked as volunteers before their current correctional assignment. Furthermore, 83 per cent of those who had prior volunteer experience had served in at least four areas of volunteer work. Following are several of the program areas in which the volunteers had worked:

	No.	%
Church Work	69	56
Youth Work	56	45
Community Work	42	34
Fund Raising	28	23
School	18	15
Correctional Work other than current assignment	11	9
Hospital Work	6	5
Poverty Program	4	3
Other	5	4

The large percentage of volunteers with previous volunteer experience seems to confirm that volunteers feel a need to help in the community. That many had prior experience in church work is not surprising considering the religious orientation of the majority of volunteers sampled.

Of the 90 volunteers who had previous volunteer experience, over half, or 48 (39%) had worked as volunteers for five years or more. Only seven (6%) responded that they had worked under one year. Ten (8%) responded that they had worked between one and two years and 25 (20%) responded that they had worked between three and four years. Of those individuals who had over five years of experience, the majority had more than ten years' experience. Thus, volunteer work is certainly not new to most of the respondents.

As to the length of volunteer service in corrections itself, there was a considerable difference of response. The largest portion of volunteers, 62 (50%), responded that they had worked in corrections one to two years. Twenty-seven (21%) had been active for three to four years, two (2%) had been active for five to six years while only two (2%) had more than seven years of experience. A rather large number indicated that they had under one year's experience, indicative of the growing recruitment effort. Two failed to respond to this question. Nevertheless, in view of the fact that the volunteer program in Washington in relatively new, the short length of volunteer service is not unusual and is not necessarily indicative of dissatisfaction with the program.

Perceptions of Usefulness to Corrections

To determine why the volunteers feel they are useful to the field of corrections, they were asked to choose between two categories, that is, because they feel they have "something special to offer" or because they feel there is not "enough paid staff." Ninety per cent of the volunteers indicated they felt they were useful because they had "something special to offer." Those individuals so indicating were then asked to select reasons they felt were important. Their answers were as follows:

	No.	%
Can be a friend, show real concern	81	65
Personal interest and involvement	61	49
Offender can confide in us, no barrier to authority	58	47
Dedication, not working for money	22	18
Contact with outside world	22	18
Can give individual attention	21	17
Unprofessional, fresh not hardened	10	8
Have different skills to offer	9	7
Personal experience allows us to understand better	5	4
Can give more time than staff	4	3
Unbiased, objective	2	2

From these results, it is apparent that most volunteers see their greatest potential contributions lying in the area of interpersonal relationships of an informal nature. As correctional professionals are not in a position to provide this type of relationship, it might be presumed this would reduce possible conflict of interest between amateur and professional. On the other hand, an over-identification with the offender on the part of a volunteer might place the volunteer in a very vulnerable position in which he unwittingly becomes an accessory to the offender, helping him to avoid the controls placed upon him by the legal community. That this would cause conflict with the system of corrections is undeniable. Thus, while this type of relationship might be of greatest importance it is also one which requires a great deal of sensitivity and perception on the part of the volunteer.

Volunteers' Attitudes Toward Crime

To determine what the volunteers' attitudes are toward crime and how these attitudes affect their reasons for becoming volunteers, the sample population was asked to state major reasons they felt people became criminals or delinquents. Given three choices between personality problems, social conditions, or both equally, the majority of the respondents, 80 (64%), indicated "both equally." Twenty-three (19%) volunteers felt that personality problems were primary reasons for persons becoming criminals while 21 (17%) felt that social conditions contributed most to this.

TABLE VII

SPECIFIC REASONS WHY PEOPLE BECOME CRIMINALS OR DELINQUENTS—PERCEPTIONS OF WASHINGTON AND U.S. VOLUNTEERS, ADULT PUBLIC AND CORRECTIONAL PERSONNEL*

Causes	Wash. Volunteers	U.S. Volunteers**	Adult Public***	Correctional Personnel****
	%	%	%	%
Broken Homes	49	44	9	23
Environment	27	42	16	45
Parents Too Lax	14	34	59	44
Poverty	2	27	16	35
Lack of Love and Understanding	58	24	NA	NA
Mentally Ill	2	24	3	29
Lack of Education	4	17	12	25
Lack of Moral Guidance	44	16	NA	NA
Lack of Self-respect and Dignity	27	15	NA	NA
Poor Communication Between Parent and Child	22	10	NA	NA
Alcohol	6	10	10	9
Time of Unrest	2	10	4	9
Lack of Religion	19	8	7	3
Not Enough Recreation for Young	1	8	9	4
Frustration	9	8	NA	NA
Young People Have No Morals	NA	6	12	11
For Kicks	3	6	9	10
Drugs, Narcotics	6	4	10	4
Unemployment	3	3	12	6
Kids See Violence on TV	1	3	4	NA
Cars and Houses Unlocked	NA	3	NA	NA
Courts Too Lenient	5	2	5	NA
Some Parents Too Strict	NA	2	NA	NA

NA – Not Available

*Percentages add up to more than 100 because respondents gave more than one answer.

Sources:

Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training, **Volunteers Look at Corrections, (Washington: The Commission, 1969), p. 12.

***Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training, **The Public Looks at Crime and Corrections**, (Washington: The Commission, 1969), p. 5.

****Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training, **Corrections 1968: A Climate for Change**, (Washington: The Commission, 1968), p. 6.

Following the question regarding major reasons for criminal activities, the volunteers were asked to select three more specific reasons accounting for criminal activities. Table VII shows their responses, comparing them to those of U.S. volunteers, the adult public and correctional personnel. The three specific reasons felt to be most important by Washington volunteers were those of lack of love and understanding, broken homes, and lack of moral guidance. This is very much in contrast to the responses shown by U.S. volunteers and correctional personnel, but does show a very definite relationship to the Washington volunteers' previous responses regarding reasons for becoming volunteers. Clearly, Washington volunteers are most concerned about dimensions of interpersonal relationships. It is interesting to note that very few Washington volunteers considered such factors as poverty, lack of education, and mental illness as being reasons for criminality. Although they did give a relatively large response to environmental factors, generally, the Washington volunteers do not appear to be looking for such scapegoats as drugs, alcohol, violence on television, etc. on which to blame all criminal behavior.

Hesitations About Working In Corrections

It might generally be presumed that one very real deterrent to obtaining volunteers to work in corrections would be a reluctance on the part of the individual citizen to come in contact with the criminal population. The volunteers were therefore asked if they had any hesitations about working as a volunteer in corrections. The respondents were divided into two equal categories in their replies, 50 per cent saying "yes" and 50 per cent responding "no." Those who indicated that they did have hesitations were asked to select one or more reasons for this. The results of their responses are as listed:

	No.	%
Fear of Inadequacy or Failure	29	23
Lack of Experience	25	20
Inability to Communicate with Offenders	21	17
Becoming Too Involved	10	8
Fear for Personal Safety	7	6
Not Being Accepted	4	3

Clearly, from these responses, Washington volunteers were more concerned about their own possible shortcomings or inadequacies than they were about personal safety, etc. Indeed, very few showed any fear for personal safety, a factor which one might otherwise presume to be quite important considering the nature of the volunteer work.

Summary

From the foregoing, it would appear that most of the volunteers presently working in Washington corrections are doing so for altruistic reasons, attempting through interpersonal contact to help the offender re-enter the community and overcome the personal disadvantages which he has had. Nevertheless, the volunteers, perhaps because of their comfortable status

within the community, seem to show little concern over the socio-economic factors contributing to the offender's behavior. Because of this, even with the best intentions in the world, the volunteers may have built-in obstacles to the establishment of the close interpersonal relationships which they so earnestly seek.

CHAPTER IV

VOLUNTEER WORK IN CORRECTIONAL AGENCIES

In evaluating the volunteer's role in corrections, it is first necessary to determine what this role is. The following chapter will deal with this, concentrating more specifically upon the type of work being done by the volunteer, how he became involved in it, what agency requirements are regarding training, and the supervision received by the active volunteer.

The Volunteers' Previous Knowledge of Corrections

Although this work reveals that most Washington volunteers in corrections have had previous experience in volunteer work of one type or another, only a small minority of 11 (9%) reported having done any volunteer work in corrections previous to their present assignment. Furthermore, the personal and professional backgrounds of the group sampled would seem to preclude any prior contact with offenders or correctional personnel except for rare occasions, and those probably under unusual circumstances. This assumption was somewhat confirmed by the volunteers' response to the question of the amount of previous knowledge that they had about corrections before the current volunteer assignment. Only six (5%) individuals stated that they knew a great deal about corrections. A larger number, 46 (37%), indicated they had had "some" previous knowledge while 72 (58%) reported having "hardly any."

Initial Contact with Correctional Agency

TABLE VIII

HOW WASHINGTON AND U.S. VOLUNTEERS FIRST HEARD ABOUT AGENCY WHERE THEY ARE WORKING

Source of Information	Washington Volunteers	U.S. Volunteers*
	%	%
Church or other organization membership	58	26
Contact with agency staff	12	19
Friend or relative	12	18
Contact with another volunteer	2	17
Club	3	9
Through television, radio or newspaper	9	7
Class or course of study	0	4
Place of employment	1	4
Community Volunteer Bureau	1	2
Other	2	18

Source:

*Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training, **Volunteers Look at Corrections**, (Washington: The Commission, 1969), p. 14.

As with the U.S. volunteers, most Washington volunteers first heard about their correctional agency through church or organization membership. However, whereas only 26 per cent of the U.S. volunteers learned this way, 58 per cent of the Washington volunteers did, a

fact which is reflective of the major areas of recruitment and explains to a large extent the religious orientation of the present volunteers in Washington adult corrections. Although other volunteers reported having heard through contact with agency staff, news media, etc., their numbers were relatively few, comparatively speaking. Particularly to be noted, is the fact that 17 per cent of the U.S. volunteers learned of the agency through contact with other volunteers while only two per cent of the Washington volunteers learned this way. This would suggest a good deal more recruitment activity on the part of the U.S. volunteer than on the part of the Washington volunteer, perhaps because little effort has been made to date to encourage this. In any event, this is certainly an area that should be emphasized, especially if, as it is hoped, the volunteers are to act as channels of communications between corrections and the community.

Who made the first contact with regard to volunteer work, the agency or the volunteer? The response was almost evenly divided, 55 (44%) indicating the agency had made the first contact, 56 (45%) stating they had made the first contact, 10 (8%) not sure and three more (3%) apparently not sure either as they gave no response.

Screening Elements

To determine what, if any, screening the volunteers underwent to be accepted by the correctional agencies, the sample population was asked to respond to the statements listed in Table IX.

TABLE IX

INITIAL SCREENING ELEMENTS ENCOUNTERED BY WASHINGTON AND U.S. VOLUNTEERS*

Screening Element	Washington Volunteers	U.S. Volunteers**
	%	%
Not interviewed by anyone special but given job wanted	10	45
Interviewed by someone at agency	33	41
Asked to give written information	57	25
Interviewed by staff member at a community volunteer bureau	15	19
Asked to give reference	22	18

*Percentages total more than 100 because some respondents gave more than one answer.

Source:

**Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training, Volunteers Look at Corrections, (Washington: The Commission, 1969), p. 15.

Although 71 (57%) of the Washington volunteers sampled were asked to give written information for initial screening and 41 (33%) were interviewed by someone at the agency, the general response infers a lack of uniform screening on the part of Washington corrections, at least during the early days of the program. This situation has now been corrected, as every volunteer applicant is asked to give written information concerning himself and is interviewed by a staff member before placement.

Current Volunteer Involvement

It has been noted previously that most Washington State corrections volunteers have served in this capacity for only two years or less. The following are responses to the question of length of service in current volunteer assignment:

	No.	%
Under 6 months	22	18
6 months - 1 year	22	18
1 year - 2 years	60	48
3 years - 4 years	17	14
5 years and more	0	0
No response	3	2

Since the length of service in current volunteer assignment seems very closely related to length of volunteer service in corrections, it can be inferred from the survey that most volunteers have stayed with their initial assignment. This would also suggest that the volunteer approves of his assignment and is relatively satisfied with it.

As to the frequency with which the volunteer visits the person he sponsors, or sponsored, 50 (40%) of the volunteers reported visiting once a month, 43 (35%) once in two weeks, 16 (13%) once a week, and two (2%) four times a week or more. Nine (7%) reported visiting less often than once a month and four (3%) are at present unassigned.

The average length of time spent by the volunteer visiting the offender was reported by the majority of 59 (48%) to be one hour. Twenty-three (19%) volunteers reported visiting under one hour, 31 (25%) visited for two hours, four (3%) visited for three hours, and three (2%) reported visiting for more than three hours.

From the over-all response, it appears that the overwhelming majority of volunteers try to visit the offender with whom they are working at least once a month for one hour. It should be noted that while the length of time spent in visits might be controlled within the adult institutions, the frequency of visits is not. It is therefore not necessity but apparently convenience and/or interest which dictates the rate of visitation.

Current Assignments

Of the number of volunteers responding to the Volunteer Poll, 92 or 74 per cent indicated that they are presently working directly with an offender. Thirty-two or 26 per cent stated they are not. Of those who are not presently involved, it is possible that some offenders, after being paroled from one of the institutions, failed to maintain contact with their sponsors. Thus, the fact that the volunteer is not currently working directly with an offender is not necessarily indicative of disinterest on the volunteer's part.

Agency Requirements for Volunteers

Asked of all the volunteers was the question "Were there any education, experience, or other requirements you had to satisfy before you were accepted as a volunteer in corrections?" To this question 18 (15%) volunteers indicated that there were, while 101 (81%) indicated there were not and five (4%) gave no answer. It thus seems conclusive that for the majority of volunteers no special requirements were made, or if they were, they were so basic as to be overlooked or ignored.

Orientation and Training for the Volunteers

The poll asked the volunteers what kind of training they had received prior to placement on an assignment. The volunteers answered as follows:

	No.	%
Help from staff	18	15
Interview with supervisor or other agency personnel	10	8
Orientation session provided by agency	96	77
Written directions and instructions	30	24
Instructions from another volunteer	8	6
Training provided by another agency	3	2
Other	2	2

From the foregoing, it can be seen that a large majority of those people receiving training received it via an orientation session provided by the agency. This appears to be an appropriate method to employ and should insure a certain degree of uniformity of training. As can be noted, some of the respondents received more than one type of training. This is because a certain amount of orientation is provided by the private agencies supplying volunteers, in addition to the orientation provided by adult corrections.

In addition to being questioned about general orientation or training, the volunteers were asked if they had received any specific training for the type of volunteer work in which they are now employed. Very few, 22 (18%) in all, responded that they had, while 80 (64%) stated that they had not. Twenty-two (18%) individuals made no response to this question, implying some confusion as to what they thought was meant by "specific training."

Following the question about specific training, those respondents who had not received any were asked whether they felt training would be helpful or not. The responses were quite evenly divided, 37 (46%) stating training would be helpful, 39 (47%) stating training was not necessary and four (7%) not responding.

Whether or not specific training for volunteer assignments would be useful to the volunteers appears to be open to some question, especially as far as the volunteers themselves are concerned. Considering that the vast majority of volunteers are involved in sponsorship rather than training or counseling, specific training might be difficult to provide unless it involved sensitization to the offenders and their needs. However, considering the wide socio-economic gap between the average volunteer and the offender, this might be an extremely valuable program to initiate.

Specific Volunteer Assignments

As noted previously, 92 of the volunteers sampled reported that they were working directly with an offender. As the volunteer program encompasses both the Division of Adult Corrections and the Division of Probation and Parole, the respondents were also asked to indicate whether they were working inside an institution with inmates or in the field with parolees and/or probationers. The volunteers who reported working inside the institutions indicated that they were involved in the following types of programs:

	No.	%
Self-Improvement Programs	1	1
Sponsorship - Visitation	64	52
Counseling, Guidance or Testing	1	1
Recreational Activities	0	0
Entertainment Activities	0	0
Pre-Release Preparation	2	2
Arts and Crafts Programs	0	0
Teaching	1	1
Religious Programs	2	2

The volunteers who reported working in the community with parolees and probationers gave the following responses to the type of work they were doing:

	No.	%
Counseling, Guidance and Testing	7	6
Probation - Parole Sponsorship	27	22
Recreational Activities	1	1
Volunteer Probation-Parole Officer	2	2
Entertainment Activities	0	0
Self-Improvement Programs	2	2
Job Placement	10	8
Teaching	0	0
Religious Programs	2	2

Obviously, the vast majority of volunteers are involved in sponsorship programs, as was indicated earlier. This is the result of past recruitment programs which were directed specifically towards obtaining volunteers for this type of work. Consequently, the many other areas in which competent volunteers might offer very welcome assistance are under-represented at this time. Although recruitment of individuals with special talents has been almost ignored to date, more consideration should be given to just such a program even while efforts might continue to be aimed at obtaining sponsors. This is not to denigrate the sponsorship program as it obviously fills a very real need. Nevertheless, there are undoubtedly many people who would not wish to participate in an interpersonal relationship with an individual offender, but who would be willing to offer services in less personal, more specialized areas.

Volunteer Supervision

In response to the survey's request to "identify the supervisor with whom you work in your volunteer assignment," 51 (41%) volunteers stated that a paid staff member with additional other duties than volunteer coordinator supervised them; 20 (16%) stated that a paid staff member assigned to volunteer coordination only was solely responsible, while 12 (10%) indicated they were supervised by paid volunteers, nine (7%) by unpaid volunteers, and 18 (15%) not sure. Fourteen (11%) gave no response.

Obviously, the majority of volunteers sampled are supervised by paid staff members with additional duties. This probably refers to the institutional counselors or field parole and probation officers who are working with the offenders being sponsored by the volunteers.

Summary

Although a large number of Washington volunteers sampled have been active in one or more kinds of volunteer work, only a few have had prior experience in corrections. First contact with corrections was through a church or other organizational affiliation for over half the sample reporting. Once the individual has shown an interest in becoming a volunteer in corrections, there is a general practice to require written information from him in addition to conducting a personal interview with him prior to his acceptance as a volunteer.

It can be inferred from the survey that once a volunteer is given an assignment he is likely to stay with it. This, in turn, suggests satisfaction with the assignment.

A substantial majority of the volunteer sponsors visit their clients on an average of once per month for an hour. Evidence gathered indicated that no special education or experience requirements were imposed on the volunteer in order to qualify for his job. Training the volunteers takes place through orientation sessions provided by the agency. In some cases more than one agency provides training to the same volunteer. The majority of volunteers sampled who are now actively working in adult corrections have individual sponsorship assignments

rather than specialized functional roles. Most volunteers in adult corrections are supervised in their assignments by a paid staff member with other additional duties.

Although there are still some areas in need of expansion, the over-all impression of the volunteer program in Washington corrections is that of a fairly well organized effort, especially when compared to the U.S. volunteer programs.

CHAPTER V

VOLUNTEERS' ATTITUDES TOWARD CORRECTIONS

The isolation that corrections has maintained from the community which it serves has long been recognized as being ultimately harmful to the rehabilitation process. It is felt that one of the most effective ways of overcoming this isolationism is through the use of citizen volunteers. This is assuming, of course, that the volunteer is aware of correctional goals and feels an affinity not only to the offender with whom he works but with the agency as well.

With this in mind, it was felt to be of utmost importance to determine what the volunteer thinks of his work with corrections as well as what he thinks of Washington State corrections itself. Should his attitude be extremely negative, it is assumed that this is the message the volunteer will take back to the community. Ultimately, of course, this could be destructive of community acceptance of the offender and of new correctional goals, assuming these goals are the ultimate rehabilitation of the offender and his return to the community.

Volunteer Perceptions of Agency Goals

To actively support a goal an individual must be aware of what that goal is. To determine if Washington volunteers were aware of correctional goals, they were asked to list them as they perceived them. Their responses are shown in Table X.

TABLE X

PRIMARY GOALS OF CORRECTIONAL AGENCIES AS PERCEIVED BY WASHINGTON AND U.S. VOLUNTEERS

Goals	Washington Volunteers	U.S. Volunteers*
	%	%
Punishment	4	13
Rehabilitation	84	74
Protection of Society	6	9
Changing Community Attitudes	6	4

Source:

*Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training, Volunteers Look at Corrections, (Washington: The Commission, 1969), p. 20.

The majority of the respondents, 104 (84%) felt that rehabilitation was the primary goal of the correctional agency with which they are working. This compares very favorably with the goals as perceived by U.S. volunteers, a higher percentage of whom felt that punishment rather than rehabilitation was primary. Among the Washington volunteers responding, only six (4%) individuals felt this was the case. Seven (6%) stated that they felt protection of society was important while seven more (6%) indicated changing community attitudes was primary.

TABLE XI

GOALS WHICH SHOULD HAVE PRIMARY EMPHASIS AS PERCEIVED BY WASHINGTON AND U.S. VOLUNTEERS AND U.S. CORRECTIONAL PERSONNEL

Goal	Washington Volunteers	U.S. Volunteers*	Correctional Personnel**
	%	%	%
Punishment	2	2	2
Rehabilitation	82	83	69
Protection of Society	3	3	16
Changing Community Attitudes	13	12	13

Sources:

*Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training, Volunteers Look at Corrections, (Washington: The Commission, 1969), p. 21.

**Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training, Corrections 1968: A Climate for Change, (Washington: The Commission, 1968), p. 15.

Having determined what the volunteers perceived to be the primary goals of the correctional agencies, it was necessary to determine whether they felt what should be coincided with what is. The volunteers were therefore asked to again indicate primary goals, this time as they felt they should be.

As indicated by Table IX, the majority of volunteers felt that rehabilitation should be the primary goal of the agency. Two individuals stated that punishment should be, while four stated protection of society and 16 indicated changing community attitudes. From this it appears that Washington volunteers' perceptions of what should be were more closely aligned with those of U.S. volunteers than those of the correctional personnel. Strangely enough, however, in all three instances the percentile responding to punishment remained constant.

It is perhaps predictable that correctional personnel gave a greater response to protection of society as a primary goal than did the volunteers as this is usually accepted by correctional agencies as a basic reason for their existence.

The volunteers increased response to "changing community attitudes" as what should be a primary goal may well be reflective of their heightened awareness of the need for community involvement in the correctional process and the acceptance of the offender by the community as a prerequisite for rehabilitation.

Volunteers' Perceptions of Efficacy of Agencies' Programs

If volunteers and professionals are to work effectively together it is inferred that the one has a certain degree of faith in the effectiveness of the other's work. This survey did not, of course, attempt to determine what the Washington correctional personnel's attitudes were toward the volunteers' work. It did, however, try to determine what the volunteers' attitudes were concerning the professionals' efficacy. Hence, the volunteers were asked how many offenders they believed were helped by the agency. The volunteers responded as follows:

	No.	%
Most	56	45
Some	39	32
Only a Few	8	6
Not Sure	21	17

Few volunteers responded that they felt "only a few" were helped by the agency, while a fairly large number indicated that they felt only some were assisted. These evaluations may not be so much a result of pessimism as of realism, especially considering the emphasis placed on the rate of recidivism by the mass media. Also, it should be noted that many of the volunteers responding to the poll worked with offenders in the institutions where the recidivism rate is highest. Furthermore, the offenders with whom they worked were often those with the fewest resources and the least amount of stability, two factors which tend to correlate rather highly with recidivism. Thus, the fact that the majority of the respondents still felt that most offenders were helped by the agency with which they worked would seem to indicate a good deal of faith in the correctional process.

As a whole, the response to the question of efficacy appears to be oriented more towards optimism than pessimism. It would undoubtedly be interesting to further question those who answered "only a few" to determine if this is an attitude of long standing or if it was a response to an unfortunate experience with one of the offenders or a member of the staff with whom the volunteers worked.

Rating the Volunteer Program

To determine what the volunteers' attitudes were toward the volunteer program and whether they felt the State of Washington had effectively organized it, they were asked to give their impressions of the organization. Eighty-four (68%) of the respondents felt that the program was at least fairly well organized; twenty-seven (22%) were not sure, and thirteen (10%) felt the program was poorly organized.

Examining these responses, it appears that a substantial number of the volunteers sampled felt that the Washington State program is fairly well organized. Nevertheless, the State continues to build the organizational structure of the volunteer program. This will undoubtedly do much to enhance the image of State corrections with the volunteers and might improve the ability of the volunteer to carry a positive message back to the community.

Volunteers' Relationship with Supervisors and Agency Staff

Having questioned the volunteers concerning their relationships with the agencies, an attempt was made to determine what types of interpersonal relationships existed between the volunteers and the individual correctional personnel with whom they worked. The first question directed toward this goal was that of rating the staff supervisor with whom the volunteer worked in his assignment. Fifty-eight (47%) volunteers rated their supervisors as "excellent"; 42 (34%) rated him as "pretty good"; nine (7%) evaluated the supervisor as being fair; two (2%) as being "poor," and 13 (10%) failed to respond.

From these findings, it would seem that a majority of the respondents feel they have at least a "pretty good" relationship with their staff supervisor. The fact that 13 failed to respond to the question appears to be indicative of either confusion as to who the staff supervisor is or hesitancy to make any value judgment regarding the matter.

To help further clarify the volunteers' relationship with staff, they were asked how good a chance they felt they would have of having a worthwhile suggestion for improving a particular agency program presented to and discussed by staff. Again the response of the volunteers would

indicate a feeling of relatively close relationship with the agency as 66 (53%) responded that they would have a very good chance and 37 (30%) stated that they would have a fairly good chance. Only five (4%) felt they would have hardly any chance while 16 (13%) were not sure.

The ratio of the responses changed somewhat when the volunteer was asked how good a chance he thought he would have of having the suggestion implemented by staff. The number of individuals responding "very good" dropped quite sharply to 36 (29%). In contrast, those answering "fairly good" increased to 49 (40%) and those feeling that they had "hardly any chance" increased to seven (6%). The volunteers not sure of staff implementation also increased, 32 (25%) responding to this.

From the differences between these two responses, it appears that volunteers feel they have greater support from individual staff members than from the agency as a whole. Nevertheless, in both cases the majority seemed to feel fairly optimistic about agency acceptance of them and their suggestions.

The feeling of agency acceptance was further confirmed by the results of the answers to the question "Do you feel that you know what is going on in the agency in which you volunteer, or do you feel like an outsider?" The majority, 81 (66%), stated they knew what was going on. Only 14 (11%) felt like outsiders while 29 (23%) were not sure, possibly indicating a lack of communication between the volunteers and the agency or its staff members. In all, the response does indicate that there is a certain feeling of alliance with the agency on the part of the majority of volunteers. Nevertheless, with the number of "no responses" it also appears that the agencies would do well to attempt to improve their lines of communication between the staff members and the volunteers.

Job Satisfaction

Obviously, a majority of volunteers feel satisfied with their relationships with the staff. How do they feel, however, about their work with the offenders? It is satisfying or frustrating? Does it encourage further involvement or discourage it.

Basic to the feeling of work satisfaction is that of having enough work to do but not too much. This is especially the case when it is remembered that the volunteer does not have full time to devote to his volunteer work but must fit it into any number of other family, employment, and social activities. It is interesting to note that by far the greatest number of volunteers, 99 (80%), responded that their work was about right. An extremely small number of two (1%) felt that they had too much work to do while 17 (14%) felt they had too little. Six (5%) failed to respond. Obviously, the implication is that most volunteers are happy with the amount of work they do. If there is any dissatisfaction it is with having too little to do. Thus, it would appear that a major factor in job satisfaction on the part of the volunteer is having enough work to do. It would be well for the agencies to recognize this if they are to maximize volunteer satisfaction.

Presumably, if an individual is satisfied with his work, he also finds it interesting. This was certainly the case with 110 (89%) volunteers who were asked if they felt correctional work was very interesting. Only eight (6%) indicated that they did not find it particularly interesting and of those eight all were individuals who at the time of the survey were not assigned to any particular program. Six failed to respond to the question. Nevertheless, the overall response seems to support the contention that it is important to keep the volunteers involved in the program if they are to support it and be effective volunteers.

Included in the feeling of job satisfaction is the belief, on the part of the volunteer, that he is contributing something worthwhile and that his contributions are appreciated by others. In order to determine the degree to which those factors are being satisfied amongst correctional volunteers, the volunteers were asked the following three questions: "How important do you

feel your volunteer job in corrections is?"; "Do you believe the agency staff appreciates your work?"; and "Do you believe the offender appreciates your work?". To the first question of feeling of importance, all volunteers felt that their work was of some importance. In fact, most of the volunteers, 97 (78%) felt their job was very important while 27 (22%) thought it was somewhat important.

With regard to the second question concerning staff appreciation, 122 (98%), an overwhelming majority, responded "yes" while only two (2%) responded they did not feel the agency appreciated their work.

The last question, "Do you believe the offender appreciates your work?", elicited a somewhat different response, showing a little greater uncertainty on the part of the volunteer. To this question 114 (92%) stated "yes," eight (6%) responded "no" and two (2%) gave no response at all.

From the answers to the three foregoing questions, it seems that the volunteers feel their jobs in corrections are important. Moreover, they feel their work is appreciated by those individuals with whom they work, both correctional personnel and offenders. Unless the respondents were being extremely optimistic, it would appear that the agency and/or the offender has managed to impart to the volunteer a sense of appreciation for his services. This, in turn, is seen as a positive ingredient to working with members of the community and in obtaining their support. After all, the majority of people "like to be liked."

To secure further information about attitudes, the sample population was asked how many volunteers were felt to be disappointed with their work. Their answers follow:

	No.	%
Most	3	2
Some	40	32
Only a Few	42	34
None	3	2
Not Sure	34	28
No Response	2	2

Apparently while the volunteers felt almost no doubts about the positive response of agency personnel and offenders to their work, their evaluation of their fellow volunteers is much less certain. This seems to infer that there is either a lack of communication among the volunteers which produces this degree of uncertainty or that the communication which does occur implies a greater degree of disappointment in the work than the volunteers actually feel or are willing to admit. In either event, it would appear that one agency goal in the volunteer program might be that of improving the feeling of solidarity through increased communication among the volunteers themselves. To do this should strengthen the volunteer program as a whole by providing volunteers with support from within as well as from without.

Effective Use of Volunteers in Corrections

The volunteers were asked whether or not they felt they were being used effectively in the correctional program. Their responses were as indicated:

	No.	%
Used Effectively	43	35
Effectiveness Could Be Improved	53	43
Not Sure	16	13
No Response	12	9

As can be seen from the above, while a fairly large number felt volunteers are used effectively, an even larger number felt their effectiveness could be improved. The individuals responding "could be improved" were then asked to suggest some improvements. Given a choice of ten categories, the respondents (some of whom checked more than one answer) gave the ensuing responses:

	No.	%
Need more volunteers	72	58
Better training and orientation	38	31
Give volunteers more background information on offenders he works with	31	25
Better staff supervision	15	12
More contacts with offenders	12	9
More cooperation with staff	12	9
Offer better job and educational opportunities for volunteers	11	9
More varied jobs	9	7
Give volunteers more responsibility and freedom	7	5
Other	8	6

Although the responses to the above question were varied, it is obvious that they all offer positive suggestions for an improved volunteer program. It is interesting that the majority of the respondents cited a need for more volunteers as a means of increasing the effectiveness of the program. This seems to reaffirm a basic acceptance of the concept of volunteerism.

Summary

In all, the volunteers' attitudes toward working in corrections appear to be extremely positive. Their perceptions of agency goals, both what should be and what is, are generally in line with modern correctional philosophy.

While the responses of the individual volunteers seem to infer a great deal of job satisfaction, their perceptions of fellow volunteers' attitudes regarding this were not so clear-cut, perhaps indicative of a lack of communication among the volunteers themselves.

By far the majority of responses indicate a decided affinity on the part of the volunteer for his work. In view of this, it is suggested that corrections could have no better messenger to carry the needs and philosophies of corrections back to the community.

CHAPTER VI

SURVEY IMPLICATIONS FOR WASHINGTON ADULT CORRECTIONS

As indicated in Chapter I, the purpose of this survey was not that of determining the effectiveness of the volunteer program in Washington State adult corrections. Rather, it was that of identifying and describing the volunteers and their work. Nevertheless, the implications of the survey and the changes and improvements they may suggest should increase the effectiveness of the program if implemented. For this reason, this final chapter will be concerned with the summarization of results of the survey and their implications in terms of possible directions to be taken by Washington State adult corrections in future program recruitment, training, and volunteer utilization.

Volunteer Demography – Present and Future

The most frequently used argument for the utilization of volunteers in corrections is their potential ability to gain public support for correctional programs and goals, something which corrections, itself, has failed to do thus far. As a result of this failure, "people are petrified literally of the negative influences of the ex-offender in the community. And they are really not aware of the positive potential impact that is in the ex-offender and his returning to good citizenship in the community."[11] Consequently, the offender frequently finds only rejection when he does return to the community even after duly "paying his debt to society."

One major avenue of hope seen in the morass of apprehension and ignorance is that of volunteerism; for it is the motivated volunteer who can open new vistas to public interest and support of corrections. Through his experience in corrections the volunteer can hopefully gain understanding of the offender and his problems. This knowledge he can then take back into the community in which he lives and works, thereby gaining much needed community support for the offender, for "one enthusiastic volunteer is worth three professionals as a missionary for public service."[12]

If one accepts that a legitimate function of the volunteer is to act as a "missionary" for corrections, it would appear that the present Washington volunteer, as revealed by this survey is in an excellent position to be an extremely effective missionary. An elite member of the community, in terms of education and income, the volunteer is in an ideal position to be an opinion maker. A stable family man, active in his church and other volunteer programs, he has probably established wide-spread contacts which should provide him with ample opportunity for disseminating information about the correctional process.

Nevertheless, there is one area of the community where the present volunteer might not be so effective and that is among the lower income, less educated groups. Yet it is in this very group that the Louis Harris survey revealed the greatest fear and lack of understanding of the offender[13] and hence the greatest need for change. Furthermore, it is usually this very part of the community from which the offender comes, and where he will continue living. It is therefore of utmost importance to the rehabilitation of the offender that he, the offender, be able to obtain some support from the community if he is to live successfully within it. Unfortunately, to date neither corrections nor the private volunteer programs have done a great deal to enlist support from the members of this community for the offender.

In view of this lack of support, yet the great need for it, it seems incumbent upon adult corrections to exert every effort to recruit citizen volunteers from this socio-economic area. Hopefully, then, once they become involved with corrections and understand its goals they will be able to enlist community support for them.

Gaining public support among the lower-income, less educated group, however, is not the only advantage to be attained from the recruitment of these people. Specifically, the offender might better profit from association with a volunteer whose background is similar to his own than with an individual whose background is not. True, the present volunteer as a member of the solid middle class may be able to offer more substantive assistance in terms of employment and formal counseling. However, in terms of inter-personal communication, the offender may find it extremely difficult to relate to a volunteer whose education is far superior to his own and who probably is relatively unaware of the basic problems of poverty, unemployment and lack of skills faced by the offender. Thus, however good the intentions of the middle or upper-middle class volunteer, they may come to nought because of his inability to communicate them in a meaningful manner.

For this reason, then, as well as that of gaining public support, it would appear to be advisable for Washington adult corrections to broaden the base of its volunteer program, seeking through intensive recruitment, members of the disadvantaged communities. In this respect, particular attention should be placed upon recruitment of members of the black community.

Another resource somewhat overlooked to date is that of "womanpower." Yet it has already been demonstrated that a large number of women are ready and willing to work in the capacity of a volunteer. Although there might be some initial resistance from the professional staff concerning allowing women to work with male offenders, careful screening and the placement of women in roles other than that of sponsor, at least at first, should allay this resistance to some degree.

It should be noted in view of the aforementioned suggestions, that the Division of Probation and Parole has already anticipated many of them. As a consequence, attempts are now being made by the Division to broaden the base of volunteerism, using as a springboard to the community a group of private citizens known as Probation and Parole Community Councils. These councils, formed in every major city in the state, are actively recruiting volunteers from all social stratas. The councils are especially concerned with those areas of the community presently under-represented. In fact, membership on the council itself is representative of the community structure as a whole. Each council member is asked to give of his time and effort to the end that his community will become more actively involved in the support of correctional programs and goals.

Broadening the Scope of Volunteerism

From the results of this survey, it was revealed that the vast majority of individuals presently acting as volunteers in corrections are assigned the role of sponsors, that is to say they are assigned to work on an individual basis with one offender. As a sponsor, the volunteer's main function is to act as the offender's friend, assisting him in finding employment, giving guidance on personal matters and in general being available when the inmate or parolee/probationer is in need of a friend and confidant.

Although a majority of volunteers are working as sponsors, this role is actually only one of a number that offer potential contributions to the correctional process. Some examples of additional roles that might be filled by non-professionals are counseling, testing, teaching, leading recreational and/or entertainment activities, job placement, and self improvement instruction. There are many citizens with talents and experience in these areas who might offer their invaluable services to corrections. Especially to be considered are the many housewives who, while presently unemployed outside the home, have the education, experience, and desire, to volunteer part-time assistance. Also in this category is the retired individual who often has time and valuable talent available.

Actually, the types of work that can be done by volunteers are limited only by the imagination. Given a recruitment and training program which is versatile enough to fulfill the needs of the correctional agencies, implementation of many of these job suggestions should be possible.

Training and Supervision of Volunteers

The State of Washington now conducts regular training workshops for all volunteers in adult corrections. This is good; however, it is clear from the survey that expansion of the training effort will be required as the program is further developed. This expansion might include such teaching aids as films and audio-visual equipment; a closed circuit video taping device; and an even more comprehensive edition of the *Manual For Volunteers in Adult Corrections* currently in use in the program.

Additional staff with full time community organization duties will probably be required to implement the expanding training effort, and should be used to provide on-going short-term workshops and seminars as well as individual counseling sessions with volunteers. This augmentation of professional community organization staff will also tend to enhance the supervision provided the volunteer corps and will implant a more stable base of meaningful contact between the volunteer and the professional line staff. Moreover, greater agency/volunteer contact should foster increased identification with the agency as a whole.

Conclusion

The volunteer program in Washington state adult corrections is still very young. As with new programs throughout history, it has met with resistance and rejection at one time or another. Nevertheless, perceptive leadership within adult corrections has recognized the advantages to be gained through the encouragement of a vital, healthy volunteer program. They have therefore created some guidelines for achieving such a program. However, while the administration has accepted volunteerism as a potentially positive program this does not mean that the professional staff as a whole has. Indeed, unless the professional staff can be convinced that volunteers will be of assistance to them rather than only foster additional work, it is doubtful that volunteerism will ever meet with unqualified acceptance. In turn, if the volunteers are not accepted by professional staff, their effectiveness will be greatly reduced. For this reason, it would seem the next step to be taken is that of improving staff acceptance of the volunteer. In the meantime, every effort should be made to reduce the amount of administrative work that the professional must do with the volunteer program and to encourage, through as many incentives as are available, close cooperation between the professional and the amateur.

FOOTNOTES

[11]Louis Harris, "Changing Public Attitudes Toward Crime and Corrections," Federal Probation, Vol. XXXII, No. 4 (Dec., 1968), p. 12.

[12]Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training, The Public Looks at Crime and Corrections, (Washington: The Commission, 1968), p. 25.

[13]**Ibid.**, p. 2.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Alcabes, Abraham and Herman Piven. The Crisis of Qualified Manpower for Criminal Justice: An Analytic Assessment with Guidelines for New Policy. Vol. 2. Washington: U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1969.

Clegg, Reed K. Probation and Parole. Springfield: Charles C. Thomas, 1964.

Giardini, G. I. The Parole Process. Springfield: Charles C. Thomas, 1964.

Harris, Louis. "Changing Public Attitudes Toward Crime and Corrections." Federal Probation. Vol. XXXII, No. 4. (Dec. 1968).

Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training. Corrections 1968: A Climate for Change. Washington: The Commission, 1968.

--------. The Public Looks at Crime and Corrections. Washington: The Commission, 1968.

--------. Volunteers Look at Corrections. Washington: The Commission, 1969.

--------. A Time to Act. Washington: The Commission, 1969.

Keve, Paul W. Imaginative Programming in Probation and Parole. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press 1967.

The President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice. The Challenge of Crime in a Free Society. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1967.

Task Force on Corrections. Task Force Report: Corrections. Washington: The President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, 1967.

--------. Task Force Report: Crime and Its Impact—An Assessment. Washington: The President's Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice, 1967.