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Abstract

This paper is an attempt to determine the functions of penitentiary statistics and research for the structure of the Canadian Penitentiary Service. The penitentiary structure is defined as a bureaucracy and the statistics and research program as one of its sub-structures. By studying penitentiary statistics and research some insight is gained into this system operating as a bureaucratic organization.

From an historical study of the Penitentiary Service it was found that little research has been done. Furthermore, limited reliance has been placed by penitentiary administrators on statistics and research in decision-making. Major changes in policy resulted from the findings of official enquiries. The major function of existing statistics seems to have been the public accounting of Service operations.

With the adoption of inmate rehabilitation as an operating philosophy, the more complex administrative situation which has resulted seems to require increased reliance on a statistics and research program in order to achieve this new goal of the Penitentiary Service. While the need for an expanded statistics and research program in penitentiary administration has been recognized, shortage of funds has necessitated reliance on the Dominion Bureau of Statistics for guidance and implementation of this operation. The involvement of the Bureau has resulted in the provision of statistics sufficient for public accounting purposes at considerable savings to the Service. However, considering the immediate
needs of the Service for increased statistical data and a variety of research studies, the major participation of the Dominion Bureau of Statistics would seem to have a limiting effect on the program from two points of view. Information arising from this study indicates that the ability of the Dominion Bureau of Statistics to produce the required data is insufficient for the optimal operation of the penitentiary statistics and research program. Secondly, the involvement of an outside agency in the program seems to have been interpreted unfavourably by the penitentiary staff, with the result that accuracy of statistical data and internal acceptance of the statistics and research program have been impaired.

This research suggests as a general conclusion that it is profitable to study correctional agencies in terms of the theory of complex organizations. More specifically the information obtained indicates that, in order to achieve its present goal of inmate rehabilitation, the Canadian Penitentiary bureaucracy is dependent on the development of an efficient statistics and research program for which there seems to be no functional alternative. Consideration of the administrative arrangements necessary to make this program maximally functional for the penitentiary bureaucracy has lead to the conclusion that requirements of efficiency, staff acceptance of this program and therefore ultimate achievement of bureaucratic goals, demand that the Service assume increased control over policy and operation of its program of statistics and research.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

PURPOSE, METHOD AND TECHNIQUES OF THE STUDY

Statement of the Problem

At least as early as 1836 the Penitentiary of Upper Canada was required to produce and report statistics concerning the characteristics of the inmate population.\(^1\) At Confederation the provincial penitentiaries were joined to form what is now the Canadian Penitentiary Service and the practice of publishing inmate and other types of statistics in the Annual Reports has continued up to the present time.

Little seems to be understood with respect to the purposes of these statistics in penitentiary administration or what use is made of them. Moreover, it is not generally known why the traditional pattern of presenting penitentiary inmate statistics was adopted in the first place nor why it has continued practically unchanged until recent times. Furthermore, it is unknown if the published statistics are the only series available to the administration or whether other series exist of which penitentiary executives make independent use. Finally, there seems to have been little effort made to measure the validity

---

and reliability of current penitentiary statistical data.

With respect to penitentiary research, it is generally understood that some of the Royal Commissions and Committees appointed to investigate corrections in Canada have approved the principle of research in this field. Whether any research has been undertaken within the penitentiary system, however, is not widely known. There seems to have been no clear public statement as to what purpose research would have in penitentiary operations, if any were undertaken.

Among administrators and academicians in correctional work today, one senses a developing concern as to whether the money and effort expended in our institutions are actually accomplishing the hoped for rehabilitation of inmates. There seems to be a general awareness that the answers to many crucial questions in correctional administration can be supplied by an adequate statistics and research program. It seemed fitting, therefore at this time, that a study be undertaken to discover the use which is being made of statistics and research in Canadian penitentiary administration and what they mean in terms of the goals of the organization. The data for this research was collected during the summer of 1963 and essentially describes the penitentiary administration and its statistical and research program as of these dates.
Method

This study may be described as a qualitative structural-functional analysis. The qualitative nature of the research results primarily from the fact that little previous study has been done in the area of penitentiary statistics and research. It was necessary first to describe the situation in a general way in order to generate hypotheses, suggest relationships and prepare the ground for more sophisticated analysis.

Structural-functional analysis was considered a useful method by which to study statistics and research, as they bear upon operations of the penitentiary system. With this methodology a basic assumption is made that social structures tend to be maintained and preserved. According to Merton a system may combine sub-structures which are either functional, dysfunctional or non-functional for the total structure. Therefore, it is the net balance of functional and dysfunctional items which determines the degree to which the organization is maintained. Furthermore, the same item may have both functional and dysfunctional consequences for the system.²

The term functions herein means manifest functions as defined by Levy. These are intended or recognized objective consequences contributing to the adaptation or adjustment of the system to the social environment. Dysfunctions are defined as

---
those observed consequences which lessen the adjustment of the system.\(^3\)

Following the procedures suggested by Merton and Levy\(^4\) an attempt will be made to define the penitentiary administrative structure as a bureaucracy related to the literature of complex organizations. Penitentiary statistics and research will be considered as items or sub-structures within the penitentiary bureaucracy. The purpose of the study is, within the limits of the methodology and the quality of the data, to determine the functions, if any, which result from the operation of a statistics and research program in penitentiary administration. In the nature of the case this can only be a partial structural-functional analysis of the penitentiary system because it concentrates on only one of its sub-structures, namely the statistics and research program. But in describing this program and discovering whatever problems are related to statistics and research in penitentiaries, it is intended that some insights will be obtained into the operation of this administration as a bureaucracy. Some judgements are also possible concerning the administrative arrangements which could be instituted in order that statistics and research will become optimally functional for the Canadian Penitentiary Service.


Hypotheses

One general and several specific hypotheses are advanced, as follows, concerning Canadian penitentiary statistics and research.

1. Correctional organizations, such as the Penitentiary Service, may be profitably studied in terms of bureaucratic theory and structural-functional methodology.

2. In the past, administrative decisions within the Service have preceded statistical description and no reliance has been placed on statistics in making policy.

3. Statistics, on the other hand, have been used to support and justify administrative actions and to prove that responsibilities have been fulfilled.

4. The function of statistics in penitentiaries is evolving from one of support and justification of operations to one of guidance with respect to administrative decisions but this change is not yet complete.

5. The present statistical partnership between the Penitentiary Service and the Dominion Bureau of Statistics is unlikely to be efficient in terms of the expanding needs of penitentiary administration for these data.

6. As the role of penitentiaries in treatment of inmates becomes better defined, the function of statistics will be to demonstrate, through research, that penitentiary programs result in rehabilitation of offenders and hence are justified. To the extent that statistics are not used in this way it will be dysfunctional for the Penitentiary Service in terms of its present goals. The lack of development in this direction may result either in a change of goals and/or removal of public support.

Since one central postulate in this study is that operations of correctional agencies can be profitably studied as bureaucracies and the data will be analyzed in this context, consideration will now be given to aspects of the theory of complex organizations.
BUREAUCRATIC THEORY

The Weberian Model

A survey of the literature of complex organizations indicates that much has been written on this subject, especially in the last decade, but, with the exception of a few notable attempts, it has not been integrated into a systematic body of theory. However, there is considerable agreement among authorities that the work of Weber has been an inspiring source and recognized starting point for subsequent research in formal organizations. Weber described three legitimate types of authority on which are based different patterns of administrative operation; the traditional, the charismatic and the rational-legal. The rational-legal pattern operates on the basis that those in authority have a right to leadership because of the legality of a set of rules according to which the administration functions. This is the model which has special application to this study and some of its main features are briefly elaborated below.

Weber perceived that the increasingly complex economic operations of western industrial society have been associated with greater technical division of labour, specialization of workers into types of tasks and a requirement for more efficiency in order to compete on the market. These factors in association, he contended, finally resulted in the separation of workers from the means of production and the control by management of human and
non-human factors of production. The development of bureaucracies was materially assisted by the evolution of the capitalist system, and the one phenomenon is associated with the other. The rational-legal type of administration is counted the 'most important mechanism for administration of every day profane affairs.' In spite of complaints levelled at bureaucratic control by those subject to it, Weber claims that our society could not function without bureaucracies except by a return to less complex operations. In general, bureaucracies have resulted in all fields of endeavour because that form of administration best meets the requirement for predictable and calculable management.

The work of a bureaucracy deals with a special area of responsibility in which the officials have operational jurisdiction. The jurisdiction is normally described by statute together with regulations enacted by the administration, which tend to be stable and exhaustive. The business of bureaucracies is normally a continuous operation, the management of which is based on written documents or files. This requires, within the organization, a staff of clerical persons to manage

---


6Ibid., p. 338.

7Ibid., p. 333.

8Ibid., p. 338.
The Weberian model of bureaucracy tends to emphasize those features which maximize efficiency of bureaucratic operations. Several factors combine to bring this about. Weber claims first, that in order to achieve the necessary amount of discipline and subordination among officials, selection by appointment rather than election is essential. Secondly, as society becomes more complex, the appointment of officials is increasingly based on technical proficiency. The skills necessary to qualify for a position are usually acquired by a lengthy process of training and are increased by day to day experience on the job. Furthermore, the bureaucrat, in his official capacity, is subject to strict and systematic discipline and control in the conduct of his office. That is, his official conduct is subject to a system of rules and regulations the nature of which has been summarized by Bendix as follows:

a) the duty of each official to do certain types of work is delimited in terms of impersonal criteria;

---


11 Gerth and Mills, op. cit., p. 199.

12 Parsons, op. cit., p. 334.
b) the official is given the authority necessary to carry out his assigned functions;

c) the means of compulsion at his disposal are strictly limited and the conditions under which their employment is legitimate are clearly defined.\(^\text{13}\)

Under these conditions less friction occurs in the conduct of business than would be the case with other administrative forms and hence tasks are accomplished more objectively and efficiently.

Typically the official's position is his sole occupation which he pursues separately from his private affairs. The whole staff of officials is organized into an hierarchy according to levels of authority. Those in the lower positions are the more numerous and subordinate to those at higher levels. In return for his full time and skilled performance the official is normally paid a regular salary. There is also the understanding that career opportunities for advancement exist whereby he can achieve superior positions in the hierarchy and increased salary. Again, there is the expectation that tenure will be held for life with a pension at retirement age.\(^\text{14}\) Being removed from the means of production the employee therefore exchanges faithful performance of duties for security. This dependency of the worker on the organization, Weber points out, gives


\(^{14}\)T. Parsons, op. cit., p. 333.
officials an interest in preserving the bureaucratic structure and seeing that it is perpetuated.\(^{15}\) This is one reason why the organization becomes practically indestructible and will continue even if there is a change in control or if the personnel over a period of time is entirely replaced.\(^{16}\)

Informal Organization

The Weberian rational-legal model of bureaucracy, because of the method used to derive it, emphasizes formal structure and logical operation which are characteristic of the ideal type of formal organization.\(^{17}\) Weber largely neglects to consider the dysfunctional aspects of complex organizations and the unofficial patterns of behaviour which have since been found to exist and which profoundly affect these operations.

Blau claims that there are at least three reasons for the formation of an informal structure of relationships within formal organizations. In the first instance, all eventualities cannot be anticipated and provided for in the official regulations because the changing conditions of operations are not entirely foreseeable. Secondly, it is said that the bureaucratic

\(^{15}\) Gerth and Mills, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 228.

\(^{16}\) \textit{Ibid.}, pp. 198 and 230 and also T. Parsons, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 385.

working environment produces feelings of anxiety and anomie in the majority of employees. Finally, Blau contends that working in subordination to others in a disciplined way runs counter to the egalitarian values of our culture. All these factors give rise to the development of informal rules and relationships as adjustments to an otherwise illogical or uncomfortable employment situation.

In the study of bureaucracy it is also necessary to realize that workers bring their social values and personal natures to the job and these do not always coincide with the goals of the organization. Blau and Scott claim that a fundamental aspect of authority is that subordinates in an organization follow orders only when these agree with the common value orientation of their peer group.\(^\text{18}\)

Weber has made clear, and Merton has confirmed, that workers must nowadays rely on some bureaucracy for their very existence. Hence the fate of the worker is joined to the fate of the organization.\(^\text{19}\) On the other hand workers resist complete conformity to organizational goals and management, in mobilizing human resources, pays the price of adapting its policy, to some extent, in line with the personal needs of lower level


participants. Participants, in short, cannot be forced into the organizational mold but must be induced to loyal conformity, a process which is never perfectly accomplished by management.  

Weber's formal model therefore seems too simplistic to be applied unmodified to the analysis of complex organizations. In the light of these new findings the bureaucratic work situation is more accurately seen as a combination of formal and informal components in which technical and human elements are interdependent and in equilibrium. Depending on administrative conditions and the abilities of the management personnel, the informal organization and value system of workers could either impair or advance the goals of the bureaucracy.

The Environment of Bureaucracies and their Goals

The literature also reflects a developing concern with the links between the larger social system and bureaucratic subsystems. In this respect Barnard concludes that:

'the initial existence of an organization depends upon a combination of (these) elements appropriate to the

\[\text{\textsuperscript{20}}\] Blau and Scott, op. cit., p. 29.


external conditions at the moment. Its survival depends upon the maintenance of an equilibrium of the system. This equilibrium is primarily internal, a matter of proportions between the elements, but it is ultimately and basically an equilibrium between the system and the total system external to it.\(^{22}\)

Parsons has also written that bureaucracies should be considered 'as a subsystem of a more comprehensive social system'\(^{23}\) and indicates that the goals of an organization are its major links with the environment. He conceives of the achievement of an organizational goal as the production of a commodity which can be used by some other system in the environment, whether this is a tangible object or a service.\(^{24}\) To Parsons, considering organizations as subsystems within the larger society implies that their value systems be legitimate in terms of the values in the superordinate system. From this legitimacy is derived environmental acceptance of the main patterns of operation which are necessary to sustain the bureaucracy.\(^{25}\)

Not only must organizations have legitimate roles within the society's value system but they must also adjust their activities to the goals and structures of one another.

\(^{22}\)Barnard, op. cit., pp. 82-83, (emphasis supplied).


\(^{24}\)Ibid., p. 65.

\(^{25}\)Ibid., pp. 67-69.
A continual process of compromise occurs as different organizations attempt to enlarge or preserve their spheres of activity and acquire a share of the limited environmental resources with which to operate.

It has been said, regarding adjustment of bureaucratic goals, that there are two opposing processes which can be involved; goal displacement and goal succession. The first is a term applied to the increasing attention of staff to the means by which organizational goals are achieved, rather than the goals themselves. The operational procedures assume a sacred value and are performed as a ritual which is dysfunctional for the organization because its goals tend to become deflected. Merton suggests that one source of this pathology is built into the bureaucratic structure since the concern of officials with their own security, which ensures their disciplined action on behalf of the organization, at the same time induces conservatism in decision-making.\textsuperscript{26}

The opposite mechanism, the succession of goals, is defined either as the acquisition of additional purposes when the original ones became established or the replacement of these by different objectives. Sills' study of the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis illustrates the case where a replacement goal was found by an organization which had

accomplished its original objective. In considering the conditions which control whether
goals will be succeeded or displaced, Blau and Scott conclude
that the answers may be in environmental attitudes. If the
environment is hostile, considerations for the survival of
the organization motivates its officers to be more attentive
to administrative procedures than to achieving goals. If the
society will allow the organization to achieve its goals and
provide the necessary extra stimulation, the staff will be
motivated to seek advanced objectives. This in turn relates
to the value and centrality of the goals for the community at
large.

Two other factors apparently enter into the succession
of goals complex. A statement by Thompson and McEwen indicates
that the initiative of administrators may be crucial in
determining whether their organizations obtain environmental
support or not. Implied in this is that aggressive, able
executives will move into fluid situations to find new goals to
achieve and weaker, passive officials will not. The other
important observation in the literature is that measurement of

28 Blau and Scott, op. cit., p. 231.
progress toward goals is essential to adjustments of organizational purposes in line with environmental requirements. In the same article Thompson and McEwen state that goals must be constantly reappraised. They recognize, however, that;

'as goals call for increasingly intangible, difficult to measure products, society finds it more difficult to determine and reflect its acceptability of that product, and the signals that indicate unacceptable goals are less effective and perhaps longer in coming.'

Thus the purpose and structure of an organization may be changed by a number of internal and external pressures which are activated by the very process of attempting to achieve bureaucratic goals. The more marginal the goals related to the values of the environment and those of its staff, the more likely adjustments to goals and organizational structures will occur.

Government Bureaucracies and Total Institutions

In the Parsonian scheme the environmental controls over complex organizations are classified into three types which may occur in combination. One is the generalized normative control of the society. The second is some sort of body lying between the society and the organizational structure, such as a board of control. The third type is attachment of the organization to some level of government bringing it directly under political

\[30\text{Ibid.}, \ p. \ 179.\]
authority. Thus government departments can be classed as specialized types of bureaucracies which operate with funds largely supplied from tax revenue.

According to Parsons, two conditions that determine support of an organization by taxation are either that its goals are considered important but cannot be made to pay commercially, or the type of service which is provided would endanger the public interest if managed by private enterprise.

Government bureaucracies by virtue of their separation from the commercial world are somewhat protected from competition to which they would otherwise be subject. They nevertheless compete among themselves for scarce tax dollars and the success with which they do so still depends upon the centrality of their goals related to the value system of the tax payers.

Out of his dealings with government departments each citizen arrives at an opinion concerning civil service organizations which commonly tends to be one of dissatisfaction. A study by Janowitz, Wright and Delany has investigated the public image of government agencies in a large metropolitan center in the United States. They found that, in general, there was marked

---


ignorance of government organizations and operations. Secondly, the public was ambivalent toward the services supplied. People wanted the benefits provided but were negative toward payment of high taxes and red tape which they thought were associated with government administration. The public also felt that political influence determined whether service was extended by an agency to clients. Finally, the prestige of civil servants in the minds of the public seemed to be below desirable levels. The authors conclude that the attempt to improve the public image of government administration in their study was inadequate for two main reasons. One was lack of money. Associated with this was a poorly organized system of communication by which the goals of public agencies could be justified.  

Among government bureaucracies are the agencies which are responsible for prisoners in correctional institutions. These would be classed by Blau and Scott as 'commonweal' organizations. Commonweal organizations which deal with prisoners are synonymous with 'coercive' organizations as classified by Etzioni and more specifically what Goffman has called 'total institutions'.

---


34 Blau and Scott, op. cit., pp. 8, 54 and 57.

The characteristics of total institutions Goffman places under four main headings which seem consistent with the writer's experience and what appears elsewhere in the criminological literature. First, there is the artificiality of separating groups of people from the community into an environment which is unisexual and 'conglomerate' in the sense that large groups of people perform most of their daily activities in each other's company. Secondly, to manage masses of people in custodial environments, there must be a certain rigidity of operations which is unvarying from day to day according to some overall plan. Third, there is a split between the staff and inmates which inhibits communication between them. The result of this is that two separate sub-cultures develop in total institutions. Finally, the populations of these institutions must do some work but the opportunities for productive labour and the incentives are less than those in the outside world.\textsuperscript{36} In the nature of the case this makes for difficulties in administration and control since most inmates are hostile to the staff and goals of the institution.

Etzioni has put forward a hypothesis as to why rehabilitation programs in coercive organizations are ineffective. He questions whether multiple goals can be effectively achieved by an organization if they are inconsistent with its compliance structure. This author postulates three types of organization;

\textsuperscript{36}Ibid., pp. 314-316.
coercive, utilitarian and normative. He claims that the first is most effective in achieving 'order' goals, the second 'economic' and the third 'cultural' goals. Control of inmates is an order goal and rehabilitation is a cultural goal. Where a coercive organization, such as a prison, tries to achieve both order and cultural goals it is not effectively accomplished because the types of power associated with these different operations tend to cancel each other out. Thus there is a dilemma facing organizations aspiring to fulfill two incongruent goals. If both goals are equally stressed they neutralize each other. If one is stressed the other is neglected, even though the organization can probably survive these conditions. Etzioni suggests the solution may be in the segregation of incongruent functions within subunits of the same organization or attempting to accomplish them at different points in time.\textsuperscript{37}

Cloward also indicates that a major source of administrative difficulty in management of prisons lies in this very combination of custody and rehabilitation practices which is now a trend in penal institutions. He finds that whatever attempts the staff make to motivate inmates toward rehabilitation are defeated by continuing public attitudes of rejection.\textsuperscript{38}


There seems ample evidence in the literature that administration in government agencies especially with regard to inmate populations, is a difficult area of operations. If government administration lacks prestige in the eyes of the public at large and if the public rejects its social outcasts more or less permanently, we assume that treatment of prisoners by government agencies has little centrality with the environment although custody is regarded as a necessary evil. This would make for problems in obtaining the necessary funds for operations as well as public approval for principles and programs of rehabilitation. The suggestion that the dual goals of custody and treatment are inherently difficult to achieve in association is an observation with which many correctional workers would agree. Part of the difficulty arises because the adoption of the rehabilitation goal necessitates the recruitment of professionals. This in turn upsets the traditional power structure in modern correctional systems since authority and responsibility are not yet clearly divided between 'line and staff' or 'custody and treatment' personnel.

The first part of this study will attempt to define the penitentiary administrative structure as a bureaucracy related to the theory of complex organizations, establish the goals of the Service and determine whether they are static or changing. It will then be possible to reach some conclusions about the functions of statistics and research for this structure in the past and their appropriate function in the administration of the Service for the future.
CHAPTER II

THE CANADIAN PENITENTIARY SERVICE

An understanding of the goals and structure of the Canadian Penitentiary Service can best be achieved by a review of its historical development.

The origins of the Canadian Penitentiary Service precede Confederation. Prior to 1867 the provinces of Canada, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick each had an institution for convicted criminals. At Confederation the penitentiary for the province of Canada at Kingston became a federal penitentiary for the newly formed provinces of Quebec and Ontario. The penitentiaries of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick were incorporated into the federal system in 1868.

A major concern at the time of Confederation was how authority and responsibility would be divided between the provincial and federal governments. Part VI of the British North America Act deals with the division of legislative powers. According to this statute the Dominion was to make laws for the 'peace, order and good government of Canada' in matters not assigned to the provinces. Specifically, under subsections six and twenty-eight, the federal government was to be responsible for establishment, maintenance and management of penitentiaries.

---

39 The British North America Act, 1867, Statutes of Canada, 30 and 31 Victoria, Chap. III, Section 141.

Johnstone and Henheffer have divided the history of inmate treatment in Canadian penitentiaries into four periods as follows:

(1) Pre-Confederation
(2) 1867-1938
(3) 1938-1946
(4) 1946-1953

This is probably as good a classification as any, except that the fourth period extended until 1960 when the regime of General Gibson ended with his retirement. A fifth period should now be added from 1960 to the present, marking a new phase of penitentiary operations which began with the appointment of Commissioner A. J. MacLeod in that year.

The above mentioned authors describe the Pre-Confederation period in penitentiaries as a brutal era marked by the liberal use of corporal and other forms of punishment. They discern a slow trend toward humane treatment of prisoners in the period following Confederation, which however deteriorated into a series of disturbances in the 1930's, bringing about a Royal Commission investigation into the management of the system. The third period, following publication of the report of the Royal Commission in 1938 until 1946, they describe as 'quiescent'. The fourth phase was marked by a radical swing away from

---

punishment toward rehabilitation of inmates as the operating philosophy for Canadian penitentiaries.\textsuperscript{42}

Considering the history of penitentiaries in Canada, it seems safe to say that the major changes in administrative structure and policy have come about as a result of Royal Commissions or other types of public enquiries. Since 1913 there have been six major government investigations which dealt directly with conditions in the Penitentiary Service or with penitentiaries as part of the Canadian correctional system\textsuperscript{43}. These major investigations have resulted from extreme public concern about penitentiary operations but the circumstances which precipitated official action have varied from case to case.

The Royal Commission on Penitentiaries of 1914 resulted from improper management of Kingston Penitentiary and seems to have been precipitated by official charges which were laid by the staff against certain administrative personnel. Part of this Commission's terms of reference were:

\textsuperscript{42}Ibid., pp. 5-8.

\textsuperscript{43}There have been at least two additional enquiries which have considered, in the course of investigation, either the crimes or punishment of penitentiary inmates. These are (1) The Report of the Royal Commission on the Criminal Law relating to Criminal Sexual Psychopaths, (Queen's Printer, Ottawa, 1958). (2) Reports of the Joint Committee of the Senate and House of Commons on Capital Punishment, Corporal Punishment and Lotteries. (Queen's Printer, Ottawa, 1956). Prior to 1913 there was one other enquiry; The Royal Commission on Prison Labour of 1876. However the results of this investigation would not seem to have a bearing on this study.
a) Generally, the subject of the conduct and administration of penitentiaries, including such methods as may conduce to the permanent reformation of the convicts,\textsuperscript{44}

The investigation showed, that in 1913, inmates were being treated according to principles enunciated in the Penitentiary Act of 1834 which governed the operation of Kingston Penitentiary when it was still a provincial institution for Upper Canada. The Commissioners state:

'Solitary imprisonment, labour and religious instructions have been the only agencies employed for the reclamation of the unfortunates'.\textsuperscript{45}

Their recommendations proposed forward looking reforms for penitentiaries including, among others, establishment of a three man Penitentiary Commission with headquarters staff, classification of inmates, state-use prison industries, the indeterminate sentence and parole boards for each institution.\textsuperscript{46}

Unfortunately these recommendations were presented in the opening year of World War I and as a consequence no changes were immediately effected. However, in May 1918, the Commission Report resulted in modest revisions of the Penitentiary Act. Under the Act of 1906 provision was made for the appointment of two Inspectors who were to report to the Minister of Justice.\textsuperscript{47}

\textsuperscript{44}\textit{Report of the Royal Commission on Penitentiaries, 4 George V.}, Sessional Paper No. 252, (King's Printer, Ottawa, 1914), p. 5.

\textsuperscript{45}\textit{Ibid.}, p. 6.

\textsuperscript{46}\textit{Ibid.}, pp. 42-44.

\textsuperscript{47}\textit{The Penitentiary Act 1906, Statutes of Canada, 6 Edward VII}, Chapter 38, Section 14-25.
In actual fact these Inspectors reported to the Minister through his Deputy. The Minister also had powers under the Act to appoint to headquarters of the Penitentiary Branch a parole officer, an accountant, an architect and 'such other officers as are necessary'.

By a 1918 amendment the chief executive officer of the Penitentiary Branch was made a Superintendent. He was to report to the Minister and give directions to three Inspectors who the Minister might appoint. In practice, as formerly with the Inspectors, the Superintendent still reported to the Minister through the Deputy Minister.

The next major investigation was the Committee to Advise Upon the Revision of the Penitentiary Regulations and the Amendment of the Penitentiary Act which reported in 1921. This Committee similarly found that there had been a lack of progress in the treatment of inmates since Confederation and that penitentiary operations were characterized by repression and cruelty. The Report recommended rehabilitation, not punishment of inmates, as the operating philosophy for

---

48 Ibid., Section 26.
49 An Act to Amend the Penitentiary Act, 1918, Statutes of Canada, 8-9 George V, Chap. 36.
50 Report Made on February 20th, 1921, by a Committee Appointed by the Right Honourable C. J. Doherty, Minister of Justice, To Advise Upon the Revision of the Penitentiary Regulations and the Amendment of the Penitentiary Act, Together with a Bill to Amend the Penitentiary Act Based Thereon as Introduced in the House of Commons, May 21st, 1921, reprinted May 4, 1946, (Jackson Press, Kingston, Ont.).
penitentiaries and changes were proposed in the regulations based on this principle of reformation. However there is little evidence that this Report had any material effect upon the system. It received first reading in the House of Commons in 1921 but was never proceeded with after the general election of that year. One result may have been that, in 1927, a further revision of the Act required the Superintendent, subject to ministerial approval, to make rules for:

b) 'the establishment and carrying on of any work or industry at any penitentiary as may be thought desirable for the useful employment or training of the convicts therein, (and) for the disposal of the products thereof'.

In the late 1920's and early 1930's throughout the world and especially in North America there was a general upsurge in criminal activities. At this time there were a series of disturbances in Canadian penitentiaries which eventually lead to a third investigation called the Royal Commission to Investigate the Penal System of Canada, commonly known as the Archambault Commission. While this investigation had as one central focus the operation of Canadian penitentiaries,

51Ibid., p. 65.

52The Penitentiary Act, Revised Statutes of Canada, 1927, Chapter 154, Section 15.

53The findings are reported in; The Report of the Royal Commission to Investigate the Penal System of Canada, (King's Printer, Ottawa, 1938).
its terms of reference went into matters of combined federal-provincial concern so that the result was a wide ranging study of principles and practices in Canadian corrections generally. It is not necessary here to discuss the recommendations of the Archambault Commission in detail. It suffices to comment on some of the findings and to note that the Report was recognized among workers in the crime and delinquency field as an advanced statement for its time concerning matters of Canadian corrections.

One of the findings was that penitentiaries, since 1932, had been operated in a highly centralized and militaristic fashion of which the Commissioners disapproved. The suggested remedy for this situation was that the Superintendent of the day be dismissed, which was done. Another recommendation was that the position of Superintendent be replaced by a three-man Prison Commission, the same opinion as that held by the 1914 Royal Commission. However, the 1937 Commission, having broader terms of reference, went further and recommended that most correctional institution services be centralized under federal control. The provinces were only to retain responsibility for offenders against provincial statutes, prisoners on remand and those serving short sentences.

\[^{54}\text{Ibid.}, p. 44.\]
\[^{55}\text{Ibid.}, p. 51.\]
\[^{56}\text{Ibid.}, p. 354.\]
\[^{57}\text{Ibid.}\]
Another part of the Report should be noted, that is the findings concerning corrections statistics and research. The Commissioners discovered a lack of uniformity in statistical information on crime and corrections in Canada, such as to make reliance on existing information dangerous. They recommended that the proposed Prison Commission, in cooperation with The Dominion Bureau of Statistics, revise the statistical system in order to produce information which would reliably show the costs of crime and the results of correction. Further, the proposed Commission, in order to become fully effective, was to use the revised statistical data to conduct 'a continuous study of all the problems affecting criminology and penology' in the country. 58

Because of World War II little immediate action was taken on the Archambault Commission recommendations. But according to some highly placed officials in the Penitentiary Service at that time, there was an expectation that a Prison Commission would be formed after the war. Concrete evidence of this was the amendment to the Penitentiary Act of 1927, assented to April 5, 1939, allowing for the formation of a 'Penitentiary Commission' but also stating that one Commissioner could act for the whole proposed Commission. 59 In the meantime,

58 Ibid., p. 175.
59 An Act Respecting Penitentiaries, 1939, Statutes of Canada, 3 George VI, Chapter 6, Section 4, Subsection 1 and 8.
however, penitentiaries were administered by an Acting Superintendent and 'no major change' was the order of the day. This policy was followed partly to avoid anticipating any changes the proposed Commission might want to make and partly because substantial changes would cost money which was not available for these purposes.

In April, 1946 the government decided to update and analyze the Archambault Commission findings by a supplementary investigation which was undertaken by Major General Gibson.60 Gibson was subsequently appointed Commissioner of Penitentiaries in the same year. He found since the Report of the Royal Commission in 1938 that a relaxation in a number of the more repressive regulations for penitentiary inmates had occurred.61 While, as one would expect, penitentiary construction had been hampered by shortages of material during the war, it was being resumed by 1946. Among construction projects, then planned or in progress, were buildings at several institutions for better segregation or training of special types of offenders, following the recommendations of the Archambault Commission.62 Also noted was the increase of industrial and agricultural production in federal institutions which was, in part, a response to the

60 The findings are reported in; Report of General R. B. Gibson, A Commissioner appointed under Order-in-Council, PC 1313, regarding the Penitentiary System of Canada, (King's Printer, Ottawa, 1947).

61 Ibid., p. 4-5, Section 8.

62 Ibid., p. 7, Section 11.
national war effort. In spite of the physical changes which had occurred as a result of the recommendations of the Royal Commission, Gibson concluded that:

'much remains to be done to give that great emphasis on the reformatory training and treatment of convicts that formed the main theme of the (Archambault) Commission's Report'. Therefore he recommended changes with respect to penitentiary administration, staff training and a more professional approach to training inmates which he considered 'first stages' in the fulfillment of the real intent of the Archambault Commission Report.

The major among the changes Gibson recommended were those pertaining to administrative structure. He claimed that, prior to the issuance of his Report, the government had already decided against the establishment of a Prison Commission under which control of all Canadian prisons would be centralized. A compromise arrangement, applicable only to the federal system, was necessary because of statutory impediments under the British North America Act and absence of agreements with the provinces permitting integration of institutional services at that time. Therefore it was proposed by Gibson that there be one Commissioner to replace the position of Superintendent, two new positions of

\[63\) Ibid., pp. 5-6, Sections 9-10.
\[64\) Ibid., p. 8, Section 14.
\[65\) Ibid., p. 17, Section 26.
\[66\) Ibid., pp. 8-9 and pp. 14-15.\]
Deputy Commissioner and that the three existing Inspector positions become Assistant Commissioners. This was accepted and given statutory recognition by revision of the Penitentiary Act assented to in June, 1947. One of the two Deputies was to be responsible for staff training and inmate education, the other for medical services and development of statistics and research. The Commissioner now reported directly to the Minister.

With these administrative changes the initial period of the Gibson regime showed a promising swing toward the principle of rehabilitation for prisoners in the federal system. It was marked by development for the first time, of a true system of classification for inmates, impetus in vocational training, regular in-service training of officers and employment of the first professional welfare workers in penitentiaries. However, it seems as time went on that the government failed to vote the necessary monies to truly fulfill the recommendations of the Archambault and Gibson Reports as they applied to penitentiaries. The consensus of opinion seems to be, that while there was an initial period of promising expansion, more emphasis was later placed on fiscal economy of operations, there was no real delegation of authority from the Commissioner to his senior officers and administrative control became increasingly centralized at headquarters.

67 The Penitentiary Act, Revised Statutes of Canada, 1952, Chapter 206, Section 4, Subsections 1 and 2.
One development concerning penitentiary statistics and research is noted from the files of the Penitentiary Branch in the two years following Gibson's appointment. A concerted attempt was made at this time to create a research position within the Service in order to describe the characteristics of the penitentiary population and assess the effects of training. This proposal received the support of the Commissioner, the duties were described and an appropriate classification was suggested for the position. The proposal apparently was vetoed by the Minister which effectively frustrated research developments in penitentiaries as envisaged by Gibson in his Report.  

In the meantime welfare oriented workers in corrections and influential citizens in the community privately approached the Deputy Minister of Justice to voice their concern about operations of the Remission Service. Upon the assent to the Ticket of Leave Act in 1899, officers of the Department of Justice administered the release of prisoners on parole presumably as part of their regular duties. In 1913 a separate section of the Department, called the Remissions Branch, was formed to deal with these matters in a more specialized way.  

68Report of General R. B. Gibson, op. cit., p. 9, Section 16 (c).  
However, it is said that as time went on, the police forces and associations became concerned that too many paroles were being granted. Hence, in 1920, the procedures of the Remissions Branch were 'tightened up' and there was a return to a more legalistic pattern of releases based on the principle of clemency rather than rehabilitation. Consequently proportionally few penitentiary inmates were paroled from 1930 to 1945.

As the idea of rehabilitation for criminal offenders gained ground, the Minister, sensitive to public agitation for parole reform, in 1956 set up A Committee Appointed to Inquire into the Principles and Procedures Followed in the Remission Service of the Department of Justice of Canada. This became known as the Fauteux Committee after its Chairman, Mr. Justice G. Fauteux. It soon became evident to the members that the Remission Service could not be investigated out of context with the other correctional services in Canada. Hence the Report greatly extended the boundaries of the Committee's original terms of reference.

One underlying principle of the Fauteux Committee Report is that society can protect itself from offenders only if it metes out justice in such a way that they are prevented from continuing in their criminal behaviour. It was assumed that this could be achieved only if the correctional services of the country were integrated to a high degree. One aspect of

\[70\text{Ibid.}, \ p. \ 1.\]
this integration of services was the recommendation that the federal government be responsible for all prisoners with sentences of more than six months.\textsuperscript{71}

Regarding institutions the finding was that classification of offenders in the federal and provincial systems could not be done in any ideal sense because the numbers of personnel were 'completely inadequate to the task involved'.\textsuperscript{72} It was therefore considered necessary by the Committee, not only to increase the size and proficiency of institutional staffs, but also to build a greater variety of facilities in which to treat special types of offenders.\textsuperscript{73}

Another aspect of the integrative principle was the recommendation for a single National Parole Board to undertake all releases and parole supervision in the country and eliminate the use of provincial Boards.\textsuperscript{74} Among the proposed duties of the Board was the maintenance of a research unit 'in conjunction with other branches of the Department of Justice and the Dominion Bureau of Statistics in order that the parole service may develop in accordance with the changing conditions in the country'.\textsuperscript{75}

The role of the universities was to train, with government assistance, the personnel to operate more adequate

\textsuperscript{71}Ibid., p. 84.
\textsuperscript{72}Ibid., p. 45.
\textsuperscript{73}Ibid., pp. 45-49.
\textsuperscript{74}Ibid., pp. 80-83.
\textsuperscript{75}Ibid., p. 83.
correctional services and also to conduct research into crime.76

Arising out of the Fauteux Committee Report was a Dominion-Provincial Conference on the Fauteux Report in November, 1956. Its purpose was to determine, between the provincial and federal governments, whether to implement the recommendations and if so to what extent. The decision of this Conference was that the federal government should study further ways and means of implementing the Fauteux Committee recommendations. The Dominion Government subsequently devised a plan for effecting these recommendations, one aspect of which concerned correctional research as a subject of mutual federal-provincial interest. A second Dominion-Provincial Conference on Correctional Reform was called in October, 1958 to consider implementation of the federal proposals. The result of this Conference was a decision by the federal government to defer any increase in responsibility for Canadian corrections until the Dominion could improve and consolidate its own correctional services.

Immediately following this second Dominion-Provincial Conference a Correctional Planning Committee was formed by the Minister of Justice under the chairmanship of A. J. MacLeod, the Director of the Remission Service before its abolition in 1958 and present Commissioner of Penitentiaries. The purpose of this Committee was to study the Penitentiary Service and make recommendations concerning its future development within

76Ibid., pp. 85-86.
the context of the Fauteux Committee Report. The study took eighteen months and the Report was submitted to the Minister in June, 1960. Since it is still considered a semi-confidential document it is not possible to fully describe the details of this Report. It can be said, however, that the Fauteux Committee recommendations, which applied to institutional correction, were confirmed but more emphasis was given to the role of research and public information in the correctional process.

Regarding the study of criminology the Committee considered that the rational evolution of a modern correctional system required development of adequate statistics and research. Correctional statistics and research were deemed to be essential in order to describe the criminal population characteristics and, on the basis of this information, be able to estimate requirements in facilities and staff. Secondly, they were considered necessary in order to measure the results of treatment programs, thus being in a position to make changes which would maximize the effectiveness of training. In fact this Committee asserted that the function of statistics and research were central to the development of the integrated federal correctional system which it envisaged for the future. The members also noted that correctional statistics and research had not so far been developed in Canada on any coordinated and scientific basis.

Summary of the Recommendations Contained in the Report of the Correctional Planning Committee of the Department of Justice, June 8, 1960, (mimeographed)
Penitentiary history repeated itself in 1960, following submission of this Report, when Committee Chairman MacLeod was appointed Commissioner in much the same way as Gibson had been installed fourteen years before. It is therefore logical to assume that the future course of developments in the Penitentiary Service will follow as closely as possible the recommendations of the Correctional Planning Committee.

With the revision of the Penitentiary Act in 1961 some further changes occurred in the administrative hierarchy of the penitentiary system. Speaking in the House of Commons in support of this bill, Mr. Fulton, then Minister of Justice, claimed that although the Penitentiary Act had been amended many times, fifty out of eighty-two sections of the 1952 statute remained the same as they had been in the Act of 1883. This was the first time, he said, that the statute had been made 'consistent with an enlightened approach to the problem of penitentiary operations'. Fulton further stated that the new legislation would be consistent with the principles laid down by the Fauteux Report and the Dominion-Provincial Conference of 1958. Finally he is quoted as follows;

'We have embarked upon a program of penitentiary development that is designed to provide for Canada in the shortest possible time, a penal system that is at least the equal of any in the world. The science of correcting the offender is developing rapidly. This bill is designed to enable the penitentiary service to take advantage of that science and to put it to full use on behalf of the people of Canada'.

The Penitentiary Act of 1961 provides for a Commissioner reporting directly to the Minister, one Deputy Commissioner, Directors of Divisions and Regional Directors, the number of the last two classes to be decided by Treasury Board. The relationships between these positions are illustrated in Figure I. Consistent with the Report of The Correctional Planning Committee there are now Divisions of Correctional Research and Public Information. The administrative chart also indicates a trend toward greater delegation of authority to the Directors of the seven new Divisions established at the present time. Finally, decentralization of authority has recently extended to field operations with the creation, on April 1, 1963, of two Regional Directorates to oversee penitentiary operations in the provinces of Ontario and Quebec.

Two other changes in the Penitentiary Act occurred in 1961, one concerning the requirement for statistics in the Commissioner of Penitentaries' Annual Report. Since before Confederation there has been a statutory requirement that the Service report to parliament concerning its activities each year. Every Penitentiary Act also contained a subsection which stipulated the inclusion of statistical material in the Report.

---
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For example the Acts of 1906, 1927, 1939 and 1952 all required, in almost identical words, that the Report be

'accompanied --- by such financial and statistical statements and tables as (the Inspector) deems useful or as the Minister directs'.

In the Act of 1961 the requirement for statistics in the Report was deleted.

The second set of revisions concerned prison visitors and absences of inmates from institutions. Until 1961 there was always a section concerning privileged visitors in the Act. This excluded all except persons of important status such as the Governor-General, the Lieutenant Governors of provinces, Members of Parliament, Members of Legislatures and Judges of courts of record. All others who were not officers on business or close relatives of prisoners were allowed entry only by special permission of the wardens, who, prior to 1946 rigidly adhered to the letter of the law. Commissioner Gibson relaxed the application of this prohibition but with the new Penitentiary Act it was completely removed from the statute. At the same time new provisions were added which permit the Commissioner, and for lesser periods of time the wardens, to release inmates on temporary leave from institutions for rehabilitative purposes.

---

SUMMARY

From the foregoing description of the Penitentiary Service it appears to possess many of the characteristics and problems of complex organizations as they are described in the literature. The Service can basically be classified as a bureaucracy of the Weberian type. It is only one of a large complex of government departments each competing with the other for operating resources. It has a responsibility for a special area of operations, namely the care of all offenders in Canada sentenced by the courts to two years or more imprisonment. This responsibility is described by statute under which detailed and voluminous regulations have been made for the government of staff and inmates. The structure of the penitentiary bureaucracy is the familiar pyramidal departmental form made up of subordinate and superordinate positions. The operations of penitentiaries have the same reliance as other bureaucracies on files and paperwork.

It is logical to assume that any organization with century-old traditions would be inflexible and resistant to change. Added to this factor is the semi-military nature of penitentiary operations. In most correctional institutions the nature of the work makes the use or threat of force necessary. Force is evidenced in the extreme control which is exercised over the lives of inmates in custody, the use of the customary locks, bars and walls, and the presence of guards in uniform who have access to arms. Since penitentiaries have been
developed to care for the most serious offenders, they have traditionally adhered to a rather militaristic type of control which has had a rigidifying effect throughout the system. Moreover, one must add to this the fact that, for many years, ex-army or militia officers have held high ranking positions in the Service both at the headquarters and institutional level. It would be natural for these officers to apply the army type of discipline and administration to their penitentiary work. In short, Canadian penitentiaries have had all the characteristics of 'total institutions'.

Another feature of the penitentiary system of the past was the barrier which existed between the public and the Service. Formerly, the statutory restrictions against visitors and prohibitions against releases of inmates into the community produced a climate of secrecy about penitentiaries and a condition of public ignorance concerning federal correction. It is assumed that this rigid separation of inmates from the public domain was basically the result of rejection generated by fear and a need to isolate antisocial persons in the interests of preserving the larger social structure. It seems reasonable to state that while the Canadian public has been ambivalent toward welfare problems generally, it has had an openly rejecting attitude toward criminal offenders. The same public attitudes prevail today, although slightly relaxed, and as we have seen, the statutory barriers between the community and institutional populations are breaking down.
The general consensus among correctional workers is that, over the years, the Penitentiary Service had become highly traditional and ritualistic in its operations. A main reason seems to have been that the welfare of offenders was not a matter of concern to the public, the penitentiary organization had a marginal value to the environment and hence it could not compete favourably with other government agencies for operating resources. This seems consistent with the developmental pattern of the Service; that is long periods of neglect with occasional official enquiries into maladministration resulting in minimal changes in structure and operations based on recommendations of Royal Commissions.

Formerly the goals of the penitentiary organization were the detention, punishment and industrial employment of prisoners. But as we have seen, for at least fifty years the Reports of various official enquiries have advocated rehabilitation as the principal goal. Starting in 1946 we see the first real departure toward this long recommended principle which, however, seems to have died out through shortage of funds and ministerial neglect. This event is assumed to have been linked to the continuing marginality of the Service in the public eye. Revived community interest sparked the Fauteux and Correctional Planning Committees and as a result, for the first time in 1960, ministerial interest, money and staff seem to have made a large scale and integrated approach to inmate training possible. It could thus be said that relaxing attitudes toward offenders in the outside environment allowed
succession of goals to take place in the penitentiary system so that rehabilitation eventually became the primary operating principle. At the same time all the former goals of the Service have been retained.

This succession in goals involves a trend away from conservatism and punishment, toward innovation and rehabilitation. In this regard the statement of Fulton has already been noted. In addition the present Commissioner has publicly described the ways in which the Penitentiary Service is now attempting to reform inmates. These include an extension of inmate activities in the community, a longer working day for inmates, more opportunities for trade training and generally the planned development of more normal living conditions within the institution.\footnote{A. J. MacLeod, Q.C., \textit{The Changing Canadian Prison}, an address delivered on March 29, 1962 at the Annual Meeting of the John Howard Society of London, Ont.}

These philosophical changes have been accompanied by increasing size, complexity and structural alteration in administration of the Service. Statistics show the rapid rate of growth in penitentiary administration as illustrated in Table I. A 329.9\% increase in the penitentiary estimates is shown between 1947 and 1961, while a 166.7\% increase is shown from 1961 to 1963.\footnote{The budgetary figures in Table I are not expressed in constant dollars because the necessary figures for 1963 are unavailable at this time. It is known, however, that the implicit price index for government expenditures has slightly more than doubled from 1947 to 1963. From this it can be concluded that the budget for the Penitentiary Service, in deflated dollars, has roughly quadrupled during the period.} Some of this increase is the result of
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Main Estimates</strong></td>
<td>$4,155,986.00</td>
<td>$17,874,153.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>$31,590,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By Statute</td>
<td>2,264.00</td>
<td>2,400.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,400.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$4,158,250.00</td>
<td>$17,876,553.00</td>
<td>329.9</td>
<td>$31,592,400.00</td>
<td>76.7</td>
<td>659.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Inmates</strong></td>
<td>3,752</td>
<td>6,738</td>
<td>79.6</td>
<td>7,219</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>92.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Staff</strong>**</td>
<td>747</td>
<td>2,619</td>
<td>250.6</td>
<td>3,042</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>307.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Staff**</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>130.0</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>39.1</td>
<td>220.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutions Total</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>85.7</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>92.3</td>
<td>257.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Security</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Security</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Security</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* All figures as of March 31st.
** Operating and Administrative.
growth in inmate population which rose 79.6% from 1947 to 1961 and 7.1% from 1961 to 1963. However, the major increase in expenditures is the result of extra costs involved in operating a rehabilitation program against the provision of straight custodial care.

Similarly, while total staff has increased 307.2% from 1947 to 1963, the proportion of professionals has increased 220.0% in the same time period. In the same way institutional facilities have become more varied as may also be seen from the table. Although overcrowding still exists, there is a trend toward minimum security and training institutions rather than maximum security facilities.

Figure I, showing the headquarters administrative structure of the Service, indicates the wide variety of professional disciplines now represented in staff capacities. This contrasts to headquarters administrative structure which existed in 1947 and before.

All this seems to indicate that, as far as the outside environment is concerned, the goals of the Service are now assuming more centrality. Latterly this has largely been the result of a vigorous attempt by Fulton to legitimize the program at a time when the public attitudes toward the offender are becoming more positive. Another factor is the energetic leadership now being provided by the Commissioner and his top level staff, the latter presumably having been selected for their professional expertness and favourable orientation toward rehabilitation of inmates.
There is, however, some evidence that rehabilitation still has a precarious value for the public at large. It is evident to the workers in Canadian corrections that much ambivalence exists, especially toward adult offenders and the public is not completely sold on the effectiveness or desirability of present treatment programs. This is a potential source of danger to the penitentiary administrator in that the growing public support of penitentiaries could easily be reversed.

It can be observed, moreover, that the changing goals and expansion of the Service are bringing with them certain administrative problems consistent with those outlined in the theoretical exposition concerning 'total institutions'. For one thing there is, in federal institutions, the familiar split between the staff and inmate cultures. Furthermore, the values of the penitentiary inmate population are not congruent with the goal of rehabilitation for inmates. The latter cannot be considered a group which is in any way cooperative with organizational goals judging from the disturbances which have occurred in penitentiaries during 1962 and 1963.

Secondly, the rapid expansion of the inmate population has brought in its wake problems in housing, recruitment of staff, staff training and administrative coordination. The already complex situation will become even more involved if the proposed integration of all long term Canadian institutions under federal control is accomplished. All planning seems to be directed with this end in view and it seems likely that
centralization of institutional services will occur within the next five or ten years. One feature of rapidly increasing size of institutional populations in the federal domain is the need for planning ahead which was not necessary in former times.

Again the custodial and professional staffs in the institutions cannot so far be regarded as an integrated group. The value systems of these sub-groups are different because of disparities in social background, education, experience, work roles and opportunities for advancement. Therefore they cannot be assumed to be working toward organizational goals in complete harmony or in a coordinated fashion.

Finally, there is a source of administrative conflict because of the increased numbers and authority of the policy making group at headquarters. Because of increasing importance of this 'staff' group in administration, the wardens are no longer as autonomous as they were in former years. These two sub-groups also operate against a different set of working conditions, experiences and values. More than this however, the expansion of the headquarters group, as one would expect, has resulted in formulation of new policies in a way which disrupts traditional practices in the institutions. The impact of this is being felt by both operating staff and inmates. There is evidence that, because of the speed of change, the informal values of both operating personnel and inmates are not consistent with the policies of the formal organization as decided at headquarters. This in turn is likely to have dysfunctional consequences for organizational goals.
Leaving aside the consideration that achievement of rehabilitation and custodial goals may be basically incompatible in traditional institutions, enough has been said to indicate a difficult administrative situation within the Penitentiary Service. The fluid situation brought about by rapid change in goals and procedures has distorted the established formal and informal structures and upset the traditional power relationships. In order to be successful in achieving its goals in the face of these difficulties the Service will require continued public support. One method of improving its public image is to demonstrate by measurements of its programs that goals are being achieved in line with environmental expectations and hence the money being spent on penitentiary operations is justified. As we have seen, major Royal Commission recommendations since 1938 have included the development of a statistics and research program in federal corrections to fulfill just such a purpose. But up to the time the Correctional Planning Committee completed its investigations in June, 1960, nothing had been achieved along these lines. But now, as already noted, a Correctional Research Division has been formed in the Penitentiary Service and a revised program of inmate statistics went into effect in 1962.

It is with the total functions of statistics and research for the penitentiary structure that this study is specifically concerned. The next phase of the study will therefore be focused on the statistical and research techniques which
have been developed, their effect on penitentiary administration and the role of the Correctional Research Division in these developments.
CHAPTER III

ANALYSIS OF DATA

INTRODUCTION

Sources of Data

An analysis of the structure of an organization cannot be accomplished alone by reference to administrative charts and documents prepared for public consumption. The formal aspects of an administrative structure must in some way be combined with informal elements which are, for the most part, not recorded except perhaps in confidential files not available to researchers. The student, therefore, must effect sufficient penetration into the system to be able to observe and assess the on-going organizational processes and to obtain the confidence of staff so that their evaluations of the structure under study will be validly and freely communicated. The information sought in this research is largely not recorded and is unavailable except in the minds and memories of long-service personnel. For this reason the analysis is primarily based on data obtained from senior administrative and professional personnel in the Penitentiary Service. However, information contained in published and unpublished documents was used to support and corroborate data obtained from the staff. Unrestricted access was allowed by the Commissioner of Penitentiaries to all available documents including confidential material. As specified in the bibliography, the major documentary sources
were the Annual Reports of the Penitentiary Branch, Circular Letters and Commissioner's Directives, contents of the administrative files and reports of official investigations dealing with penitentiary affairs of populations.

The group of respondents in Ottawa comprised all twenty-three members of the Headquarters Staff from the rank of Deputy Commissioner down to and including the Assistant Directors. Of the total staff at headquarters only the Commissioner, the technical and the clerical personnel were not interviewed. These respondents will be referred to as the senior administrative or headquarters group.

The second group of senior staff included the Quebec and Ontario Regional Directors who are the only two so far appointed and seven out of the eleven wardens in the penitentiary system. These officials were together responsible for 3,980 out of 6,978 or 57.1% of the total inmate population, including all females, held in custody as of June 30, 1963. It is thought that the opinions and factual data advanced by this group will not differ significantly from that of the universe of wardens had all been interviewed. These respondents will be called the senior operating group.

These two senior staff groups are considered able to give factual data and render valid opinions regarding the functions of statistics and research in the Penitentiary Service for two reasons. In the first instance these officials are incumbents of high level positions within the Service which they occupy because of their technical expertness and/or long
experience. Secondly, their role is either to advise the Commissioner on policy or at a high level, to see that policy is carried out. For both these reasons the officers in the combined group are likely to know with considerable accuracy the administrative situation related to statistics and research and are uniquely qualified to give information on this subject.

The Interview Guide attached as Appendix A was used as a basis for conducting interviews with the two groups of senior penitentiary officials during the period from June 12 to July 12, 1963. The use of an interview guide allowed for comparability between interviews in addition to considerable depth of response. The questions on the guide denote the core considerations and were not addressed to respondents in the same phraseology as appears in the sample.

In this study the non-directive approach was taken in questioning. When probe questions were necessary, care was taken to phrase them impartially. The scope of questioning was thought to be broad enough to avoid collection of a narrow range of data and ensure reasonably precise interpretations to be made in the analysis.

Interviews were held in private and respondents were assured that confidentiality of information would be maintained. Interview sessions varied in length but averaged two hours. In a few cases two or three sessions were required to complete the interview or to verify information, but in the main, only one interview was necessary. Rapport is considered to have been
high since there were no refusals and information was freely given. All interviews were conducted by the writer. For these reasons the validity and reliability of data is thought to be as good as possible considering the limitations inherent in qualitative interviews.

During the same time period, the questionnaire which is attached with its covering letter as Appendix B was mailed to all professional and some senior administrative staff in the institutions. From the letter it will be seen that assurances were again given regarding confidentiality of answers requested. These respondents will be called the professional-administrative or the inmate training group. These officers are the ones responsible under the present regulations for either completing statistical forms regarding inmates, supervising their completion or contributing statistical information for entry on these forms. It is therefore considered that this group is in the best position to give opinions about the validity and reliability of statistical data recorded concerning the inmate population and the effectiveness of current statistical procedures.

Samples of the four inmate statistical forms currently in use are attached as Appendix C. Procedures for recording statistics vary slightly between institutions but, generally speaking, the Admission Form is completed by the Inmate Records Clerk based on information supplied by the inmate and checked against the Warrant of Commitment, the R.C.M.P. Fingerprint Record and previous penitentiary files if these exist.
The Classification Questionnaire is completed under general direction of the Supervisor of Classification and may be filled in by the Supervisors, Classification Officers or Classification Assistants. The personal and social information entered on this form is obtained from the inmate and may be verified from outside sources. Educational Supervisors, Psychologists and Chief Vocational Officers contribute test results and other information to this report, but generally do not enter the information on the forms themselves.

The Release Form is completed before discharge of the inmate by the Classification staff. Its purpose is to record the progress made by inmates during their period of training.

The Assistant Deputy Wardens (Inmate Training) have all been recently appointed and without exception were promoted from Classification positions in which they were involved with statistical recording as part of their duties. For this reason and because they now supervise the work of the Inmate Training staff, this group was also asked to complete the questionnaire.

It was felt that only officers who had had more than six months service in their present positions would be qualified to give valid answers to the questions. By excluding answers from those with under six months experience a total of seventy-six replies were possible. Returns were actually received from seventy-two of the professional-administrative group, constituting a 90.8% response. The returns were broken down as follows;
Classification and Psychological Staff - 45 out of 46
Educational Supervisors - 9 out of 10
Chief Vocational Officers - 6 out of 6
Assistant Deputy Wardens (IT) - 7 out of 8
Inmate Records Clerks - 5 out of 6
Total - 72 out of 76

However, as will be made clear in the analysis not every respondent answered all questions on the schedule.

Following the return of the questionnaires, interviews were held with some professionals in this group of respondents in the Quebec and Ontario Regions in order to gauge how well the schedule had been understood and accepted. These respondents were allowed to expand upon their opinions regarding penitentiary statistics and research at that time. The writer, at the same time, was able to observe at first hand the methods now being used to collect statistical data in the two largest receiving institutions, Kingston and St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiaries.

The impressions reached from these interviews were, generally speaking, that the questions on the form had been properly interpreted and the questionnaire had not constituted a threatening experience for the respondents. These impressions were strengthened by the fairly comprehensive way in which the questionnaires were completed. The one exception was respecting the questions which asked respondents to evaluate their competency in interviewing. The answers to these questions were found to lack validity such that other sources of these
data had to be found. More will be said on this point later in the analysis.

The fact that the writer was known to many of the respondents assisted in the establishment of rapport with the entire group. Moreover, previous involvement with the penitentiary statistical system meant that the nature of recent developments in this program were probably known with greater precision and better perspective than would have been possible for another student. On the other hand, personal involvement in any activity is a possible source of bias and may lead to some distortion of judgement. This was considered and guarded against in the present study. Special precautions were found to be necessary because of the fact that the writer was known to be an employee of the Dominion Bureau of Statistics. In interviews, when questions were raised regarding the Bureau's role in penitentiary statistics, some hesitancy and reticence was apparent in the answers. More will be said concerning the amount and direction of bias from this source in the appropriate section of the analysis.

Method of Analysis

The data obtained from documents and interviews was quantified within certain limits by the use of qualitative coding procedures. These basically entailed setting up mutually exclusive categories into which the qualitative data were fitted. This process of codification allowed more objective judgements to be made in the analysis concerning penitentiary
statistics and research than would have been possible by relying on purely qualitative methods.83

Definitions

In this research it was necessary to establish definitions for the terms 'records', 'statistics', and 'research' and the relationships between them. During interviews and in analysis, 'records' were defined as any unorganized basic data entered on forms in the course of penitentiary administration. In this study these mainly concerned the characteristics of inmates but might also involve quantities of material used, periods of time or financial expenditures. 'Statistics' were taken to mean some understandable arrangement of basic records into like categories. Little confusion was found to exist in the minds of respondents concerning the concepts of records and statistics and the terms, as defined here, seemed to be uniformly understood.

The term 'research' was found to have different meanings for different respondents. It was therefore necessary to establish a very broad definition. Hence research here is considered to mean any study of penitentiary administration,

---

penitentiary inmates or the crimes of inmates. The term in no way indicates the quality of any study, nor distinguishes whether it is pure or applied.

The sections of analysis under the headings below are intended not only to discover the types of penitentiary statistics and research which exist, but also why these developed and the ways in which they enter into penitentiary administration.

TYPES OF STATISTICAL AND RESEARCH USAGE

The senior administrative, senior operating and inmate training groups were questioned concerning their experience with statistics and research and the ways in which statistical and research techniques had been used in penitentiary administration. Six types of usage were discovered which differ not only as to recency of their application but also extent of use in administration. Nothing was found in the files or published documents to indicate any additional category of use. They are as follows;

(1) Preparation of staff establishments and financial estimates.

(2) Preparation of Annual Reports.

(3) Answers to questions in the House of Commons and formulation of legislative proposals.

(4) Preparation of Royal Commission Reports.

(5) Attempts at measurement of programs or studies for purposes of administrative guidance.

(6) Academic and scientific studies by professional staff or outsiders.
In general terms the relative importance and centrality of these categories to penitentiary operations is discussed under their separate headings below.

Preparation of Staff Establishments and Financial Estimates

As long as there has been a Penitentiary Service it has been necessary to estimate in advance the number of staff and amount of equipment to care for and train inmates. These needs, converted to dollars, are submitted to Treasury Board on an annual basis, preparatory to approval of the Budget in the House of Commons. In a very elementary way these estimates are linked to statistics in that they are always based on the estimated inmate population for the coming year. The purpose and method of preparing staff establishments and financial estimates are generally so well understood that no further reference will be made to this use of statistics in penitentiary administration.

Preparation of Annual Reports

Annual Reports have been submitted annually by the Service to Parliament since Confederation as required by statute. These reports contain statistics of the major aspects of penitentiary operations in the preceding year.

In addition, beginning in 1937, the Dominion Bureau of Statistics has supplied an elaborate supplement of inmate statistics which has always been attached to the Report. Prior to that date these figures were compiled by the Penitentiary
Service itself with less accuracy and less complexity.

It will be clarified later that penitentiary staff has a clear idea of the purpose of Annual Report Statistics.

Answers requested in the House of Commons and Formulation of Legislative Proposals

Statistics were also produced at headquarters either as a result of a request for information by the Minister of Justice or in anticipation of such a request. Because of the political desirability of having prompt answers to questions asked of the Justice Minister by his opponents, statistics in continuous series have been kept on subjects which were considered likely to arouse discussion in the House. Some examples are the numbers and basic characteristics of drug offenders, youthful offenders, female offenders and sexual offenders. Some of these series were reported annually in the Commissioner of Penitentiaries Annual Report and others were kept as unpublished cumulative statistics at headquarters.

In addition, the Ministry of Justice has called upon the Penitentiary Service to supply statistics from time to time when new legislation relating to penitentiary inmates or their crimes was contemplated.

Preparation of Royal Commission Reports

Beginning with the investigations of the Archambault Commission there has been a trend toward the use of statistics in formulating recommendations of Royal Commissions. Certainly
from 1936 to the present all major public investigations, which dealt with the operations of the penitentiary system, have required both the Dominion Bureau of Statistics and the Penitentiary Service to furnish data on which to base conclusions.

Attempts at Measurement of Programs or Studies for Purposes of Administrative Guidance

This usage of statistics seems to be a recent innovation which accompanied the advent of the rehabilitation oriented regime of General Gibson in 1946. Consistent with this observation is the fact that use of statistics for program measurement has occurred in the administrative areas most closely associated with specialized care and training of inmates.

A recent development is the procedural study undertaken by an outside commercial or government department. A few of these have taken place at the request of the Commissioner for the purpose of increasing administrative efficiency or formulating long range plans.

Academic and Scientific Studies by Professional Staff or Outsiders

Also since 1946 there have been a number of studies undertaken either by professional staff in the Service as a matter of their own academic interest or by researchers from outside the Service who were in need of a captive population.

The following section of the analysis deals in greater detail with the academic, administrative and Royal Commission studies referred to above.
TYPES OF PENITENTIARY RESEARCH

From the responses to interviews and questionnaires and using the material in the files, an attempt was made to compile an unduplicated list of all known studies respecting penitentiary inmates or administration. The results are shown in Table II.

As noted in the introduction, the use of the term 'research' herein has a very broad meaning. Hence any study, however simple, as long as it was directly related to penitentiary inmates, programs or administration, was included. No study was included which was completed prior to 1914 and only one is known to have taken place before that date. No claim is made that the list is absolutely complete but a fairly exhaustive search failed to reveal any other studies. On this basis the total number of separate researches was one hundred and eight.

Penitentiary research in the above sense can be categorized into three basic types as follows;

(a) Official investigations such as the Reports of Royal Commissions.

(b) Academic or scientific studies.

(c) Procedural studies into methods of administrative operation and program effectiveness.

Prior to 1946 there was no record of a study other than the official investigation type. There seems to be at least two interlocking reasons for this situation. The primary consideration is that the attitude towards inmates, prior to
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name or Subject of Study</th>
<th>Year of Completion</th>
<th>AUSPICES</th>
<th>STUDIES</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>PERSISTENCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Royal Commission on Penitentiaries</td>
<td>1914</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report on Revision of Penitentiary Regulations</td>
<td>1921</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal Commission on Penitentiaries</td>
<td>1938</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Causes of Crime</td>
<td>1946</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intelligence Quotients of Inmates</td>
<td>1948</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electroencephalograms of Offenders</td>
<td>1950</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appraisal of Statistics</td>
<td>1950</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incidence of Tuberculosis in Inmates</td>
<td>1952</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inmates Committing Sexual Offences</td>
<td>1949-50</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Against Children</td>
<td>1952</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recidivism of Dale Carnegie Course Graduates</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Follow-up and Vocational Training</td>
<td>1955</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study of Capital Case Offenders</td>
<td>1955</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study of Corporal Punishment Administered to Offenders</td>
<td>1955</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report on Capital and Corporal Punishment</td>
<td>1956</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inmates Admitted to Penitentiary on First Sex Offence</td>
<td>1956</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recidivism of Sex Offenders</td>
<td>1956</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classification of Sex Offenders</td>
<td>1956</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcoholic Offenders</td>
<td>1956</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Offenders</td>
<td>1956</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Sex Offenders in Penitentiaries 1956</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recidivism in Incest Cases</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study of Criminal Sexual Psychopaths</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study of Homosexual Offenders</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report on Criminal Sexual Psychopaths</td>
<td>1958</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes of Inmates</td>
<td>1958</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Columbia Penitentiary Administration</td>
<td>1958</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE II - Continued

**Studies Concerning Penitentiary Inmates or Operations*  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name or Subject of Study</th>
<th>Year of Completion</th>
<th>Auspices</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Persistence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>La Complicité Criminelle</td>
<td>1958</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>Penitentiary Service Employee</td>
<td>Student or Professional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Offenders</td>
<td>1958</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tests on Aging</td>
<td>1958</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcoholism and Homosexuality</td>
<td>1958</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychomotor Rigidity</td>
<td>1958</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incidence of Mental Illness Among Inmates 1945-58</td>
<td>1958</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Leave Studies</td>
<td>1954-58</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Training Study</td>
<td>1958</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deceased Employees Study 1954-59</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Accident Study</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Separations Study</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Registry Administration Study</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recidivism and Vocational Training - Penitentiary Service</td>
<td>1947-59</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recidivism and Vocational Training - Collins Bay</td>
<td>1949-59</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Assessment at Federal Training Center</td>
<td>1952-59</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Psychiatric Hospital at St. Vincent-de-Paul Penitentiary</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Services at St. Vincent-de-Paul Penitentiary</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation of a Basic Classification for Clinical Work and Research in Criminology</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dynamics Involved in Family Offences Appearing Before the Court</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some Rights Duties and Responsibilities in Penology and Suggested Changes</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Les Relations Objectives au Sein du Monde Pénitentaire</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problems in Establishing a Therapeutic Relationship in a Prison Community</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Natural History of Criminality and Some Tentative Hypotheses</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Characteristics of Drug Addicted Female Inmates</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Characteristics of Drug Addicts at British Columbia Penitentiary</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name or Subject of Study</td>
<td>Year of Completion</td>
<td>AUSPICES</td>
<td>TYPE</td>
<td>Academic Interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accidents Involving Eye Injuries at Collins Bay Penitentiary</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inmates Sentenced to Penitentiary when Under 16 Years 1955-60</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication and Destimulation</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compulsive Forgers</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effects of the Drug Lysergic Acid on Inmates</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality Patterns and Physiological Response</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Plan for Canadian Penitentiaries</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Thérapie de Groupe au Pénitencier</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary Report of Correction Planning Committee</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effects of Social Isolation</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Practices in the Penitentiary Service</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey of Organization and Administration Division</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pain Thresholds of Addicts and Non-Addicts</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After Image and Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recidivism of Dale Carnegie Course Graduates</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study of Arsonists</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age and Metabolism of Steroids</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceptual Inhibitions and Social Learning</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of Criminal Histories</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recidivism of Sex Offenders in Penitentiaries</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inmates Attacking Officers</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Late Comer to Crime</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Conflicts and Criminal Behaviour</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Acting Out in Cases of Reactive Depression</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Problem of Recidivism and Treatment of the Late Comer to Crime</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some Psychological Aspects of Sentencing</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE II - Concluded
Studies Concerning Penitentiary Inmates or Operations*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name or Subject of Study</th>
<th>Year of Completion</th>
<th>AUSPICES</th>
<th>STUDENT or PROFESSIONAL</th>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>PERSISTENCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Penitentiary Inmates with More Than Two Brothers in Penitentiaries</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>Government Penitentiary</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adopted Inmates</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>Penitentiary Service Employee</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality Types by Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Activities in Canadian Penitentiaries</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Characteristic of Indian Offenders</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effects of the Drug Lysergic Acid on Inmates</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey of Transcribing and Typing Services</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey of File Classifications</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Custodial Classification of Inmates Based on Psychological Criteria</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory Validation Scales and Effect of Cultural Differences</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leary Interpersonal Check-List</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcoholism in Inmates</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tattoos and Offences</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Homosexuality and Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penitentiary Disturbances</td>
<td>incomp.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suicides and Attempted Suicides of Inmates</td>
<td>incomp.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value System; Inmates and Staff</td>
<td>incomp.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Experiences of Inmates</td>
<td>incomp.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offender Personality Types</td>
<td>incomp.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classification of Offender Types by Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory</td>
<td>incomp.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Validation of Adult Education Tests Pilot Study</td>
<td>incomp.</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addict Parole Study</td>
<td>incomp.</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Characteristics of Addicts and Non Addicts</td>
<td>incomp.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prediction of Recidivism</td>
<td>incomp.</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* As of September 1, 1963.
the Gibson regime, was basically retributive. There was formerly little interest in the plight of the inmate and hence no research was considered to be necessary on this subject. Coupled with this philosophy, and one symptom of it, was the provision in the Penitentiary Act which allowed wardens to exclude all except special categories of visitors from penitentiaries. Until the appointment of Commissioner Gibson nobody would have been allowed inside the institutions to do any research.

Since 1914 there have been ten investigations of the official type which have been ordered by Parliament or the Department of Justice. Not all of these focussed directly on the Penitentiary Service but all have in some way investigated either its operations, its inmates or the crimes of penitentiary inmates. These comprise 9.2% of the total number of studies. This type of study has been recently characterized by some reliance on available statistical data. Mainly they depend on observation of other systems or institutions of correction and the hearing of considerable testimony from expert witnesses for the purpose of making recommendations.

There seems to be a commonly held belief among the public that official investigations are completed at great cost to the taxpayer but are never implemented. This is generally only a half-truth although occasionally the shelving of an official report can occur. More often some recommendations are implemented and some are not, either for reasons of political expediency or shortage of funds. With respect to penitentiaries,
as we have seen, all the major investigations directly focused on Service operations have brought about some changes in administration.

Starting in 1946 the Service began to encourage other types of research. Beginning at that time students and professional people were allowed into institutions to do studies on various subjects. At first, as might be expected, there were some barriers raised by the institutions against this practice. It is noted in the files from the years 1946 to 1960 that none of these studies were undertaken without a great deal of assurance that they would not impose a strain on staff resources and that they would result in a finding likely to benefit the Service. Over the years outside researchers doing studies in penitentiaries have been better accepted but there is little evidence that their work has had a direct impact on penitentiary operations. In the exceptional case the attitudes of administrators could have been changed a certain amount upon reading some of these reports and this in turn might have affected their subsequent decision-making. But a frequent comment from respondents was that the results of these studies were not fed back to the Service. One senior officer at the operating level is quoted as follows:

'That's my big complaint. They (the researchers) come in here, use the inmates as guinea pigs and we never find out the conclusions of the study'.

Twenty-nine out of a total of one hundred and eight studies or 26.8% fall into the latter category.
Starting approximately the same time, professional staff was recruited for treatment positions in the institutions and as this occurred it was natural that they should conduct studies for their own interest or to increase their academic standing. However, the same general statement could be made regarding these studies in that they had little direct application to penitentiary operations. It is also logical that, as professional staffs increased in the Penitentiary Service, they should do more studies and their incidence is in fact increasing. Furthermore, there seems to be a recent trend towards applying studies by professional penitentiary employees to problems in the work situation. As classified here, all studies undertaken by professionals, while in part-time or full-time employment with the Service, fall into this category. At present these number thirty-three and comprise 30.5% of the total.

Again starting in 1947 the Service undertook some studies for its own administrative guidance. Of the total thirty-six or 33.3% fall into this class. However, these figures are misleading. It is true that the administration gave its blessing to all studies including those in the latter category but few, until recent times, were conducted under the auspices of the central administration. Most were initiated and conducted by officers in upper level positions who were anxious to learn about an area of their departmental responsibility. To a lesser extent some attempt was made to measure the results of programs. The largest single block of studies falling into this category were initiated by the Medical Division. Of the total number
of studies in this class twenty-five out of thirty-six or 69.0% were under medical auspices.

Most of these studies focused on rehabilitation programs, mainly the medical and vocational services, but at the Federal Training Center some measurement of socialization program was undertaken. In the nature of the case, the results of this research did have some direct effect on departmental decision-making.

The latest development in penitentiary research is the applied procedural study undertaken by the central administration of the Penitentiary Service. So far these have been largely conducted by an outside commercial firm or a department of another government agency. Their purpose is to assess the efficiency of certain administrative operations and make recommendations for improvements. Examples are the several studies undertaken with regard to head office procedures by the Management Analysis Division of the Civil Service Commission and assessment of penitentiary industrial operations by the firm of Stevenson and Kellogg in 1962. The first of this variety of research was undertaken in 1959 and together they now number six or 5.5% of the overall total.

The inescapable conclusion from these data is that penitentiary research is relatively little developed. Few studies have been undertaken even given the wide definition of 'research' as it is used here. What has been done is recent. Of the total number of studies, 96.3% have been undertaken since 1947 and 48.1% from 1960 to the present. There has been
little attempt at continuous measurement of any aspect of penitentiary operations. All except three studies are of the ad hoc variety. The main development has been in the area of the academic or scientific study by the professionals inside or outside the Service. Of the overall total sixty-two or 57.4% fall into this class. They have had little applicability to penitentiary problems or direct impact on penitentiary administration. However, this seems to be changing and plans are now being made to direct this sort of research towards problems of administrative concern. The result of this policy, in the long run, will probably achieve a positive effect for penitentiary administration in orienting operations more in line with the goals of the organization. The procedural study is the most recent type of research and is a significant development in that these have been initiated by the central administration in order to increase operational efficiency. Research, therefore, which is deliberately commissioned for the guidance of the top administration in policy making, is the product of the last four years but seems to be a growing trend.

ANNUAL REPORT STATISTICS

Since statistics in some form have been included in the body of the Annual Report for many years, respondents in the senior administrative and senior operating groups were questioned as to their purpose and extent of use in operations. The results are discussed under the headings below.
Use In Administration

In questioning to determine whether and to what extent Annual Report statistics were used in administration, none of the thirty-two respondents failed to reply and the answers fell into two categories.

Of the combined senior group 65.6% claimed that they made minimal use of statistics in the Annual Report. Most admitted to an occasional reference to these tables mainly to ascertain trends of increase or decrease in the inmate population. Others in this group had made up tables from year to year primarily for administrative guidance and to demonstrate the efficiency of their own operations. Because these statistics were illustrative of operations, they became incorporated in the Annual Report where it became convenient for workers to refer to the figures in continuous series.

It was reported by 34.4% of the group that these statistics were of no use in their administrative operations. These persons considered that there had been a routine annual requirement for this information for many years and it was an extra chore which did not result in any assistance with on-going administrative work. A typical comment by one member is as follows;

'They are no help to me—just a nuisance'.

Purpose of Annual Report Statistics

The same respondents were asked their opinion regarding
the purpose of putting statistics in the Annual Report at all. Of the group 12.5% claimed that they did not know or gave no answer. The majority however had at least one opinion on this subject and sometimes gave a combination of answers.

As one answer 81.2% of the group stated that the Report itself was required by statute in order to explain penitentiary operations to the Parliament and the public. This group considered statistics in the Report as one technique of public reporting or that they constituted an historical record of operations.

Of these respondents 31.2% expressed the similar idea, either in combination with the public reporting concept or as a single opinion, that the main reason for the Report and the statistics therein was to justify administrative operations, prove their efficiency or support budgetary demands.

It seems obvious in view of the requirements for Reports to Parliament by the statutes governing most public agencies, that the function of these documents is to publicly account for their activities. The statute governing the operation of the Penitentiary Service contains such a provision and, until 1961, the additional requirement that some statistics be included in the Reports. This being the case, the second opinion of respondents would seem to be associated with the first since it can be assumed that no administrator would admit the inefficiency of his department in an official report. This is quite well understood within the administration of the Penitentiary Service and other government departments. A case
was cited by one respondent where some statistics were omitted from the Annual Report of the Commissioner of Penitentiaries, at the request of the Minister, before their submission to Parliament on the basis that the figures would be embarrassing to the government.

As part of their opinion 15.6% of respondents maintained that the supplementary inmate statistics, supplied by The Dominion Bureau of Statistics for attachment to the Report, were for academic research purposes. It is a fact that the statement which preceded these statistical tables from 1937 to 1949 contained a paragraph similar to the following:

'All relevant information concerning convicts in the seven Dominion penitentiaries is summarized in this report. The tables are indented (sic) to provide Criminologists with information concerning convicts committed to penitentiaries, the types of crime committed and the various characteristics of offenders according to such factors as age, economic condition, race, environment and other social conditions which may serve to throw light on causes leading to the commission of crime'.

However, no concrete evidence could be found that these figures were ever used in research concerning penitentiary inmates or the causes of crime—certainly not by the Penitentiary Service or the Dominion Bureau of Statistics. Researchers, whether or not employed in the Service, seem in all cases to have preferred to collect their own data. It has already been mentioned that some of the major Royal Commission investigations

---

have had cause to complain about the statistics which were available to them in the official reports and called for special tabulations to be made for their purposes. This would indicate that the selection of inmate statistics in the Annual Report are inadequate for certain types of studies.

Also the writer's experience with groups of university professors who are doing studies in Criminology is that they consider the tables in the statistical supplement to be unsuitable for their research needs. It is conceded, however, that trend studies, based upon continuous series in the Annual Report, are possible should anyone in the future want to attempt them. For this reason the feeling of most researchers is that these series should be maintained in case they should later prove to be valuable. However, the validity of these data is questionable as will soon be clarified.

Again, not all the tables seem to have been designed for research application. For example, tables entitled 'Weekly Earnings When Last Employed By Conjugal Condition', and 'Employment Prior to Commitment By Conjugal Condition' seem to be slanted more to questions which might be raised in the House of Commons concerning the public costs of supporting inmates' families.\(^8^5\)

In an attempt to determine the basic intent of these statistics the writer interviewed high ranking officers of the

\(^{85}\)Ibid., Tables 32 and 33, p. 134.
Service who would have been in a position to know details of the arrangements made with the Bureau to produce the statistical supplement in 1937. It is said at this time that a great deal of interest was being stimulated in North America by the gang wars and organized crime of the prohibition era in the United States. Partly because of this, the Opposition in the House of Commons began to ask questions regarding Canadian Penitentiary inmates. These questions required answers based on statistics. For the first time in 1931, inmates of penitentiaries were included in the Census and the information supplied from this source was found to be effective in assisting the Minister to satisfy his critics. On this basis the Bureau 'sold' the Penitentiary Service on processing an elaborate statistical supplement on a yearly basis which relieved the Service from the work and expense of doing this time consuming and technical work. In the opinion of these respondents some of the tables in the statistical supplement may have been devised with the idea that they could be used in research. However, their main function was to fulfill the expansive goals of the Bureau and equally to supply the Service with an accurate and continuous body of information with which to answer the questions put to the Minister. As far as can be determined this seems to be the major function of the statistical supplement today.

Reasons for Lack of Change In Annual Report Statistics

No precise content analysis of the Annual Report Statistics has been made but it is observed that generally the same
statistics are now reported about inmate characteristics and penitentiary operations as at the time of Confederation. As new departments were added in the institutions they reported their activities, partly in writing and partly by statistical tables, in the way which seems to have best demonstrated their efficiency, economies effected or productive capacity. Formerly, as at present, the administration was interested in reporting inmate characteristics such as ethnic origin, educational level, religious persuasion, type of crime and the like.

Where changes in statistical content or format did occur in the Report they seem to have coincided with changes in penitentiary leadership. Respondents in the senior administrative and operating groups were asked to comment upon this phenomenon. No respondent disagreed that the Annual Report in all its aspects, including its statistics, had been rather consistent in format and content over periods of many years. Only three out of thirty-two or 9.4% could give no reason for this or failed to answer. The majority or 71.9% gave as the reason, administrative apathy, unconcern or routine. This group mainly took the view that administrators generally 'let sleeping dogs lie' in the interests of running a smooth operation. Of the respondents 6.2% cited public apathy. The comment of one person in this group is quoted as follows;

'If people start stirring things up in the community, procedures change fast enough'.

Another 9.4% blamed the fear of ministerial reaction, on the basis that Members of Parliament became used to arguing in terms
of comparative figures and found it convenient to have the same series continue year after year. One of these respondents gave an example of a case where revisions were suggested in the inmate statistics but the office of the Minister of Justice would not allow the changes to be made, presumably because repercussions from the Opposition were feared. Another respondent in answer to this question is quoted below:

'Let me ask you a question. Have you learned in your study that the Minister signified a change was to be made? No? Then that's your answer!'

In this connection the section of the Penitentiary Act has already been cited which stipulates the Commissioner or the Minister would decide on what statistical tables to include in the report. This being the case, it would be a natural occurrence that the statistical content changed mainly when Commissioners or Ministers changed. In between these times the unvarying content of the reports seems to be an example of the ritual performance which typically occurs in bureaucracies and which has been mentioned by Merton. The penitentiary staff and the Minister seem to have been content to use the previous year's Report as the basis for the following one for fear that someone would criticize any change. When a new leader entered the scene who had other ideas and the strength to insist on variations, the pattern was changed but this pattern in its turn became routinized over the years.
The revision of the data collection system for inmate statistics, which was carried out jointly by the Dominion Bureau of Statistics and the Penitentiary Service in 1961 and 1962, has already been noted. The revised procedures came into effect on April 1, 1962. The main features of the new program were, that much more social and psychological information was to be recorded than formerly and the professional staff was now put in charge of data collection instead of the clerical staff and inmate assistants.

It was known at the time this study took place that the Dominion Bureau of Statistics had not undertaken any tabulations of these data. Officers in the Penitentiary Service were therefore asked what independent use they had so far made of the new program of inmate statistics in their work.

Administrative Use of Inmate Statistics

The general response was that these data were of very limited assistance in administration at the present time. Of the total number of respondents in the senior administrative and senior operative groups, thirty-one out of thirty-two or 96.6% signified that inmate statistics were not used at the present time. Only one in the group felt that these statistics were some minimal help at this time.

When respondents were asked about the potential assistance of these statistics, it became apparent that there was a general
lack of knowledge about the program. This is reflected in the number who could not put forward any opinions or answers. Nine or 28.1% failed to comment, mainly from lack of knowledge on which to base a judgment. A typical quote is as follows;

'I don't think it's been going long enough to be able to tell'.

However, fourteen or 43.4% judged that these statistics would be of potential help as presently designed, providing these figures could be processed and made available. A further nine or 28.1% of the respondents indicated that the program was a potential help to the Service but required some changes in content.

Reliability and Validity of Inmate Statistics

From responses to the questionnaire mailed to the professional-administrative group in charge of statistical recording, an attempt was made to assess the validity and reliability of data concerning the characteristics of inmates. Information was requested under the six conditions listed below, all of which were thought to have some effect on the quality of the data recorded. In addition, respondents were asked their considered opinion concerning the authenticity of the data.

Interviewing Conditions

Interviewing conditions may affect the accuracy of data supplied in interviews in a number of ways. If the interviewer is unable, because of the surrounding conditions, to establish
rapport with the client, it is likely that the quality of the
data will be impaired. Interviewing conditions were broken
down into considerations of space, physical surroundings,
privacy and time provided for the interview process.

On the subject of space allotments, only four or 5.5%
of respondents did not reply. Sixty-two or 86.1% felt that
space provided was satisfactory for interviewing.

It had previously come to the writer's attention that
in some penitentiaries, surroundings in which interviewing
took place were unsatisfactory. Sometimes interviews had been
conducted in vacant cells under conditions of noise and poor
light. Respondents were therefore asked to assess interviewing
surroundings. Four or 5.5% did not respond. Of the balance,
fourty-eight or 66.6% declared that surroundings were satisfactory
for interviewing.

In the matter of privacy required for adequate interview-
ing, again 5.5% made no reply. However, forty-two respondents
or 58.3% of the total group considered privacy of interviewing
conditions satisfactory.

Subsequent checks made at headquarters and observations
of the two large receiving institutions in Ontario and Quebec
confirmed that improvements had been made in arrangements
provided for interviewing. But in addition, the staff may
have become so accustomed to 'making do' with substandard
arrangements that they have adjusted to any inadequacies of
space, physical surroundings and privacy which might exist.
In the matter of time adequate for conducting interviews for statistical purposes, however, only twenty or 27.7% of respondents claimed that they had sufficient time considering the extent of their other duties. This seems to depend upon the routine of the particular institution. In the writer's observation there are some receiving penitentiaries where there is pressure to move inmates into production shops or satellite institutions and the whole classification process is shortened to achieve this end. In others, the warden has so organized the administrative arrangements that adequate time is allotted for interviews.

In summary it therefore seems, that at least with some interviewers or in some institutions there are errors introduced into the recording of statistical data which result from the above factors, especially the time required to conduct adequate interviews.

**Understanding of Purpose**

It goes almost without saying that if the staff does not understand the purpose for which statistics are collected and the reasons why the questions are asked, they will probably not do an accurate job of recording. Nine, or 12.4% of the respondents gave no answer as to whether they understood the purpose of collecting the statistics. This is a rather high percentage which may indicate that some chose not to answer rather than admit lack of knowledge. However, thirteen or 18.1% actually admitted they lacked understanding or only partially understood
the purpose for which the information is being collected.

This situation has, to some extent, been remedied in that the Dominion Bureau of Statistics has published, for penitentiary use, a Penitentiary Reporting Manual which partly describes the purposes of statistical reporting. In addition the Service has apprised the top level professional staff, in meetings and training sessions, of the tentative plans which have been made for these statistical programs. But, as will be later clarified, there is as yet no clearly defined statistical and research program. However, it may be the case that the professional leadership in institutions generally understands the purpose of these statistics but this information has not been passed down to lower levels. This leads us into the next section which deals with interview training and experience of staff.

Staff Training and Experience in Interviewing

It is generally recognized that interviewing is a skill that can improve with training and experience. The more training and practice, the more an interviewer is likely to elicit accurate answers to his questions. On this subject it was known that no training sessions had been given to the reporting staff by either the Penitentiary Service or the Dominion Bureau of Statistics. The senior professional personnel in the institutions had known in advance the question areas which were to appear on the new reporting forms. However, when the system went into effect no training was undertaken
as to the use of these forms or interpretation of items appearing on them. Prior to April 1, 1962 forms and manuals were supplied to the institutions and the system was inaugurated without further preparation. Therefore, training with respect to penitentiary statistical reporting has been a 'learn by doing process'. Furthermore, there is no editing program set up at the Dominion Bureau of Statistics or at Penitentiary headquarters whereby any mistakes on the report forms could be referred back to the institutions for corrections. In this case it is possible for mistakes in interpretation of statistical requirements to occur about which the reporting staff never learns.

Apart from the specific training in interviewing for statistical purposes, the inmate training group was asked about their general training and experience in interviewing techniques. It was found that this was a somewhat threatening experience for respondents, judging from the quality of the replies. These were not considered sufficiently valid for use in this study. Therefore, the writer obtained the same data from consultation with headquarters supervisory staff who had access to the personnel files. It is felt that this source supplied accurate information on the interviewing experience and training of professional institutional staff. It was determined that thirty-five or 48.9% had no professional training or special instruction in interviewing. On the other hand only four or 5.5% could be considered to have insufficient experience in interviewing.
It seems therefore, that in an ideal sense, there is some deficiency in interviewing skills in this group mainly because members lack formal interview training and to a lesser extent lack experience.

Verification of Data

Workers in the field of corrections recognize that inmates can be deceptive in interviews and that it takes special techniques to discover deliberate errors which this population will introduce into interview material. Inmates do this either to try for a 'better deal' in the institution, to escape discovery of information which might get them into further trouble, or for the satisfaction of confusing the staff. It is therefore especially necessary to verify the information given by inmates against other reliable sources. Twelve or 18.1% of the respondents failed to answer questions concerning verification of inmates statistics. Forty-four or 61.1% reported that either no attempt was made to verify data or that it was only done intermittently. The verification procedures seem to vary with the institution. Some have a routine system of verifying most of the significant aspects of the inmate's history but in others it is not a well developed procedure. Opinions have been expressed by some of the personnel that verification of data is undesirable and should not be done because it reemphasizes the offender's crime to the community and this might damage his chances of reestablishment. Where routine checking of information is not done however, we can
assume some lack of validity in the data.

Forms Design

It is also recognized that the design of the statistical form can affect reporting accuracy in terms of its wording, spacing and general format. Eighteen or 25.0% had no comment to make on this score. Forty-five or 62.5% of respondents were of the opinion that forms design was satisfactory for their purposes.

Opinion of Accuracy

The respondents were finally asked their subjective opinion of the accuracy of the information they were collecting. With regard to the total information collected, twenty-five or 34.8% reportedly felt the information was accurate most of the time. Thirty-seven or 51.1% were of the opinion that it was sometimes accurate and one or 1.4% felt that it was mostly inaccurate. Eight or 11.1% did not answer.

There are, however, more opportunities for biasing the personal and social data requested in interviews, especially if it is not verified. Concerning this kind of data, twenty or 27.7% of respondents considered it was accurate most of the time. Thirty-seven or 51.1% felt that it was sometimes accurate and two or 2.8% considered it mostly inaccurate. On this subject twelve or 16.0% did not answer.

Conclusion

On the subject of validity and reliability of penitentiary
statistics, Meltzer appraised the basic data used in Canadian penitentiary statistics in 1952. He found then that deficiencies existed because of the interview process, lack of verification of data, the vagueness of the definitions according to which items of information were recorded and a lack of comprehensiveness of the information reported. He attributed these deficiencies to a lack of communication between upper and lower levels of the hierarchy in the Service. The routine collection of data was done because an order existed to do it. Participants at that time were aware of the poor quality of the information, but nobody safeguarded against it and nobody could clearly give Meltzer 'the actual or possible administrative uses of official statistics'.

The author concluded that the administrators, having set up formal machinery for data collection, assumed that 'it would function adequately and automatically irrespective of the attitudes and skills of its personnel'. Fundamentally Meltzer believed that, before the situation could be rectified, it was necessary for the Penitentiary Service 'to clarify for itself and then for other parts of the Penitentiary system, its aims in compiling these statistics'.
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It seems from what has so far been said concerning inmate statistics that the same general criticisms could be made today as ten years ago. There has undoubtedly been improvement in validity because of the transfer of the recording responsibility to the Inmate Training staff, the improvement of forms and the publication of a manual of definitions. But in the light of the above responses concerning the interviewing conditions, the lack of understanding of purpose, the untrained interviewers and lack of verification of data, it cannot be assumed that validity is high. Information later in the chapter further confirms Meltzer's conclusions regarding the adverse effect of statistical policies on the acceptance of the program by operating staff.

**AMOUNT OF ADMINISTRATIVE RELIANCE ON STATISTICS AND RESEARCH**

Having investigated whether and in what ways Annual Report and Inmate Statistics were used in administration, an attempt was then made to roughly gauge the amount of reliance administrators placed on statistics and research of any kind in making their decisions. It was a possibility that a set of departmental administrative statistics existed upon which penitentiary executives relied but which were hidden from view. It has already been suggested that this was the case with respect to some departments and that some of their statistics finally became included in the Annual Report. No precise attempt was made to measure the amount to which any type of statistics
entered into administrative decisions. However, the headquarters group and the senior operating group in the field were asked in general terms the extent of their reliance on statistics and research in the conduct of their work. The information was checked against the writer's own knowledge of penitentiary operations.

It was found that only four or 5.5% of the combined group considered that they had no recourse to statistics at any time in their work, apart from special series they might prepare for annual reporting. On the other hand, no administrator admitted to a substantial reliance on statistics or research in his work. Sixty-eight or 94.4% claimed that they relied to some minimal extent on statistics and research in decision-making. However, the statistics and research which are referred to here can only be considered simple in nature. They consist of either numbers of inmates on which staff establishments and financial estimates can be based or amounts of commodities against which rates of consumption can be checked and the like. At the present time medical and agricultural operations are judged to be the ones in which the most sophisticated and continuous use of statistical data and minor studies is being made. In addition, as already noted, there have recently been a few ad hoc procedural studies into the operations of the Organization and Administrative Division, parts of which have been used to promote efficiency. If one excludes financial accounting as a statistical procedure, atypical areas with respect to the use of any statistics and research in decision-
making are the Purchasing and Financial Control departments. This circumstance seems to be related to the specialized nature of these operations and their remoteness from the inmate, who is the focus of administrative concern.

The overall conclusion is that present reliance on any statistical procedures or research studies in penitentiary operations is minimal and that in the past these techniques have been used to an even lesser extent.

Reasons for Non-Reliance on Statistics and Research

Respondents in the combined headquarters and senior operating groups were then asked the reasons why, in the past and in the present, more reliance had not been placed on statistics and research as techniques of a more scientific operation. All respondents had knowledge and opinions on this subject. Sometimes several were mentioned in combination by one person. These are discussed below in order of the frequency with which they were mentioned.

Small, Simple and Stable Operations

Fourteen out of thirty-two or 43.7% of the respondents gave as one opinion the small size and stability of operations which existed in former years. They pointed out that for many years previous to 1960 and the opening of the farm camps, the number of institutions had remained relatively static at six or seven penitentiaries. Between the completion of the British Columbia Penitentiary in 1878 and the year 1930 only one
institution, Collins Bay Penitentiary, was opened.\textsuperscript{89} Total inmates held in custody as of March 31 that year was 3,187. By 1947 the count had risen to 3,752, an increase of 17.7%. But between 1947 and 1961 two more medium security institutions had been opened and the count had risen by 79.6%. Until this 'population explosion' occurred there was a long period of relatively unchanged conditions during which the situation was fairly predictable and hence sophisticated techniques of administration were unnecessary.

Highly Personalized and Centralized Administration

Seven or 21.8\% of the respondents mentioned as an additional opinion, the fact that administrative power within their experience prior to 1960 resided almost exclusively with the Superintendent or Commissioner himself. There was relatively little delegation of authority and hence decisions became largely a matter for the person in ultimate control. The same pattern repeated itself in the institutions where the wardens formerly held more power than is the case today. Thus there was little need for any except the top level administrators to have reliance on statistical or research techniques. All the rest of the employees were working under orders and hence were not required to solve complex problems for themselves.

\textsuperscript{89} Excluded is the Alberta Penitentiary which opened in 1906 and closed in 1920.
Tight Fiscal Control and Shortage of Staff

An observation made by twelve or 37.5% of the group was that, until recently, the Service had been characterized by extreme shortage of funds and consequently shortage of staff. This effectively eliminated any opportunity for operating on a scientific basis. As will be seen from Table 1 the budget increased 659.8% from 1947 to 1963. Similarly, total staff increased in the same time period by 307.2%. This expansion as already noted, only occurred when the rehabilitation principle was accepted for penitentiaries. Before this, operations were based on expediency because of limited resources.

Custodial Philosophy

In the minds of seven or 21.8% of respondents non-reliance on statistics and research in penitentiary administration was associated with the custodial philosophy which prevailed until 1946. To quote one officer;

'In the old days we never suspected that inmates would not learn their lesson. Later we found many were coming back'.

Another is quoted as follows;

'When we started vocational training at the 'Bay' was where statistics first came into the picture'.

These comments seem to indicate that it wasn't until recidivism came to be recognized as a problem and the Service began operating in more complex ways, that sophisticated techniques of administration were needed.
No Appreciation or Understanding of Statistics or Research

Nine or 28.1% of respondents remarked that there was, until recently, no understanding of the role of statistics and research anywhere in government or the business world. Therefore, while penitentiaries did not use these administrative aids, they were not out of step with the general trend in former days. This may have been a valid comment to make at one point in time but it seems that business generally and forward looking government departments have been relying upon these techniques for many years.

Public Pressure

An additional three or 9.4% of respondents mentioned the extreme sensitivity to public pressure characteristic of penitentiary administration. This group claimed to have observed over a long period that no changes occurred in operations until the public demanded them. In between times the administration remained static. In these circumstances no logical development of operations was possible and no necessity for statistics and research procedures arose.

It is contended that all these reasons probably have a bearing on the type of administration characteristic of penitentiaries in the past and its non-reliance on statistics and research. Furthermore all seem to be inter-connected one with the other.
Main Techniques of Administrative Decision

Having generally established the amount of statistical and research information which exists and the limited scope of its use in administration, respondents were then asked what were the main techniques of arriving at decisions. The answers can be classed into three categories; two dealing with static periods of operation and one concerned with changing situations.

In static situations the major technique was what will be called here 'experience'. Under this heading respondents included such terms as 'common sense' and decision-making based on 'precedent'. Twenty-two or 68.7% of respondents mentioned that policy decisions in static periods were mainly made on the basis of experience together with personal inspection and a minimal reliance on 'basic figures'. A further nine or 28.1% of the group mentioned that decisions were based, in the past, on long experience and inspection alone. A senior official is quoted as saying;

'In the past administrative decisions were based on the personal experience of one man or a group of men. Statistics were not used to any meaningful extent'.

In dynamic situations, where a radical departure in policy occurred, the administrative technique was to imitate and adapt. One of the group is quoted on this subject as follows;

'When it comes to any changes we're the greatest imitators in the world'.

Within the Service it is known that staff training developed in this way. Basically, the Penitentiary Service staff training program was copied from the Wakefield system in England and later incorporated methods first tried out in the United States. The same process was again associated with the expansion of the industrial system in Canadian penitentiaries. The latest application of the adaptive technique in the Penitentiary Service is the observation of statistical reporting programs in the correctional systems of the north-eastern United States with a view to possible application in federal institutions.

Summary Related to Characteristics of Penitentiary Administration

The overall conclusion to this material confirms the impression that penitentiary administration of former days was not distinguished by scientific or logical development. Because the organization was not highly valued in the society, it apparently was largely ignored for long periods during which finances were scarce. However, when conditions deteriorated badly enough, there were investigations and public pressure which resulted in changes. The goals then became re-oriented but routinization occurred once again as time went on. There was apparently no built-in process of growth for the organization which was dependent on external stimulus in accomplishing any adjustments that were made. Long term observation of this pattern led eleven or 34.4% of respondents to observe that penitentiary administration in the past amounted to decisions based on expediency or emergency. A further thirteen or 40.6%
remarked that another characteristic was lack of advanced planning. Respondents rightly do not blame existence of such a pattern on past leaders. They feel that the responsibility basically resided with the public and its unconcern about penitentiary matters, which resulted in restricted budgets and consequently a routine, year by year operation.

CHANGE IN RELIANCE ON STATISTICS AND RESEARCH

To attempt to determine if there was a change occurring in administrative use of statistics and research, respondents were asked, in their opinion, if the reliance on these techniques seemed to be on the increase, staying the same, or decreasing in the recent past. No attempt was made to measure the amount of any such changes. The majority of eighteen, or 56.2% of the respondents, claimed their reliance on statistics and research remained unchanged. Thirteen or 40.6% claimed an increase and only one or 3.1% stated that his usage of these techniques was decreasing.

A difference was noted between the responses of the senior operating group and the headquarters group in this regard. All the senior operators except one reported the same minimal usage of basic figures. But more than half of the headquarters group reported an increase and these were persons largely involved in policy formulation for Inmate Training programs. This reported difference is consistent with the role of the headquarters staff in planning policy. The senior operators in the field have apparently not yet reached the stage of measuring
the results of their programs. More on this subject will be said later in connection with the present emphasis on long range planning.

Needs for Further Increase in Statistics and Research

The senior administrative and operating groups were questioned regarding the possible further need for a body of statistics and research studies for use in their own operations and in the Service as a whole. All members of the combined group could see an immediate further need for administrative guidance based on statistics and research in some aspect of penitentiary operations. The senior operating staff pointed without exception to the planning role of headquarters as the main reason for this need.

The inmate training group in the institutions responded to this question as follows. Eight or 11.1% failed to answer. Of the balance only one indicated that less reliance on statistics and research was required in the Service. Three or 4.2% were doubtful about the need but sixty or 83.3% felt an immediate increase was required.

In their own operations only four or 17.4% of the headquarters group could see no need for increased reliance on statistics and research. One person expressed doubt about any increased reliance which might be necessary in his department. These reactions, however, could be associated with the specialized nature of the operations involved. On the other hand, sixteen or 69.5% felt an immediate increase of statistics
and research data would improve their administrative efficiency, especially in the advanced planning for facilities and programs. One of this group commented:

'If we don't get more statistical information we'll continue to fly blind the way we're doing now'.

Another two or 8.6% of the headquarters group saw a need for statistical and research data in their operations but at a later date. This was associated with the recent creation of these departments which were still in the process of evolving their roles.

In contrast to the headquarters group, only three of the senior operational staff expressed a feeling that statistical data could be used at present in institutional work. Six, or double this number, indicated these needs lie in the future. Two general reasons were given for these opinions. One was that the procedures and programs effected in penitentiaries under the MacLeod regime had not had time to become stabilized. The system, to some persons, appeared to be in such a state of flux that no patterns existed which could be measured. Secondly, it was said that there was not enough Inmate Training staff to do the treatment job and the measurement of programs as well. It became quite apparent during the study that the senior executives in the field regarded the role of the professional in institutions as providing direct service to the inmates and resented the imposition of paper work on this staff. Part of this paper work is the job of statistical reporting. The feeling that professionals should be reserved as much as possible for
direct treatment purposes no doubt influences the opinions of field executive staff regarding the importance and position of statistics in institutional management.

This is a case of a duty being assigned to a work group by management which is functional or potentially functional for the organization as a whole but dysfunctional for one of its parts. While Regional Directors, Wardens, and professionals approve, in principle, the collection of statistics and see their potential worth, it seems a firm opinion of this total group that, if they do not result fairly quickly in positive benefits to the institutions, they are not worth collecting. This attitude fits with the report from the inmate training group that they do not have enough time to do a proper statistical reporting job. The statistical reporting program tends to be blamed for the fact that there is a shortage of professional people in institutions to do all the varied work now required of them. Although there seems to be some exaggeration of the situation on the part of the operating staff, the statistical program would seem to be having dysfunctional consequences for institutions to the extent that it limits professionals from performing what is regarded as their central role -- the direct treatment of inmates. There is evidence here that the formal organization is not congruent with the informal attitudes and values of lower level participants. This in turn seems to have a bearing on the acceptance of the statistical program and seemingly affects the validity of the statistics themselves. The important thing, however, is that most workers at lower and
higher levels in the hierarchy have as a firm opinion that administration of penitentiaries can either now or in the near future be benefited by a properly operated statistics and research program.

Reasons for Increased Reliance on Statistics and Research

The combined senior administrative and operating groups were then asked the reason for their opinion that an increased dependency on statistics and research exists. Their answers fell into three main categories and one minor category. Often more than one of these answers was given by one person.

The reason most often given was that the process of administration and philosophy of operations had changed. Respondents included in their concept of administrative change such elements as the delegation of authority, decentralization of operations and the acceptance of the principle of rehabilitation. Thirty-one or 96.8% of respondents gave administrative change as one answer. This opinion is consistent with the actual changes which can be observed to have taken place since 1960. Not only have new divisions of responsibility been created at headquarters but their Directors now possess real authority for formulating policy. Also a decentralization of operations into regions was started in 1963.

Another major reason, given by twenty-one or 65.6% of respondents, was that the organization had become larger, more complex and more dynamic. This is also consistent with what can be observed of the dynamics of the penitentiary organization.
Expansion in all phases of operations are proceeding at once. Budget, buildings, inmates and staff have all been expanded phenomenally since 1947 as made clear in Table 1. Nor has expansion stopped. Four new medium security institutions are scheduled to open in 1967 and, as a consequence of the recent disturbances in penitentiaries, there is talk of some specialized institutions being built for the so-called 'psychopathic' offenders.

The third major reason, given by nineteen or 59.4% of respondents, amounted to application of outside pressure, either by the public or other government departments, for increased efficiency and long range planning. In the service at this time there is a great emphasis upon efficiency of operations. This has been heightened by the activities of the Glassco Commission which was concluding its investigations when this study took place. Apart from the recommendations of the Glassco Commission, however, the Treasury Board is also demanding greater proof of efficiency and more advanced planning. Hence, building programs are now required to be forecast five years in advance and operating estimates three years ahead. In addition to this, the Service itself is requiring its staff to forecast building needs as much as ten years in advance.

A minor reason given by three or 9.3% of respondents was that more data had accumulated with which to do research. This is undoubtedly true but the same type of data has been accumulating for many years without any previous use being made of it.
The inescapable conclusion from these opinions is that penitentiary officials are feeling the impact of changing administrative goals and procedures in their work. They see statistics and research as techniques to help cope with the problems which are arising as a result of increased complexity and the need for long range planning.

Future Uses of Statistics and Research

An attempt was also made to ascertain more specifically from respondents what they hoped a statistical and research program would accomplish in terms of their own operations or the organization as a whole.

The main function of statistics and research data, in the opinion of twenty-seven or 84.4% of respondents, comes under the heading of administrative guidance. There were two cores of emphasis in this respect, sometimes both given by the same person. Fifteen or 46.9% of respondents emphasized short run assistance to administrators in the form of solutions to procedural problems. Twenty-three or 71.9% emphasized the function of long range projections of populations for planning buildings, treatment programs and the long term measurement of treatment results.

Fifteen or 46.9% saw the functions of statistics and research in the future as either increasing efficiency, saving money or avoiding error. But really this is the same principle of administrative guidance expressed in terms of penalties incurred for misjudgments.
Seven or 21.2% saw one main function of a statistics and research program as the fiscal justification of needs—that is the creation of irrefutable statistical evidence which would 'prove' to the Treasury Board the need for budgetary items.

These answers reflect the view of executives that the organization is now so large, dynamic and involved in such complex operations that more primitive methods of decision-making will no longer be precise enough to ensure accuracy. The main concern of respondents is to avoid criticism from the public by being more efficient and making correct administrative decisions. This efficiency criterion in turn is linked with financial considerations and the need to convince the Treasury Board that the budgetary requirements of the organization should be approved. The general opinion is that statistics and research will assist in the preservation and maintenance of the organization and to the extent that they do, they will be functional for the Penitentiary Service structure.

Divisional Research Priorities

Respondents were also asked where they thought the emphasis of statistics and research programs should be placed in terms of the greatest administrative need. They were requested to rank Divisions according to these priorities. It became immediately apparent that the formal organization outlined on the administrative chart was not descriptive of the real division of organizational responsibilities as the staff saw it.
For example, most respondents saw the Medical Division as essentially part of the Inmate Training Division although they are under separate direction at the present time. Others included the Industries Division as part of the Inmate Training Division as well. However, there were two main approaches to assigning statistical and research priorities as revealed by respondents in their answers. Twenty-nine or 90.6% of the group focused the needs for statistics and research on the inmate. This was based on the premise that penitentiaries existed for the purpose of caring for inmates and without knowledge of them the organization could not fulfil its purpose. Three or 9.4% of the respondents took the view that while caring for inmates was the primary purpose of penitentiaries, this could not be accomplished without first researching staff and organizational matters.

The ranking of statistical and research priorities by Division varied between respondents. However, the following breakdown of results indicates the majority of opinions in roughly descending order of priorities assigned. Twenty-nine or 90.6% of respondents ranked the needs of the Inmate training Division first. Two or 6.2% of the respondents took the view that statistics and research were only needed in this Division and nowhere else. One of these officers expressed the idea as follows;

'If I were asked to set priorities for statistics in the Divisions I would ignore all of them except Inmate Training and I'll tell you why. I could find analogous situations fifty times over for the operations of all the rest, which I could copy. But nowhere can you find any information on how to correct inmates'.
Twenty-seven or 84.4% of the group ranked the Medical Division third or higher; eighteen or 56.2% of respondents ranked the needs of the Organization and Administration Division third or higher; twenty-four or 75.0% ranked the Industrial Division third or lower and twenty-five or 78.1% of the group ranked the needs of the Finance and Services Division third or lower.

It seems from these expressions of opinion that all respondents, at least on the surface, are committed to the organizational goal of rehabilitation for inmates in penitentiaries. The majority opinion is that this goal takes much more information than exists at the present time if dangerous mistakes in planning and procedures are to be avoided. Therefore, statistics and research priorities should be focused on the characteristics of inmates and the effectiveness of various methods of treating them. No matter what priorities are set by respondents, all felt that organizational efficiency would be improved with more statistics and research information no matter where it was applied. Again there is a strong indication from these findings that increased use of statistics and research are seen as functional for the maintenance of the Service.

ADMINISTRATIVE RELATIONSHIPS IN STATISTICS AND RESEARCH

As a final aspect of this study, respondents in the headquarters and senior operating groups were questioned on their views as to the administrative machinery which would best provide the statistics and research information which all agreed were necessary.
It was, of course, known to all respondents that there existed in the Penitentiary Service a Correctional Research Division which was technically responsible for statistics and research. It has only been recently created, however, and could not be said to have come to grips with its responsibilities. This is partly due to the fact that there are, so far, only three positions established in the Division; a Director, a Statistician and a Secretary. Only the Director's position was filled at the time the interviews took place. The Statistician's position was frozen by the so-called austerity program and the Secretary's position was vacant. Respondents were also reminded of the fact that the Dominion Bureau of Statistics had been involved regularly since 1937 in producing tables of inmate statistics for the Annual Report and had assisted in the reformulation of the penitentiary statistical system in 1961 and 1962. It was further pointed out that universities had an increasing interest in corrections and conceivably had some prospective role to play in the future program of penitentiary statistics and research.

Members of the headquarters and senior operational groups were asked to comment upon the appropriate roles which these agencies, in combination or separately, should play in operating a penitentiary statistical and research program. Only three officers or 9.4% of the total group did not respond to this question. Of the remainder, twenty-eight or 87.5% showed either some doubt as to the latest developments with respect to the statistics and research program or a lack of understanding of the issues involved. In spite of this, there were certain
fairly clear cut opinions which arose from questioning on this subject which are discussed under the headings below.

Role of the Universities

There seemed to be either a lack of appreciation of the role of universities in penitentiary statistics and research or a definite set against academicians as not being practical enough to undertake penitentiary research. Respondents who expressed themselves definitely on this subject seemed to feel that university researchers were too 'theoretical' in their approach to problems confronting the penitentiary administrator and probably would be a long time learning the practical issues involved. This seems in line with the conclusions of Reckless who, while seeing the desirability of working relationships between academia and corrections, states that some university professors generally remain remote from the day to day work of the correctional administrator and have no real understanding of his problems. However, seven or 21.9% of the respondents saw that universities could be involved in special studies assigned, paid for and guided by the Penitentiary Service. Only one said that university personnel should be used in a consulting role and one other respondent saw the universities having a major role in the analysis of penitentiary statistics.

---

Role of the Dominion Bureau of Statistics

When the Dominion Bureau of Statistics was discussed, some reticence was evident on the part of respondents. It seemed as if the good taste of interviewees tended to restrain whatever comments they made concerning this organization because they knew that the writer was a Bureau employee. If any bias exists in the answers given, it is therefore in a conservative direction. Nevertheless, because of precautions taken in interviewing, it is felt that the information below is based on a true expression of opinion. Questioning did reveal, however, that respondents had little understanding of the role of the Dominion Bureau of Statistics as a statistical service organization in government. Furthermore there was little accurate knowledge of its capacities for processing statistical data.

The Dominion Bureau of Statistics can be called a bureaucracy, a main goal of which is to expand its operations by providing services to other government organizations. Its services do not normally include analysis or interpretation of data in any depth. This can be concluded from reading most of the Bureau's publications, which consist generally of a wealth of statistical tables but very limited interpretation of these figures. As far as is known, this organization does not now, nor is there an intention in the future, to undertake the research needs of any other government department. Such a practice would seem to be inconsistent with its organizational
goals.

Furthermore, in the area of corrections statistics, the Bureau probably cannot, with its present staff, enter into the more complex analysis of data which the Penitentiary Service now requires. It is the Judicial Section of the Bureau which has sole responsibility for national statistics of crime and corrections. Table III describes the qualifications and duties of the professional and technical staff in the Judicial Section at the present time. It will be seen that there is no single staff member who has training and background in both statistics and corrections who would be able to undertake detailed analysis of penitentiary statistics for research purposes.

Nor would the expanding operations of the Judicial Section allow this. There are, at the present time, nine annual series of statistics published by the Section plus special studies and additional continuous series being planned. In the writer's observation, these total responsibilities have already overloaded the capacity of the staff which total only twenty-seven in all professional technical and clerical positions. Coding staff has an especially heavy work load such that publication dates of some series have recently been more than one year overdue.\(^1\)

---

\(^1\)For example, the publication 'Statistics of Criminal and Other Offences -- 1961' was not published until September, 1963. *Statistics of Criminal and Other Offences -- 1961, (Dominion Bureau of Statistics, Ottawa, 1963).*
TABLE III
Position Descriptions of the Judicial Section Showing Academic Background, Work Orientation and Major Responsibilities of Present Incumbents*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Position</th>
<th>Incumbent’s Academic Education**</th>
<th>Incumbent’s Academic Orientation</th>
<th>Incumbent’s Major Work Experience</th>
<th>Major Responsibility of the Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chief, Judicial Section</td>
<td>University Post Graduate Sociology</td>
<td>Administration, Judicial Statistics</td>
<td>Overall administration and policy formulation, Judicial Section</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Analyst</td>
<td>University Post Graduate Economics</td>
<td>Analysis of economic and demographic statistics</td>
<td>Supervision of analysis in all series and participation in some series of judicial statistics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statistician</td>
<td>University Post Graduate Criminology</td>
<td>Correctional administration and rehabilitation of offenders</td>
<td>Participation in analysis of all series of judicial statistics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Officer 6</td>
<td>High School General</td>
<td>Police records and identification systems</td>
<td>Direction of field liaison in all series of statistics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime Statistics</td>
<td>University Mathematics</td>
<td>Direction of statistical processing and office management</td>
<td>Direction of statistical processing and office management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Officer 5</td>
<td>High School General</td>
<td>Police personnel and administrative duties</td>
<td>Editing and control of court statistics and some liaison -- English</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Editing and control of police statistics and some liaison -- English</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Officer 5</td>
<td>High School General</td>
<td>Police detachment and administrative duties</td>
<td>Editing and control of police statistics -- English</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court Statistics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Editing and control of murder and police statistics -- English</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Officer 3</td>
<td>High School General</td>
<td>Police detachment duties</td>
<td>Editing and control of police court and training school statistics and some liaison -- French</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Statistics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Editing and control of training school statistics and some liaison -- English</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Officer 3</td>
<td>High School General</td>
<td>Statistical coding and processing</td>
<td>Editing and control of training school statistics and some liaison -- English</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court Statistics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Officer 3</td>
<td>High School General</td>
<td>Machinist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Excludes five Technical Officer positions unfilled as of September 1, 1963 and all stenographic and clerical positions.

** May be complete or partial.
There was also a rather unrealistic idea among penitentiary officials of the potential of the Dominion Bureau of Statistics for data processing. To quote one officer on this subject;

'We shouldn't have to bother with processing the stuff--D.B.S. could give us the answers in the flick of an eye lid'.

But the fact is that data processing services of the Bureau are in maximum use. The programming for regularly scheduled work is ideally planned a year ahead. Only occasional special tabulations, if not too time consuming or frequent, may be produced in two or three weeks, depending upon other priorities.

All this confirms that the Dominion Bureau of Statistics is best able to produce continuous statistical series on an annual basis. Its administrative organization and processing facilities are probably not flexible enough to efficiently undertake the statistical analysis necessary for research into the numerous and complex procedural problems presented by a growing correctional agency such as the Penitentiary Service.

It seems, therefore, that the capacity and flexibility of the Dominion Bureau of Statistics for coding and processing of data have been exaggerated in the minds of respondents when the requirements of a well developed penitentiary statistical and research program are considered. Nevertheless twenty-four or 75% of respondents saw the Dominion Bureau of Statistics in the role of processors of penitentiary statistics. Three or 9.4% felt that the Dominion Bureau of Statistics should also be relied upon as consultants in statistics and research matters
and three, or 9.4% considered that this organization should also analyze and interpret the data.

With respect to assigning consultative and analysis roles to the Dominion Bureau of Statistics, apparently the cost of obtaining specialized staff and machinery to do this work within the Penitentiary Service was a factor in determining the opinions of some respondents. There seemed to be a feeling on the part of some, that Treasury Board would never accept the extra costs involved in duplicating services for penitentiaries which are available to them from another department. Along these lines one of this group is quoted as follows;

'In order not to duplicate the work of another department it is desirable to take the best they can offer us in help. We have to do this if the staff problem is beyond our capacity-and we have to think of the Treasury Board'.

There was also avoidance of the idea that data processing facilities should be duplicated. This was a reflection of the influence of the Glassco Commission Reports which have as a major theme the centralization of government service facilities in the interests of economy.

Role of the Correctional Research Division

Consistent with the above results, only four or 12.2% of the respondents could see the Penitentiary Service processing its own data at this time. However, twenty-eight or 87.5% felt that the Correctional Research Division should formulate its own research programs and give instructions to other organizations to process the data. Twenty-five or 78.1% felt that the
processed data should then be returned to the Correctional Research Division for analysis. A frequently heard comment was:

'Penitentiary people should do their own interpretation—they're the only ones that know what's involved. If you haven't the knowledge of penitentiary work your conclusions can be way out'.

All admitted that this role for the Correctional Research Division would require an expansion of its staff establishment.

One general conclusion reached is that penitentiary statistics and research is important enough to be managed by the Service itself and that the leadership should come from the Commissioner through the Correctional Research Division.

There seemed to be a fear that delegation of too much responsibility for the program to other agencies would result either in the job not getting done because of divided jurisdiction or not getting done properly because of misinterpretation of data.

Apparantly the majority were prepared to see the mechanical aspects of the work done by outside agencies, but not the basic essentials of problem description and the statistical interpretation. Throughout this area of the study it became apparent that most staff were bewildered by the fact that the Correctional Research Division had neither taken a strong leadership role in matters of penitentiary statistics and research nor concretely defined the purpose of the program.

In these discussions about the formal administrative arrangements which would be appropriate to the program, a number of informal opinions were expressed which help to explain the recommended division of responsibilities. One commonly
expressed feeling was that the present inmate statistical system is considered by Service personnel to be a Dominion Bureau of Statistics system, for Bureau purposes and hence not a matter of major concern to the Penitentiary Service. This is contrary to the facts since the system is intended to produce data useful to the Service and the participation of the Dominion Bureau of Statistics in providing consultative assistance was at the request of the Commissioner. But seemingly the involvement of another agency changes the feeling of Service staff towards acceptance of the program.

Another associated reaction has already been mentioned in another connection. There is the feeling in institutions that since the penitentiaries are supplying staff to record the data but getting nothing concrete in return, the program should be discontinued. Some respondents indicated that, if institutions receive some useful information from the program, objections about use of staff for statistical purposes would disappear. One assumes that if the Correctional Research Division is able to serve the needs of the institutions for data which is useful to wardens in administration, the stock of the Division and the statistical and research program will rise.

Elements of organizational pride, mixed with a desire that the Service manage its own affairs, was conveyed by some other respondents. For instance, one officer was surprised to learn that the Dominion Bureau of Statistics was not paid for processing penitentiary statistics. He is quoted as follows;

'I wasn't aware of that. Any work done for us by D.B.S.,
the universities or elsewhere should be paid for out of our vote'.

The inference here was plain that, not only should the Service pay its own way but should control its own destiny by doing so.

This is further evidence that the same lack of concern for the statistics and research program noted by Meltzer in 1952 exists today in institutions and for the same reasons.

No clearly delineated policy regarding the purpose of the program has been formulated at headquarters and the institutional staffs who are required to record data are receiving no concrete returns for their efforts. Therefore the program is undervalued by lower level participants. The involvement of the Dominion Bureau of Statistics as a leader in policy determination apparently further dilutes interest in the program. Ironically this situation prevails at the time when the principle of reliance on statistics and research in penitentiary administration is being accepted at upper and middle levels in the hierarchy. The conclusion is that, while the principle is considered legitimate, the lack of strong control of the program by the Penitentiary Service and the kind of administrative arrangements now governing its operation are not congruent with the informal values of the penitentiary staff on this subject. A final quotation from another respondent seems to sum up the general feeling;

'I feel strongly that any department with our responsibilities should have its own Research Division well staffed. The Penitentiary Service should lead the research program and other services could be brought
in to support our efforts. Otherwise it would be the same thing as asking the Department of National Health and Welfare to assume total responsibility for the health needs of the inmates'.
CHAPTER IV
SUMMARY AND IMPLICATIONS FROM ANALYSIS

With minor changes the hypotheses postulated in this paper tend to be confirmed by the data presented. The contention that correctional agencies may be profitably studied as bureaucracies, using the structural-functional method, has been demonstrated by the foregoing analysis. As we have seen, many of the concepts appearing in the theory of complex organizations, such as the displacement and succession of goals, informal influences on formal organization and the effects of central and marginal goals on bureaucratic structure are applicable to this subject matter. The literature does not reveal that researchers have analyzed the administration of correctional agencies extensively in terms of bureaucratic theory. But the evidence of this study confirms that these organizations do not differ essentially from other bureaucracies and that study of these structures in terms of one or more of their sub-structures could become a major technique of correctional research.

Concerning the more specific findings of the study, it is next concluded that the statistics in the Commissioner of Penitentiaries Annual Report, including its supplement respecting characteristics of the inmate population, have been functional for the penitentiary structure. It is clear that they have assisted the Service to justify its operations to the Minister and the Minister to justify his policies to parliamentary
opponents. Special unpublished series of statistics, kept on a continuous basis or produced ad hoc for answering questions in the House of Commons, have had the same function. The effectiveness of the Annual Report in producing a favourable image for the Service with the general public, however, has probably not been great. One reason for concluding this, is its limited circulation. Only 3,484 copies were distributed for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1962.

There has never been a substantial reliance on statistics in penitentiary administration even though use of this technique in decision-making is slightly on the increase. But, to the extent that there appears to have always been some minimal use of statistics in administration, the second hypothesis is not entirely consistent with the facts. Use of these 'basic figures' to reach decisions are assumed to have made the administrative process somewhat more efficient and hence would have been effective in maintaining the bureaucratic structure.

A few administrative procedural studies and attempts at program measurement have been made since 1947. These have had direct application to problems encountered by executive staff at headquarters and to a lesser extent in institutions. No attempt has been made to measure the quality of these studies but insofar as the results were accurate, it is judged they were functional for the departments concerned and hence the system. There is no doubt that some of the results have been applied by administrators to their work.
On the other hand, studies done by professionals outside the Service have been largely non-functional since there is little evidence that they were applied to problems in the Service. The same conclusion can be made with respect to studies done for their own academic improvement by professionals employed in the Service, except that there seems recently to be an increasing tendency to apply these to penitentiary problem areas.

It is contended that the Penitentiary Service, because of its role in caring for society's rejected persons, enjoyed a poor public image in the past. Hence its goals had a marginal value with the outside environment which in turn resulted in long periods of neglect. When major changes occurred they were the result of public pressure sometimes involving an official enquiry. This pattern was borne out in the review of the history of the Service. Furthermore, long service executive personnel have attested to the same dynamics of penitentiary development. Therefore, the functions of Royal Commissions and similar investigations for the preservation, expansion and recent succession in goals of the penitentiary structure cannot be denied. In fact these official enquiries have been the major means for effecting organizational change in the Penitentiary Service.

The penitentiary bureaucracy is now expanding in size and complexity of its operations, which is partly a result of the re-orientation in its goals. Whereas, in the past, punishment and industrial employment of inmates were the main organizational goals, these have been succeeded by the
rehabilitation of inmates which is now the primary focus of penitentiary operations. This philosophical change makes at once for a more involved administrative situation and generates additional problems which require solution.

The fact that there is now more money being voted for rehabilitation of inmates in penitentiaries indicates that the legitimacy of the Service in the public eye has improved. The bureaucratic participants are aware of a need to maintain this presently improving position by demonstrating that organizational goals are not only being achieved but being achieved in an efficient manner. The executive and professional staff believe that a statistics and research program, applied to their administrative problems, will be an effective tool for maintaining the legitimacy of the organization and ensuring its continued public support.

The present leadership has also concluded that administration, logically based on results of statistics and research, is central to the maintenance and future development of the organization. This is evidenced by statements in the Report of the Correctional Planning Committee which is the master plan for administration of the Service at this time. Concrete implementation of the program is apparent in the establishment of a Correctional Research Division within the administrative structure and the potentially useful body of inmate statistics which has been built up since 1962. Yet no research use has been made of these data, no crystallized policy for the statistics and research program has been evolved.
and there is confusion among lower level participants as to the true role of the Correctional Research Division. In this regard a dilemma is created by the contradictory expectations of the Penitentiary Service and the Dominion Bureau of Statistics about their respective roles in penitentiary statistics and research.

On the one hand the Penitentiary Service is faced with a shortage of expert staff in its Correctional Research Division. The Treasury Board accepted the principle that there should be a research operation within the Service at the time when the positions of Correctional Research Director and Statistician were authorized. But this amount of staff could not possibly accomplish the multitude of studies which would be required if the statistics and research program are to be maximally functional for the penitentiary structure. Therefore, in order to implement a correctional statistics and research program, it must attempt to obtain what outside help is available and the Dominion Bureau of Statistics has supplied some valuable assistance. But penitentiary leaders apparently expect the Bureau to assume major responsibility for the policies, development and implementation of this program. This is illustrated by the quotation from the Commissioner of Penitentiaries Annual Report for the fiscal year ending March, 1962, which follows;

'The Judicial Section of the Dominion Bureau of Statistics has again served us well in furnishing accurate statistical information in relation to our operations. We await with interest their proposed changes in methods of acquiring, tabulating and reporting correctional
statistics. Such changes we are confident will enable us to improve our service'. 92

As previously shown, the necessity for Penitentiary leadership to rely upon outsiders for development of these services is not congruent with the informal values held by executive and professional participants in the system. The latter favour leadership and control of this program from within the Service.

On the other hand the primary reason for the existence of the Dominion Bureau of Statistics is to supply statistical services and information to the public and other organizations. In providing these services to the penitentiary system the Bureau has assumed a measure of informal control over the penitentiary statistics and research program. It has been producing the statistical supplement to the Annual Report for many years and played a major role in the revision of the penitentiary statistical program in 1961 and 1962. But as we have seen, the Judicial Section is restricted as to staff which can be assigned to the penitentiary program. Data processing facilities at the Bureau are similarly limited in their availability for production of special tabulations for penitentiary research.

What has not been explained regarding the present division of responsibility between these organizations, is how the research program of the operating department will remain flexible and efficient enough to serve organizational goals

when leadership and data processing are the responsibility of the outside agency. If the Dominion Bureau of Statistics is to be responsible for policy formulation and statistical processing, will its own organizational needs override those of the Service? It is contended here that the Dominion Bureau of Statistics, in supplying the statistical requirements of the Penitentiary Service or any other organization, will be primarily governed by its own capabilities in terms of staff and machinery at any one point in time. If these resources are inadequate to cope with its total responsibilities, the service to outside departments will be impaired and consequently their operations may suffer. In assisting with the implementation of a research program within an operating department, if the statistical requirements seem likely to overload the Bureau's capacity to code and process data, it is probable that staff would advocate a revision of that program more in line with their immediate capacities. Such conflicts of interest are likely to result in compromises which are dysfunctional for the operating organization in reaching research objectives. These considerations speak against delegation of major responsibility for the penitentiary statistics and research program to any one or a combination of outside agencies.

Regarding the administrative design which would be maximally effective in implementing the penitentiary statistics and research program, it seems that the informal value system of the staff requires that leadership be firmly undertaken by the Service. This partly involves the clear definition of
objectives and procedures of the program and demonstration that it can benefit the organization as a whole. Only in these ways will the program be accepted as a legitimate operation within the penitentiary organization.

Considering the specialized nature of penitentiary operations, the interpretation of statistical data and some special studies would almost certainly have to be undertaken by penitentiary staff who can be employed for their skills in analysis and experience in corrections. The Dominion Bureau of Statistics shows no inclination or ability to supply this kind of service on a large scale and, in fact, direct involvement in penitentiary research would seem inconsistent with its own goals. Some research projects, however, could be assigned to university departments which would require payment out of the penitentiary budget.

Data processing is an operation which could continue to be supplied by an outside agency such as the Dominion Bureau of Statistics unless the efficiency of the penitentiary statistics and research program is impaired by delays in production of these data. In that event mechanical tabulation services should be supplied by the combined resources of several data processing agencies or be undertaken by the Service itself.

It seems that, in order to assume the necessary control of the program, the Penitentiary Service must eventually make a substantial investment in terms of staff and possibly machinery. There seems to be no way to develop a statistics and research program which will be maximally functional for the
structure and at the same time avoid the expenses involved.

In final summary the information gathered in this study suggests that, in terms of the changing and more complex goals of the penitentiary bureaucracy, a well developed statistics and research program would be immediately functional for the organizational structure. Such a program, to be optimally effective, must be closely identified with the Penitentiary Service. It seems that there is no functional equivalent for such a program since only this kind of development will produce the precise sort of measurements which are required by the Service to guide its increasingly complex operations. The alternative is to continue to rely on the best judgment of experienced personnel which is recognized to be inadequate because it does not always fit the changing circumstances of present penitentiary operations. To the extent that such a program does not develop, it is postulated that dysfunctional consequences will ensue. It seems probable in those circumstances that the primary goal of the Penitentiary Service will become subverted, the hoped for rehabilitation of inmates will fail to be achieved and the legitimacy of the organization in the public estimation will consequently diminish.
APPENDIX
Introduction

The purpose of these questions is to try to determine the relationship of Canadian Penitentiary statistics and research to the administration of the Service. The answers will be used in the preparation of an unpublished student thesis.

No reference will be made to any respondent's personal opinions and all information will remain entirely confidential.

Question Areas

(a) Are you familiar with the Penitentiary statistical and research program in some of its aspects over the past years?

(b) What work,

(i) have you had to do with statistics and research in the past?

(ii) in the present?

(c) Has your work with statistics and research increased or decreased over time?

(d) What do you think is the reason for this?

(e) What purpose (did ) statistics and research serve in your own area of (do ) (will) responsibility. (e.g. - for making policy decisions, guiding operations of programs etc.).

(i) in the past?

(ii) in the present?

(iii) in the future?

How were policy decisions made in the past in your department?
(f) What purpose (did ) statistics serve in the operation of the Service 
    (do )  
    (will) 
    as a whole,  
    
    (i) in the past?  
    (ii) in the present?  
    (iii) in the future? 

    How were policy decisions made in the past in the Service as a whole?

(g) Which Divisions need statistical and research information the most?

(h) If penitentiary statistics and research were abolished would it make any difference,  
    
    (i) to your own administration?
    (ii) to the administration of the Service? 

(i) Were any specific studies ever done concerning characteristics of in­
   mates, administrative procedures or types of training administered to
   inmates?

(j) When were these done?

(k) Which were on a continuing basis and which were ad hoc studies?

(l) What use were made of these?

(m) What was the purpose behind the publication of the statistics in the
    Commissioner's Annual Report?

(n) Why was the traditional pattern adopted?

(o) Why did the pattern remain unchanged so long?

(p) What caused the pattern to be changed in 1962?  

(q) What do you think of the present statistical system as potentially
    assisting 
    
    (i) your own work?  
    (ii) penitentiary administration generally? 

(r) What do you see as the respective roles of the Penitentiary Service,  
    the universities and the Dominion Bureau of Statistics in this program
    now and in the future? 

(s) Any additional comments?
Dear Sir or Madam,

A graduate student is completing a research thesis for the obtention of a Master's degree in criminology, which deals with Penitentiary procedures.

The Commissioner has asked everyone to cooperate with him in this undertaking, and he now has an office in the Justice Building, so that he may work closer to his sources of information.

Although it is realized that the word "questionnaire" may produce an initial negative reaction, we would nevertheless ask you to cooperate in this undertaking, that will give our Service some idea of the usefulness of certain statistical procedures.

You are asked to be quite frank in your opinions even if you feel that they may not agree with our own thoughts on the matter.

As the time element is important, would you make a special effort to return them to me, c/o Room , Justice Building, before June 25th.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Jean Garneau, Ph.D.,
Acting Director (IT).

JG:LS
RESEARCH QUESTIONNAIRE

INSTRUCTIONS

1. Please answer all questions which apply to you.
2. Answer the questions frankly and completely but objectively.
3. Do not confer with others on the answers, - make them completely your own.
4. Complete all answers which do not require verbal answers with an "X".
5. Please return completed questionnaires by June 25, 1963.

---

1. Do you know of any studies or research which have taken place in your own or another federal correctional institution?

Yes_____ No_____

2. If the above answer is 'Yes' please complete the following information.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Study</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Name of Sponsor</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Year of Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(University Dept., Pen. Service, Student, etc.)</td>
<td>(Study of; Inmates, Training, Administrative Procedures, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. 

2. 

3. 

4. 

...2
3. Which of the above were:

   Continued from year to year  enter numbers

   One time studies  enter numbers

4. With respect to the present statistical documents which you help to complete for each inmate, please give answers to the following questions:

   (a) In your opinion are the interviewing conditions adequate with respect to;

      (i) Space  Yes____  No____

      (ii) Surroundings  Yes____  No____

      (iii) Privacy  Yes____  No____

      (iv) Length of time available  Yes____  No____

   (b) If the answer to any of the above is 'No' in what way are the interviewing conditions unsatisfactory?

   ________________________________________________________________

   ________________________________________________________________

   ________________________________________________________________

   ________________________________________________________________

   (c) What are the titles of the officers who conduct the interviews regarding the:

      ADMISSION FORM  

      ______________________________________________________________

      ______________________________________________________________

      ______________________________________________________________

      ______________________________________________________________

      CLASSIFICATION QUESTIONNAIRE

      ______________________________________________________________

      ______________________________________________________________

      ______________________________________________________________

      ______________________________________________________________

      RELEASE FORM

      ______________________________________________________________

      ______________________________________________________________

      ______________________________________________________________

      ______________________________________________________________

      ______________________________________________________________

      ______________________________________________________________
(d) Do the same officers conduct these interviews with the inmates at all times or are interviews conducted by different officers from time to time?

**ADMISSION FORM**

Same Officers_____ Different Officers_____

**CLASSIFICATION QUESTIONNAIRE**

Same Officers_____ Different Officers_____

**RELEASE FORM**

Same Officers_____ Different Officers_____

(e) When interviewing do you follow the sequence of questions on the forms each time or follow a different sequence from time to time?

Same Sequence_____ Different Sequence_____

(f) Do you understand the purpose of collecting all the information on the,

Admission Form______ Yes_____ No_____  
Classification Questionnaire______ Yes_____ No_____  
Release Form______ Yes_____ No_____  

(g) Have you received formal training concerning the method of completing forms apart from instructions in the Penitentiary Reporting Manual?

Yes_____ No_____  

(h) With respect to interviews you conduct to complete the Classification Questionnaire and Release Form, do you consider yourself,

Professionally Trained in Interviewing______ Yes_____ No_____  
Experienced in Interviewing______ Yes_____ No_____  

(i) In your opinion is the information entered on the forms,

1. Accurate most of the time

2. Sometimes accurate and sometimes not

3. Mostly inaccurate
(j) If the answer to (g) is 2 or 3 state the reasons for your opinion

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

(k) In your opinion is the information entered on the forms concerning the personal and social background of inmates,

1. Accurate most of the time

2. Sometimes accurate and sometimes not

3. Mostly inaccurate

(l) If the above answer is 2 or 3 state the reasons for your opinion

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

(m) Is there any independent check made with outside sources to verify information given by inmates on the,

Admission Form

Classification Questionnaire

(n) Does the information received from sources other than the inmate himself assist in completing the forms?

Yes_____ No_____

(o) Is the design of the forms satisfactory as to space allowed for answers, positioning of items, congruence with interviewing procedure, etc.

Yes_____ No_____

(p) If the above answer is 'No' give reasons for your opinion:

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

(q) In terms of your total responsibilities do you have sufficient time for statistical recording?

Yes_____ No_____
(r) In your opinion do statistics and research assist in the operations of penitentiaries?

Yes _____ No _____

(s) If the answer above is 'Yes' or 'No' give the reasons for your opinion:

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

(t) Please add below any extra remarks you may wish to make about the Penitentiary statistical system:

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

Signature ___________________________ Rank or Position ___________________________
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ALIASES</th>
<th>NAME OF INMATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Last</td>
<td>First Middle</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE WAIVER SIGNED</th>
<th>DATE ADMITTED</th>
<th>SENTENCE COMMENCED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Day Month Year</td>
<td>Day Month Year</td>
<td>Day Month Year</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| OFFENCES STATUTE SENTENCE CONSECUTIVE WHERE SENTENCE CONCURRENT |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|
| Day Month Year Day Month Year Day Month Year Day Month Year     |                                                              |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGGREGATE SENTENCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NAME OF MAGISTRATE OR JUDGE TYPE OF COURT PROBABLE DATE OF DISCHARGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DATE OF BIRTH PLACE OF BIRTH RELIGION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day Month Year Day Month Year</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEX</th>
<th>SINGLE</th>
<th>MARRIED</th>
<th>COMMON LAW</th>
<th>WIDOWED</th>
<th>SEPARATED</th>
<th>DIVORCED</th>
<th>No. OF CHILDREN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>APPARENT MAJOR MEDICAL AILMENT PENSION (Type) REGIMENTAL No. UNIT AND SERVICE ON DISCHARGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Heart ailment Diabetes Epilepsy Other (specify)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LAST PENITENTIARY AND No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Penitentiary</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sentenced as:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HEIGHT WEIGHT BUILD COMPLEXION COLOUR OF HAIR COLOUR OF EYES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ft. in. lbs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROMINENT MARKS, SCARS, TATTOOS AND DISABILITIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACCOMPlices</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Sentence</th>
<th>Institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>COMPIlNG OFFICER</th>
<th>TITLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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**PENITENTIARY TRANSFER FORM**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>Last; First; Middle.</th>
<th>F.P.S. No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DISCHARGING INSTITUTION</td>
<td>AREA No.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEPARTURE DATE</td>
<td>Compiling Officer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECEIVING INSTITUTION</td>
<td>AREA No.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARRIVAL DATE</td>
<td>Compiling Officer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FOR DISTRIBUTION SEE REVERSE SIDE
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## PENITENTIARY
### CLASSIFICATION QUESTIONNAIRE

**CONFIDENTIAL**

**DISTRIBUTION**

**RESTRICTED**

**AS APPROVED BY**

**DIVISIONAL DIRECTOR**

**DISTRIBUTION:**
- Copy 1 – Inmate’s institutional file
- Copy 2 – Judicial Section, D.B.S.
- Copy 3 – Penitentiary Headquarters

**SOURCE OF INFORMATION**

**CRIMINAL HISTORY**

**Present Conviction**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place of occurrence</th>
<th>First conviction</th>
<th>Offence committed with others</th>
<th>Offence committed alone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>city or town</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N.V.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Previous Convictions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Juvenile probation</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>N.V.</th>
<th>Adult probation</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>N.V.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Times</td>
<td>N.V.</td>
<td>Gaol or reformatory</td>
<td>Times</td>
<td>N.V.</td>
<td>Penitentiary</td>
<td>Times</td>
<td>N.V.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juvenile institution</td>
<td>Times</td>
<td>Parole violations</td>
<td>Times</td>
<td>Escapes</td>
<td>Times</td>
<td>N.V.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Drugs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>User</th>
<th>Addict</th>
<th>Not indicated</th>
<th>Duration of addiction or use yrs.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Drugs used</th>
<th>Prin.</th>
<th>Sec.</th>
<th>Other opium compounds</th>
<th>Prin.</th>
<th>Sec.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Heroin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbiturates and compounds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tranquilizers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marijuana</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other (specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Means of supporting drug habit:**

---
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### PSYCHOLOGICAL TEST RESULTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Invalid</th>
<th>No Testing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M.M.P.I. Profile</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other Tests (specify)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PERSONAL HISTORY

**Education**
- Education test grades
- Mathematics
- Other (specify)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English</th>
<th>Mathematics</th>
<th>Other (specify)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Age on leaving school**
- Yes
- Grade completed
- Young adults

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age on leaving school</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>N.V.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Where obtained**
- Province or country

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Where obtained</th>
<th>Province or country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Disciplinary record**
- Yes
- No
- N.V.

**Occupation**
- Occupation
- Industry

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Industry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Employed at time of offence**
- Yes
- No
- N.V.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employed at time of offence</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>N.V.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Employment pattern (two years)**
- Employed
- Unemployed
- Incarcerated
- Financial assistance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment pattern (two years)</th>
<th>Employed</th>
<th>Unemployed</th>
<th>Incarcerated</th>
<th>Financial assistance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Origin**
- Ethnic origin
- Country of birth
- Year of arrival in Canada
- Language spoken

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Origin</th>
<th>Father</th>
<th>Mother</th>
<th>Inmate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Languages spoken**
- in the home
- by inmate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Languages spoken</th>
<th>in the home</th>
<th>by inmate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Marital Data**
- Marital status
- Total
- No. of Children
- No. of Dependents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital status</th>
<th>Single</th>
<th>Married</th>
<th>Common-law</th>
<th>Widowed</th>
<th>Separated</th>
<th>Divorced</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of Children</th>
<th>No. of Dependents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Medical Condition**
- Is the inmate fit for:
  - full duty
  - light duty
  - no duty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Medical Condition</th>
<th>full duty</th>
<th>light duty</th>
<th>no duty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nature of physical or mental disability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In this disability:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>permanent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**FAMILY BACKGROUND**

Did the subject grow up with his parents?  
- Yes [ ]  
- No [ ]

If 'No', at what age did separation occur: From father ___ yrs; From mother ___ yrs.

Reason for separation ____________________________________________

Type of family substitution ________________________________________

If foster placement, how often ______ times.

Did his family have any health or welfare assistance?  
- Yes [ ]  
- No [ ]

Was this assistance  
- temporary [ ]
- intermittent [ ]
- long term [ ]

**Relationships**

- Discipline by father  
  - Firm but kindly [ ]
  - Lax [ ]
  - Overstrict [ ]

- Discipline by mother  
  - Suitable [ ]
  - Fair [ ]
  - Unsuitable [ ]

- Supervision by mother  
  - Warm, overprotective [ ]
  - Indifferent or hostile [ ]

- Affection of father [ ]

- Affection of mother [ ]

**TRAINING RECOMMENDED**

- ACADEMIC ____________________________
- VOCATIONAL ____________________________
- SPECIAL THERAPY ____________________________
- SECURITY ____________________________

**REMARKS**

Date ____________________________  
Compiling Officer ____________________________  
Title ____________________________
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# PENITENTIARY RELEASE FORM

**ALIASES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last</th>
<th>First</th>
<th>Middle</th>
<th>Last</th>
<th>First</th>
<th>Middle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**NAME OF INMATE**

**DATE OF BIRTH**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**DATE OF ADMISSION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**DATE OF RELEASE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**WARRANT EXPIRY DATE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**TYPE OF RELEASE**

- Gradual
- Parole
- Unconditional release
- Court order release
- Death
- Other (specify)

**CUSTODIAL ESCAPES**

- Force used against persons
- No. of days remission lost
- No. of convictions by disciplinary board
- Custodial classification

**DID INMATE LOSE ANY TIME FROM TRAINING?**

- Yes
- No

**RESPONSE TO PROGRAMME**

- Actively
- Uncooperative
- Ambivalent
- Cooperative
- Actively Cooperative

**SPECIAL THERAPY**

- Classification Officer or Social Worker
- Psychologist
- Psychiatrist

**TYPE OF CONTACT**

- Individual
- Diagnostic Occasional Intensive
- Group
- Diagnostic Occasional Intensive
- Family
- Diagnostic Occasional Intensive

**TRAINING ACHIEVEMENTS**

- Academic grades attained in
  - English
  - Mathematics
  - Other

**ADULT EDUCATIONAL COURSES**

- Academic
- Social
- Arts and crafts
- None

**VOCATIONAL TRAINING**

- TRADE 1
- TRADE 2
- TRADE 3

**MONTHS IN TRAINING**

- Graduated
- Not Graduated
- Nil

**REASON NOT GRADUATED**

- Nil

**MAINTENANCE AND INDUSTRIAL PRODUCTION**

- (State work area and time spent)
  
  1. Mos.
  2. Mos.
  3. Mos.

**MEDICAL CONDITION ON RELEASE**

- Fit
- Unfit

**DISABILITIES**

- Temporary
- Permanent

**MEDICAL CONDITION ON ADMISSION**

- Fit
- Unfit

**DISABILITIES**

- Corrected
- Improved
- Same
- Worse

**EMPLOYMENT**

- Employing
- Unemployed
- Employment in trade acquired in institution
- Untrained or unskilled employment

**RESIDENCE**

- Relative's home
- Hotel or boarding house
- Other (specify)

**AGENCY CONTACTS**

- Public agency
  - Voluntary Supervision
- Private agency
  - Voluntary Supervision
- Other (specify)
  - Voluntary Supervision

**N.E.S.**

- Yes
- No

**PROGNOSIS**

- Good
- Doubtful
- Poor

**MONEY, BONDS AND SECURITIES**

- Stated destination

**DATE**

**COMPILING OFFICER**

**TITLE**

---
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