

**Mutual Respect, Conflict and Conflict Resolution in Prison: A Response to the
Commission on Safety and Abuse in America's Prison Report**

February 2012

Rebecca Trammell, Ph.D.
The University of Nebraska at Omaha
The School of Criminology and Criminal Justice
Omaha, Nebraska

Abby Vandenberg, M.A.
The University of Nebraska at Omaha
The School of Criminology and Criminal Justice
Omaha, Nebraska

Timbre Ludden, M.A.
The University of Nebraska at Omaha
The School of Criminology and Criminal Justice
Omaha, Nebraska

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements	2
Summary of Findings	3
Introduction	4
Previous Research	5
Methods	9
Findings	17
Recommendations	60
Limitations of this Study	73
References	74

I Acknowledgements

As the primary investigator, I need to thank my research team who worked diligently to conduct and transcribe interviews and organize this project. They are: Abby Vandenberg, Timbre Ludden, Mackenzie Patrick, Michael Johnson, and Jessica Turner. On behalf of the research team, I thank the Nebraska Department of Correctional Services. In particular, I must thank Director Robert Houston and Steven King for granting me access to the prison facilities and helping me through the IRB process. I thank B.J. Spring for giving me the official Nebraska Department of Correctional data that appear in this report. At each facility, we worked with prison representatives who worked countless hours and gave us constant support and help. These people are Tammy Kluver, Ron Limbeck, Pam Hromodka, Win Barber, and Danny Hayes. These five men and women are outstanding representatives for the Nebraska Department of Correctional Services. We could never thank them enough. We need to thank the men and women who gave up their valuable time and allowed us to interview them. In total, we interviewed 383 inmates and 43 staff members. These people were both helpful and kind. We could not have asked for a better group of people to work with.

II Summary of Findings

- 45% of inmates sampled experienced some form of non-sexual violence in prison. Inmates have assaulted 33% of the staff members interviewed for this study.
- 4.1% of inmates sampled were involved in some type of sexual assault while incarcerated.
- Disrespectful behavior was identified as a major cause of violence in these facilities.
- Violence between inmates and between inmates and staff is more likely to happen at the Lincoln Correctional Center, the Nebraska State Penitentiary and the Tecumseh State Correctional Institute.
- Fights or assaults are more likely to be reported in the Nebraska Correctional Center for Women than any other prison.
- Inmates at the Lincoln Correctional Center, the Nebraska State Penitentiary, and the Nebraska Correctional Center for Women who stated that they were members of a street gang before entering prison were statistically more likely to report fighting with another inmate. Inmates from the Nebraska State Penitentiary and the Tecumseh State Correctional Institute who claimed to be a member of a prison gang were statistically more likely to claim that they fought another inmate. Only the inmates from the Tecumseh State Correctional Institute who claimed to be members of a prison gang were more likely to state that they assaulted a staff member.
- Inmates who were sentenced for a violent offense were more likely to report fighting inmates in three facilities: Omaha Correctional Center, the Nebraska Correctional Center for Women, and the Nebraska State Penitentiary. Violent offenders at the Tecumseh State Correctional Institute were more likely to admit to assaulting a staff member.
- Inmates and staff members blame both inmates and staff, to varying degrees, for conflict and violence in these facilities.

III Introduction

In 2006, the *Commission on Safety and Abuse in America's Prisons* released a report focusing on the current state of American prisons (Gibbons and Katzenbach 2006). In this report, they recommend that prison officials in the United States promote an ongoing “culture of mutual respect” and “Create a positive culture in jails and prisons grounded in an ethic of respectful behavior and interpersonal communication that benefits prisoners and staff” (Gibbons and Katzenbach 2006: 75). They argue that employees in each prison must promote a culture of mutual respect on a daily basis. This moves beyond the idea of reducing conflict between inmates and tasks prison staff with fostering a respectful, peaceful, and rehabilitative culture in prison. Moreover, they find that prison staff must model appropriate behavior in front of the inmates. In other words, staff members must be respectful to each other and to the inmates.

To be sure, there are many problems in our nation's prisons. In the last thirty years, we maintained overcrowded prisons and reduced rehabilitation programs in many states (Gibbons and Katzenbach 2006). This contributed to a number of problems, including an increase in prison gangs, violence, and underground economies (Jacobs 1977; Orlando-Morningstar 1997; Parenti 1999; Wacquant 2001). In some states, prison gangs became a serious problem as they sold drugs, promoted racism and caused violence (Fong, Vogel, and Buentello 1992; Hunt, Reigel, Morales, and Waldorf 1993; Irwin 1980; Orlando-Morningstar 1997; Trammell 2009b). The Commission's study was a response to these events. Members held open hearings with community members, activists, prison officials, and former inmates. The commission offered recommendations on how to make prisons safe and productive instruments of change.

As a response to the recommendations put forth in their report, we interviewed inmates and correctional staff and evaluated how social interactions contribute to a healthy, and respectful prison environment. In doing so, we specifically focused on three overarching issues: mutual respect, conflict and conflict resolution. These issues are connected to each other and to the general prison culture. In fact, this study seeks to better understand the inmate culture and how inmates and staff work together, or in opposition, toward the ideal of promoting a culture of respect and rehabilitation. Surveys were administered to inmates and staff in five prisons in Nebraska. Questions focused on the specific conditions under which conflict occurs and how conflict is managed in a functional manner. Questions also focused on how interviewees understand “mutual respect” and how respect is cultivated in prison. This report outlines our major findings, as well as recommendations we created for the Nebraska Department of Correctional Services.

IV Previous Research

In March of 2005, a group of “Respected civic leaders, experienced corrections administrators, scholars, advocates for the rights of prisoners, law enforcement professionals, members of the religious community, and former prisoners” (Gibbons and Katzenbach 2006: 6) came together and formed the *Commission on Safety and Abuse in America’s Prison*. Led by the Honorable John Gibbons and attorney Nicholas Katzenbach, this was the first national prison commission convened since the 1970s. They interviewed correctional staff, inmates, and national experts to evaluate the current state of American prisons. Also, they held open hearings and allowed these people to publicly discuss important issues such as overcrowded prisons, violence, rehabilitation, and prison culture. They made several recommendations to reduce these problems. For example, they recommend that measures be taken to prevent inmate

overcrowding and minimize the time inmates spend in isolation/segregation. Moreover, they recommend that prison staff cultivate a culture of mutual respect:

Growing recognition of the role that institutional culture plays in running a safe and healthy facility has led corrections administrators and other experts in the field to seek concrete ways to make positive changes in the cultures of their institutions... Culture change requires ongoing efforts to shift values and behaviors over time and must be understood as a continual practice, rather than any single event or program (Gibbons and Katzenbach 2006: 67).

While this is a logical and promising goal, it begs the question of how inmates and prison staff should work towards this important objective. It is also important to understand the relationship between staff and inmates and how conflict is resolved in a productive manner. According to the findings presented by the commission, staff must model positive social responses to conflict and show respect. In other words, there must be a good deal of cooperation among the staff and inmates. Furthermore, it is important to understand how everyone involved resolves conflict in a productive manner. In their report, the commission encouraged prison administrations to work with researchers to examine their state prisons to find out as much as possible about these issues.

There are approximately 5,000 adult prisons in the United States, and no two prisons are exactly alike. Each prison has its own culture, norms, and rules. Typically, state prisons are maintained by a centralized prison director and official rules are standardized (Useem and Piehl 2006). However, unofficial rules and norms develop in these total institutions. Within the last fifty years, researchers examined the “inmate code.” Inmates are socialized to follow informal rules in which they must act tough, not interfere with other inmates and not befriend the

correctional officers (Kupers 2001; Sykes 1958; Terry 1997; Trammell 2009b). To be sure, the inmate code can foster or hinder respectful behavior in prison and contribute to inmate violence.

Scholars often claim that inmate conflict and violence are byproducts of the social deprivation of incarceration (Cloward 1960; Tittle and Tittle 1964). Later studies found that prison culture is sometimes imported from the outside world (Irwin 1970; Irwin and Cressey 1962; Schrag 1954). Hassine (2007) goes so far to argue that there is no *official* inmate code; inmates simply import their own norms which are, many times, tied to criminal activity outside of prison. For example, there is a “robbery” culture and a “sex offender” culture, and these offenders maintain norms and their deviant subcultures behind bars (Hassine 2007). Research also shows a link between street culture and prison culture, particularly with regard to drug use and distribution (Irwin 1970) and gang activity (Moore 1991). As the drug trade emerged in prison, inmate culture and the inmate code changed as some inmates use violence to maintain their businesses in order to make money in prison (Trammell 2009b). In general, scholars agree that prison culture is a combination of street culture and the norms created out of social deprivation (Akers, Hayner, and Gruninger 1977; Pollock 1997; Winfree, Newbold, and Tubb 2002).

There is little doubt that inmates create their own deviant subculture. Of course, this raises several questions. First, how does this affect their relationship with prison staff, especially correctional officers? More specifically, does this help or hinder the culture of mutual respect as outlined by the *Commission on Safety and Abuse in America's Prison*? It is safe to presume that conflict and conflict resolution play a key role in prison culture. People may be courteous to one another under the best circumstances. However, when conflict arises, the interaction between inmates and staff or between inmates should tell us a great deal about how *respect* is maintained

and promoted. Of course, prison is a total institution in which correctional officers are tasked with maintaining order and safety. If a fight or riot breaks out, there is little doubt that the top priority is stopping the violence and making sure that the prison is secure. However, it is also safe to assume that violence is an end result of disrespect or other forms of conflict. In other words, we should focus on how inmates and staff describe daily interactions that lead up to or promote an outbreak of violence.

Secondly, if we understand that conflict takes place in these, and all other, social settings, it is advantageous to understand how people resolve conflicts. This presumes that, on some level, inmates and staff in all prisons learn to coordinate action in a productive manner. Currently, there are no prisons in the United States in which riots are a daily problem or the majority of inmates kill each other. We should also focus on how inmates and staff describe how and why they cooperate and coordinate their behavior in a functional manner.

In the state of Nebraska, the correctional system still uses parole boards or “indeterminate sentencing,” which means that inmates must prove that they have rehabilitated and paid their debt to society in order to be released. The Nebraska Department of Correctional Services maintains a manageable number of inmates (approximately 4,200) and has a lower than average recidivism rate of approximately 23% (Robinson, Brown, Murray, and Kennedy 2006). This is quite startling since the national average ranges between 60-70% for recidivism (Fischer 2005; Robinson, Brown, Murray, and Kennedy 2006). Also, the Nebraska Department of Correctional Services offers a wide range of rehabilitative programs which focus on mental health issues, education, anger management, parenting classes, and job skills (Nebraska Department of Correctional Services 2010). Clearly, this is done to insure that inmates are prepared for release and ready to enter his/her community. In other words, Nebraska has a manageable inmate

population and their Department of Corrections takes a proactive approach in rehabilitation. Therefore, this seems to be a good place to study mutual respect, conflict and conflict resolution.

V Methods

Data and Sample

The data used in our study come from interviews conducted in five adult prisons in Nebraska over a four-month period. Male and female inmates were randomly selected from prison rosters made available by the research staff at the Nebraska Department of Correctional Services. Six researchers conducted private interviews with these inmates using a survey instrument. A total of 816 inmates were randomly selected to participate, and inmates from each prison were included. In total, 383 inmates (74 females and 308 males) agreed to participate and were interviewed for this study.

The legal age of majority in Nebraska is 19. Therefore, the ages of those surveyed range from 19 to 73, with a mean age of 37. Interviews were conducted in classrooms, visiting rooms, and staff offices. Prison employees, including security staff, were not present during the interviews, and these employees stayed outside of the interview room or away from the inmates while the interviews were conducted. This allowed inmates to privately answer the survey questions. The average time spent conducting the interviews was 43 minutes and the interviews ranged from 15 minutes to 3 hours. A total of 3 inmates were not interviewed because they could not speak English and/or verbally consent to the interview.

Initially, inmates were contacted by a member of the prison staff and told that they were chosen to participate in a research project. At that time, they could choose to not participate. A total of 413 (51% of the random selection) inmates refused to leave their cells, had been recently paroled, had been transferred to another facility, or could not be found. There is no reliable way

to determine why the inmates would choose not to participate at this level because the researchers were not involved in this process. Those who agreed to come to an interview room met with one of six researchers who verbally read the consent form to them. At that time, they were told that participation was voluntary and were given the option to return to their cell. A total of 26 (3%) inmates from the random selection refused to participate at this stage. Those who offered a reason for nonparticipation said that they had no time to finish the interview or they were uncomfortable with the type of questions being asked. We had a response rate of 46% of the sample. Overall, we interviewed 10% of the prison population.

Under the best possible circumstances, researchers net an 80 to 85% response rate from the research sample (Maxfield and Babbie 2008). However, prison inmates are difficult to interview for several reasons. First, they may be at their work detail, in the prison yard, or in a rehabilitative program when they are called to participate. Inmates may refuse to cooperate with the prison staff out of spite or anger directed at the staff member. They could be concerned about participating in research projects or not trust researchers. Inmates fight or break rules and this means that they could be sent to the administrative segregation unit. Some inmates, due to mental health or substance abuse issues, may not understand the request made by the staff member. Finally, inmates often transfer from one prison to another or parole from prison altogether. The prison staff informed us that they could not bring in some of the inmates for all of these reasons. However, they did not keep a running count of how many inmates fit into each of these categories and the researchers were not involved in this process.

Although 51% refused to leave their cells or were otherwise unavailable, only 3% of the random sample refused to participate directly to a researcher. Also, a total of 11 selected inmates lived in a protective custody unit but still agreed to be interviewed. Some inmate participants

were not randomly selected but heard about our project and volunteered for the study. As per IRB regulations, they were allowed to participate.

In addition to inmates, staff members at each facility were also asked to participate in the research project. They were given the name and phone number of the principal investigator and told that they could call to set up a meeting outside of the institution. If they chose, they were also allowed to visit us while we were at their prisons and sit down for an interview. In total, 43 men and women volunteered to participate and were interviewed. This study includes staff from four prisons: Lincoln Correctional Center (6), Omaha Correctional Center (21), Nebraska State Penitentiary (4), and Tecumseh State Correctional Institution (12). There were no volunteers from the Nebraska Correctional Center for Women. Those interviewed include: correctional staff, caseworkers, case managers, a translator, and a recreation organizer.

This research design has been successfully used in current research on inmate violence. In a national study on inmate sexual violence, Beck et al. (2010) surveyed 10.8% of Federal and State inmates to evaluate sexual violence in prison. Jessess et al. (2007) used a random selection ($n = 322$) of California male inmates (population 119,153) to examine levels of sexual and non-sexual violence as well as the conditions under which violence occurs. Their analysis showed some rather small differences between the sample and the general population, but the sample was quite representative of the population, overall.

We compared our sample to the total population of state inmates using data provided by the Nebraska Department of Correctional Services. They provided information on age, race and most serious offense (primary offense) for the entire prison population. It should be noted that their numbers included inmates who were not eligible for our project, such as those in mental

health units or administrative segregation units. However, the random sample of inmates we interviewed is representative of the total population of state inmates with regard to age and race.

Tables 1 and 2 – Age of Participants and the General Prison Population

Average Age of All State Inmates			
Gender	Average Age	# Of Inmates	% Of Inmates
Female	35	411	8.8%
Male	36	4282	91.2%
Male and female	36	4693	100%
Source: Nebraska Department of Correctional Services			

Average Age of Participants in the Sample			
Gender	Average Age	# Of Inmates	% Of Inmates
Female	35	74	19%
Male	38	309	81%
Male and female	37	383	100%

Using a T-Test comparison of means, we find no significant differences between women in the random sample and the general prison population by age (see Tables 1 and 2). For the men, the T-Test revealed a slight difference between the means. However, we had three outliers who were men over the age of 68. When we removed these three men, the T-Test revealed no significant differences with regard to age.

Tables 3 and 4 – Race of Participants

Race				
Race	Males Inmates in the Random Sample		Male Inmates in Custody*	
	# Of Inmates	% Of Inmates	# Of Inmates	% Of Inmates
White	174	56.3%	2373	55.4%
Black	89	28.8%	1153	26.9%
Hispanic	30	9.7%	537	12.5%
Asian	1	0.3%	39	0.9%
Native American	12	3.9%	169	3.9%
Other	3	1.0%	8	0.2%
Unavailable			3	0.1%
Total	309	100%	4282	100%
*Source: Nebraska Department of Correctional Services				

Race				
	Female Inmates in the Random Sample		Female Inmates in Custody*	
Race	# Of Inmates	% Of Inmates	# Of Inmates	% Of Inmates
White	43	58.1%	256	62.3%
Black	12	16.2%	74	18.0%
Hispanic	12	16.2%	38	9.2%
Asian	0	0	0	0
Native American	6	8.1%	27	6.6%
Other	1	1.4%	16	3.9%
Total	74	100%	411	100%

*Source: Nebraska Department of Correctional Services

Using a T-Test to compare the means between white, black, Hispanic, and Native American inmates, we found no significant statistical differences between our sample and the general prison population (see Tables 3 and 4). These tests indicate that our sample is similar to the general population of prison inmates in this state with regard to race.

Tables 5 – Offense Categories for Most Serious Charge

Primary/Most Serious Offense				
Offense	Random Sample		Prison Population*	
Homicide	63	16.4%	518	11.5%
Sex Offense	79	20.6%	818	18.1%
Assault	44	11.5%	585	13.0%
Weapons	5	1.3%	129	2.9%
Arson	16	4.2%	25	0.6%
Robbery	41	10.7%	416	9.2%
Burglary	24	6.3%	370	8.2%
Theft	25	6.5%	375	8.3%
Fraud	4	1.0%	128	2.8%
Drugs	56	14.6%	574	12.7%

*Source: Nebraska Department of Correctional Services

We also compared our inmate data to the general prison population by the primary offense committed by the participant (see Table 5). The Nebraska Department of Correctional

Services provided us the data on the most serious offenses of all prison inmates. Gender was weighted before running the T-Test comparison. Using data provided by the Nebraska Department of Correctional Services, a member of the research team coded the primary offense committed by those in our study for comparison. The T-Tests revealed differences between the sample and the general prison population in five categories: homicide, weapons charges, drugs, arson, and fraud. Our sample includes a higher than average number of homicide offenders, drug offenders and arsonists and a lower than average number of people committing weapons offenses and fraud. There are no significant differences in the means for the other offenses (sex offenses, assault, robbery, burglary, and theft).

Despite the differences in the means for these categories, there is evidence that the random sample is quite representative of the larger prison population. Although we have a higher than average number of inmates who committed murder, drug offenses or arson, other violent offenders (sex offenses, assault, robbery) are equally represented. Also, the non-violent offenders (theft, burglary) are equally represented as well. This, along with the T-Test results on age and race, indicates that our random selection produced a fairly unbiased sample that represents inmates in all five adult facilities. The benefit of having a representative sample is that it increases external validity. In other words, you can make general assumptions about your sample that translate to the larger prison population.

Tables 6 Prison Staff - Job Title

Correctional Officer	6
Case Manager	2
Unit Caseworker	9
Shift Supervisor	1
Lieutenant	4
Sargent	3
Corporal	14
Unit Manager	2
Translator	1
Recreations	1
Total	43

Table 7 – Prison Staff – Gender

	Frequency	Percent
Male	32	74.4
Female	11	25.6
Total	43	100.0

A total of 43 staff members participated in this study. This was a non-random sample that included volunteers from four facilities that serve male inmates. Table 6 shows their job titles and Table 7 shows the gender distribution. The average interview time for the staff was 39 minutes. As per IRB requirements, no one was denied the opportunity to participate in the project. Because this is a non-random sample that contains no staff members from the women’s facility, their responses are not generalizable to, or representative of, the entire Nebraska Department of Correctional Services. However, they provided us with a good deal of information about their perceptions of inmate violence and interpersonal relationships in prison.

There were two security problems that occurred while we collected our data. One inmate killed another inmate and the prison was put into lockdown for several weeks during this time. We had to postpone our data collection due to this homicide. On another day, there was a

security threat and the prison had to be locked down while two researchers were collecting data. This was temporary and they were able to resume their interviews rather quickly. Neither of these incidents had anything to do with this project. None of the six researchers received any threats or believed they were in any danger while interviewing the inmates. Overall, interviewees were cooperative and forthcoming during their interviews.

For this project, the principal investigator created a survey (78 questions) focusing on the daily routines of inmates, gang membership, the types of interpersonal relationships they developed with inmates and staff, and their history of prison violence. Staff members were given a survey (62 questions) that asked about their relationship with each other and the inmates. We asked questions regarding physical and sexual violence committed between inmates and physical violence between prison staff and inmates. The researcher would read the survey to the participant and write down his or her responses. Those who admitted that they had been involved in some acts of prison violence were first asked to list the total number of violent encounters and then to describe the context of the three most recent incidents. We used a separate summary sheet to record these incidents. Inmates were asked to elaborate and give specific examples in open-ended questions. This means we collected both quantitative and qualitative data from these interviews.

Interviewers were trained to use the same prompts for each question, and we routinely met to debrief and standardize our responses to the inmates. We did this to make sure that everyone was asking the survey questions in the same manner. We also made sure we responded to questions from the inmates in the same manner.

Once the interviews were complete, we used the Nebraska Department of Correctional Services database to look up and code the four top charges of each of our interviewees. We also

coded the level of security for each of our interviewees. These data are included in our quantitative database. We used SPSS to build our quantitative database and we used Atlas software to code qualitative responses. To make this report easy to read, frequency tables are embedded within, and chi-square tests are available in the appendices.

Confidentiality

All participants were assigned a random number to be used as an identification number. No names appear on the databases and there are no direct ties from individual participants to their responses. For this report, we use the names for the prison facilities. For any other report, paper, thesis, etc., any research site will be labeled as “a midwestern prison” or “prison in a midwestern state.” In other words, those outside of the Nebraska Department of Correctional Services will never know which “midwestern state” prison system (or which facility) was used for this project. Due to the fact that we only have 43 staff members included, we will not list anything in this report that may serve as an identifier for these volunteers. For all written reports or papers (including this report), we are careful to exclude any information that may identify any of the volunteers. We do this for ethical and legal reasons.

VI Findings

Inmate Violence

The violence reported to the research team should be treated as self-reported data. These numbers will differ from official data collected by prison staff. In general, self-reports of illegal or violent acts are higher than official data because many cases (in or out of prison) are not caught and go unpunished. Scholars often describe this as a “funnel” in which violent/illegal acts are common, but few are witnessed or stopped (Mauer 1999). For example, in 2010, there

were 251 reported cases of inmate violence¹ in the five prisons we surveyed (Nebraska Department of Correctional Services 2011). With an average inmate count (in these facilities) of 3,400 in 2010 (Nebraska Department of Correctional Services), a total of 0.15% of the inmates fought or assaulted each other during that year². In our sample, a total of 77 interviewees admitted to having a fight/assault in 2010. This is a total of 20.1% of the sample. While this seems like a relatively high number, many of these inmates reported being shoved or slapped and involved in other minor incidents that occur much more frequently than serious assaults.

A total of 172 (45%) of the inmates sampled experienced non-sexual violence with another inmate. Inmates claim that they were involved in total of 975 violent incidents with other inmates. This number varied between prisons. Inmates at the Nebraska State Penitentiary had the highest percentage of inmates who reported being in a fight or assault (61%). This number coincides with official reports from the Nebraska Department of Correctional Services, which show that the Nebraska State Penitentiary had the highest number of violent incidents in 2010. Typically, the official data coincide with our findings in terms of general trends. Specifically, both Nebraska Department of Correctional Services data and our data show that inmates at the Nebraska State Penitentiary with the highest frequency of assaults and Omaha Correctional Center reporting the fewest number of assaults or fights (see Tables 8, 9, and 10).

¹ Violence includes Inmate-on-Inmate Assault with Serious Injury, Inmate-on-Inmate Assault without Serious Injury, and Inmate-on-Inmate fight.

² This number is based on the assumption that two people are involved in each reported incident.

Tables 8 – Inmates Violence – Reported by Inmates

Facility	Total Number of Inmates who Reported Violence	Sample Size	Percentage
Omaha Correctional Center	15	64	23%
Lincoln Correctional Center	34	59	58%
Nebraska State Penitentiary	55	90	61%
Nebraska Correctional Center for Women	22	74	30%
Tecumseh State Correctional Institute	46	96	48%
	172	383	
Percentage - Total	45%		

Table 9 – Frequency of Violence reported by Inmates

Number of Incidents	Frequency of Incidents	Total Number of Assaults
1	53	53
2	34	68
3	23	69
4	7	28
5	11	55
6	11	66
7	2	14
8	6	48
9	1	9
10	3	30
12	3	36
14	1	14
15	6	90
20	5	100
25	1	25
30	1	30
40	1	40
50	2	100
100	1	100
Total	172	975

Table 10 – Official Reports - Inmate-on-Inmate Assault with Serious Injury, Inmate-on-Inmate Assault without Serious Injury, and Inmate-on-Inmate fight – 2010³

Omaha Correctional Center	19
Lincoln Correctional Center	73
Nebraska State Penitentiary	110
Nebraska Correctional Center For Women	20
Tecumseh State Correctional Institution	29
Source: NDCS, 2010 Reports	

We need to point out one interesting finding. There appears to be more reported cases of violence at the Nebraska Correctional Center for Women than the Omaha Correctional Center. This is counterintuitive to the large body of work that shows that women are less violent than men. For example, men are almost eight times more likely to commit robbery (Renzetti 2006) and ten times more likely to commit murder than women (Fox and Marianne 2004; Greenfeld and Snell 1999; Renzetti 2006). Furthermore, women are less likely to kill each other in prison (Harer and Langan 2001). However, the Nebraska Correctional Center for Women holds women from minimum to maximum-security levels and the Omaha Correctional Center does not hold maximum-security inmates. This will influence rates of violence, as more high-risk inmates live at the women’s facility. Also, we had the inmates contextualize their reports of violence, and women were more likely to describe fighting their prison girlfriends. We received no similar reports of intimate interpersonal relationships occurring in the men’s prisons. This being said, there is no evidence that women are becoming as violent, or more violent, than men. This finding is expected based on the type of inmates located at Omaha Correctional Center and Nebraska Correctional Center for Women.

Researchers do not know the exact number of inmates who experience violence while incarcerated. Stephan and Karberg (2003) found that (nationally) 28 out of 1,000 state and

³ We were given data from 2010 and data from the first six months of 2011. To be concise, we used data from 2010 for comparison.

federal inmates report being assaulted, according to official national statistics. Jenness et al. (2007) found that 63% of inmates in California experienced some form of violence while incarcerated. In a study conducted in one Southwest prison, 14% of inmates were assaulted within the three-month period prior to the study (Woodridge 1994). Studies are typically done state by state and vary widely. Also, researchers have always found that violence is greatly underreported in prison (Bowker 1980; McCorkle 1993) because of the “no snitching” norm and the threat of retaliation or punishment.

There is no way to determine a “normal” range for inmate violence. However, less than half of the inmates in the study report experiencing violence. The overwhelming majority of the violence recorded by the research team and official Nebraska Department of Correctional Services data, is non-lethal violence. It is safe to say that our findings are quite typical of prisons located in the United States. Of course, it is not fair to compare our findings with research from other states because the prison populations differ between states. However, considering all the previous work examining the rates of inmate violence, 45% is an expected amount for this prison system, as a whole.

At the same time, inmates the Nebraska State Penitentiary (61%) and the Lincoln Correctional Center (58%) report a high number of inmate assaults⁴. I realize that these are high-security prisons containing at-risk inmates. To be sure, the different rates of violence in each facility highlight the differences in inmate culture from prison to prison. Therefore, we report the findings for each prison for comparison.

⁴ In fact, the numbers are close to the percentage of violent behavior reported by inmates in California (63%) (Jenness et al 2007). The California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation is considered to be one of the more violent prison systems, as well as, “ground zero” for prison gangs (Trulson and Marquart 2009).

Inmate and Staff Violence

A total number of 20 inmates admitted to fighting with, or assaulting, staff members. These inmates stated that they had a combined number of 43 acts of violence with members of the prison staff. Table 11 outlines the frequency with which inmates claimed that they assaulted a staff member. Table 12 outlines the prison where inmate-on-staff assaults took place. Although these are three recent incidents, according to the inmates, the years range from 1979 to 2011.

In Table 13, we list the Nebraska Department of Correctional Services' total number of reported inmate-on-staff assaults from 2010 for comparison. As you can see, these tables show that the majority of inmate/staff assaults took place at the Lincoln Correctional Center, the Nebraska State Penitentiary, and the Tecumseh State Correctional Institute. Inmates at these three prisons are responsible for the majority of violence in the Nebraska prison system.

Table 11 – Number of Staff Assaults – Reported by Inmates

Frequency of Incidents	Number of inmates reporting incidents	Total Number of Assaults
1	11	11
2	4	8
3	1	3
4	1	4
5	1	5
6	2	12
Total	20	43

Table 12 – Inmate/Staff Assault – Reported by Inmates – Recent Three Incidents

Facility Where Assault Took Place	Recent Three Incidents
Omaha Correctional Center	0
Lincoln Correctional Center	10
Nebraska State Penitentiary	11
Nebraska Correctional Center for Women	0
Tecumseh State Correctional Institute	9
Diagnostic and Evaluation	1
Nebraska Correctional Youth Facility	3
Total	34

Table 13 – Official Reports - Inmate-on-Staff Assault with Serious Injury, Inmate-on-Staff Assault without Serious Injury, and Inmate-on-Staff, Throwing Substances – 2010

Omaha Correctional Center	0
Lincoln Correctional Center	23
Nebraska State Penitentiary	11
Nebraska Correctional Center For Women	0
Tecumseh State Correctional Institution	37
Source: NDCS, 2010 Reports	

In the non-random sample of staff members, 33% ($n = 14$) of the interviewees report being assaulted by an inmate. According to the staff we interviewed, the majority of the assaults happened in the Lincoln Correctional Center, the Nebraska State Penitentiary, the Tecumseh State Correctional Institute, and the Nebraska Correctional Youth Facility⁵ (See Tables 14 and 15). Again, these findings align with the general trend that violence is more likely to take place at these facilities.

In Table 16, we see that the majority of interviewees who were assaulted were correctional/security staff ($n = 11$). This is not surprising considering the fact that the security staff is tasked with transporting inmates, breaking up fights, and handling any security threats. Therefore, they are more likely to physically touch the inmates and enforce the rules.

⁵ Unfortunately, the University of Nebraska IRB board would not let us interview the inmates at NCYF so there are no data for that prison.

Table 14 – Number of Inmate and Staff Assaults – Reported by Staff

Number of Incidents	Frequency of Incidents	Total Number of Assaults
1	9	9
2	1	2
5	1	5
6	3	18
Total	14	34

Table 15 – Inmate/Staff Assault – Reported by Staff – Recent Three Incidents

Facility Where Assault Took Place	Recent Three Incidents
Omaha Correctional Center	1
Lincoln Correctional Center	4
Nebraska State Penitentiary	6
Tecumseh State Correctional Institute	7
Diagnostic and Evaluation	1
Nebraska Correctional Youth Facility	6
Total	25

Table 16 – Inmate/Staff Assault – Reported by Staff – Job Title

Job Title	Assaulted by Inmate
Correctional Officer	1
Caseworker	2
Lieutenant	4
Sergeant	3
Corporal	3
Unit Manager	1
Total	14

In general, these numbers are not surprising. We see the lowest number of reported assaults against staff in the women’s prison and the prison without maximum-security male prisoners. The official Nebraska Department of Correctional Services for 2010 (Table 13) and 2011 mirror this general trend (NDCS 2010 and YTD 2011 Data).

According to Lahm (2009), the best predictor of inmate-on-staff violence is age and

aggression level of the inmate; the prison security level variable was less significant than the interpersonal relationship between inmates and staff. She states, “Despite the harshness of prison context, assaults on staff are still very personal and psychological in nature” (Lahm 2009: 145). Inmates who are overly aggressive or young are likely to physically harm the staff and may need more supervision. This certainly explains the high number of assaults reported at the Nebraska Correctional Youth Facility. However, this highlights the fact that violence is often personal and dependent on the context of the situation.

The Context of Violent Behavior

If we simply look at these numbers, we could predict that violence is likely to happen at the highest security prisons that contain men. However, it is important to contextualize these events for several reasons. First, we need to understand why violence happens in prison. If we assume that male inmates in maximum-security prisons behave violently, policy recommendations will likely focus on increasing security measures in these prisons. Such heightened security may actually reduce or alter the interpersonal interactions between the staff and inmates, which could hinder rehabilitative efforts. More importantly, it is likely that this policy will drive deviant and violent behaviors underground as inmates learn better ways to get around the rules. As previously mentioned, harsh prison rules do not necessarily reduce inmate on staff violence, but positive interactions between inmates and staff do (Lahm 2009). Furthermore, if we assume that the context of violence is important, a contextual understanding will allow administrators at the Nebraska Department of Correctional Services to take a proactive approach to address the social causes of violence.

To illustrate these points, we compared (by prison) the number of assaults/fights that were officially reported to prison authorities versus those that were not (see Appendix A). We

coded each prison into dichotomous variables (Omaha Correctional and Not Omaha Correctional Center, Lincoln Correctional Center and Not Lincoln Correctional Center, and so on) and, using Pearson’s and Fisher’s Chi-Square tests, we compared each prison to the other four institutions. These results show that, for the most recent three fights/assaults, the number of reported incidents (versus not reported) is only significant for one prison: the Nebraska Correctional Center for Women. This means that, in the men’s prisons, the chance of getting caught fighting is not significantly different than other prisons. The Nebraska Correctional Center for Women is an outlier, indicating that women in this institution are more likely to have their fights reported than are males in the other prisons.

In the other prisons, despite the high-security levels and the presumption that men are more violent, men were less likely to be caught fighting or report violent behavior. Even the Lincoln Correctional Center was not statistically different from other institutions, despite the fact that the majority of the fights/assaults indexed at this prison were reported (See Table 17).

Table 17 – Number of Fights/Assaults Reported and Not Reported – Recent Three Incidents

Facility Where Assault Took Place	Reported or Caught	Not Reported or Caught	Total
Omaha Correctional Center	9	18	27
Lincoln Correctional Center	41	34	75
Nebraska State Penitentiary	59	67	126
Nebraska Correctional Center for Women	31	5	36
Tecumseh State Correctional Institute	41	60	101
Total	181	184	365

This finding can be explained in several ways. First, women were more likely to tell us that they report violent behavior. One woman told this story:

I was getting ready for work and I turned on my light and my roommate got up and hit

me. I went to the guards and told them what happened. I got my face checked out but I didn't have any real damage. I even called my lawyer to let her know, just in case I have to go to court or something. I think she was just angry with me for something else and decided to take it out on me then. We both went to seg to cool off but I ended up getting another roommate.

We did not receive these kinds of responses from the men. Men described the "no snitching" rule and noted concern about retaliation. Women, on the other hand, were more concerned about getting into trouble and they did not want to jeopardize their chance to parole. Women were more likely to report yelling and screaming during a fight, which will bring attention to their violent behavior. In other words, men work very hard to keep their behaviors hidden from the prison staff while women are more transparent. This also indicates that women have a different working relationship with the staff, and this allows them to report inmate misconduct without fear of revenge or other negative repercussions.

Another explanation for these institutional differences is that violence is socially constructed as male behavior. Therefore, it is not unusual to see men show aggression while it is unusual to see women use violence. Women are likely to report behavior that contradicts prescribed gender roles. This also means that staff at the women's prison will be more aware of physical confrontations, as it is not "normal" female behavior. The fact that women are so much less likely to assault the prison staff is another indication that there are gender differences with regard to inmate violence. In other words, it is likely that the interaction between the inmate and staff makes a difference in whether or not violence is reported. If violence is reported and contained, this should make prisons safer for inmates and staff.

Table 18 – Causes of the Recent Three Inmate Assaults – Reported by Inmates

Facility	Disrespect	Retaliation	Gang	Money	Theft	Race	Pride	Domestic Violence	Drugs	Total
Omaha Correctional Center	16	3	--	3	2	2	1	--	--	27
Lincoln Correctional Center	32	14	9	9	3	1	1	--	--	69
Nebraska State Penitentiary	32	28	21	5	7	4	6	--	2	105
Nebraska Correctional Center For Women	12	9	--	--	2	--	--	11	1	35
Tecumseh State Correctional Institution	31	17	9	8	4	6	5	--	--	80
Total	123	71	39	25	18	13	13	11	3	316

In Table 18, we show the main causes for the most recent three fights as described by interviewees. One of the more notable differences has to do with the difference between men and women. Women were more likely to describe fighting with (or over) their incarcerated girlfriends. We can best describe these behaviors as domestic violence. We received no such stories from the men in this study. The previous research indicates that this is common in women’s prisons (Foster 1975; Giallombardo 1974; Owen 1998). In fact, Owen (1998) finds that women typically fight with their prison girlfriends more than anyone else.

Although gang members are present in all five facilities (see Table 19), inmates at the Nebraska State Penitentiary reported more fights resulting from gang activity⁶. Using Pearson’s and Fisher’s Chi-Square tests, we evaluated the connection between violence and gang affiliation. We correlated violence against staff and inmates with self-reports of gang affiliation in and out of prison⁷. It is important to note that, although we asked each inmate about their gang associations, we assume that many are not forthcoming about this issue. Some interviewees at all five facilities admitted to being in a gang (see Table 19), yet many did not

⁶ Other reasons for fights include, “Inmate had a mental health issue” or “Misunderstanding” or “I don’t know the cause of the fight.” However, these reasons were less frequent.

⁷ Inmates were asked, “Are you a member of a prison gang?” and “Were you a member of a street gang before going to prison?”

want to name the specific gang, and some inmates refused to answer this question at all. Inmates were more uncomfortable about answering this question than any other question on the survey.

Therefore, the findings about gangs should be interpreted with caution.

Table 19 – Self-Reports of Gang Affiliation

Facility	Member of a Prison Gang	Member of a Street Gang	In a Street Gang and Prison Gang
Omaha Correctional Center	0	3	0
Lincoln Correctional Center	6	11	4
Nebraska State Penitentiary	15	21	13
Nebraska Correctional Center for Women	2	8	2
Tecumseh State Correctional Institute	9	19	6
Total	32	62	25

Inmates at the Lincoln Correctional Center, the Nebraska State Penitentiary, and the Nebraska Correctional Center for Women who stated that they were members of a street gang before entering prison were statistically more likely to report fighting with another inmate (see Appendix B). Inmates from the Nebraska State Penitentiary and the Tecumseh State Correctional Institute who claimed to be a member of a prison gang were statistically more likely to claim that they fought another inmate. Only the inmates from the Tecumseh State Correctional Institute who claimed to be members of a prison gang were more likely to state that they assaulted a staff member. Gang affiliation is not associated with assaulting prison staff in the other four prisons.

No woman in this study claimed to fight because of gang activity. Also, the women inmates reported a relatively low number of fights/assaults. The Fisher’s Exact Test indicates

that the association is borderline non-significant (.046)⁸. Therefore, this correlation between gang association and fighting in the women's prison is not too concerning. The findings at the other three prisons⁹ are more interesting. We correlated race¹⁰ and gang affiliation with violence against inmates and staff and found no statistical association. This means that gangs are likely to be a problem at Lincoln Correctional Center, the Tecumseh State Correctional Institute, and the Nebraska State Penitentiary prisons but the racial category associated with the gang is not significant. The staff we interviewed stated that, from their perception, Hispanic gangs are more likely to fight. This was especially true at the Lincoln Correctional Center facility. The fact that we find no statistical difference between Hispanic gangs and other gangs could be explained several ways.

First, inmates were less forthcoming about gang questions than any other question we asked. All researchers for this project reported that the questions about gangs were more likely to make interviewees uncomfortable. Secondly, more than half of fights/assaults reported to the team were not reported to prison staff (see table 17). Members of older more established gangs (e.g., Crips and Bloods) might be better at concealing their violent behavior. This means that we will include cases of violence that the staff is unaware of. It may appear that newer Hispanic gangs are fighting at higher rates than other gangs when it may be that these other gangs are just better at concealing their violence.

We also correlated the four primary offenses, as listed by the Nebraska Department of Correctional Services, with inmate violence (see Appendix C). Their offenses were coded into dichotomous variables (violent and non-violent) and compared to inmate and staff assaults.

Using Pearson's and Fisher's Chi-Square tests, we find that inmates who were sentenced for a

⁸ Significance is measured at a P value of less than .05.

⁹ There was no correlation between gang association and violence at the Omaha Correctional Center.

¹⁰ Inmates and staff claim that gangs in these prisons are racially identified. There are white, black, Hispanic, and Native American gangs in this system.

violent offense were more likely to report fighting inmates in three facilities: Omaha Correctional Center, the Nebraska Correctional Center for Women, and the Nebraska State Penitentiary. Violent offenders at the Lincoln Correctional Center and Tecumseh State Correctional Institute were not more likely to admit to fighting inmates. However, violent offenders at the Tecumseh State Correctional Institute were more likely to admit to assaulting a staff member.

Gang Violence

Overall, there are exogenous variables that prison staff cannot control. These include inmates' street gang memberships and violent criminal histories. Previous research is mostly mixed about street gang membership and inmate violence (Berg and DeLisi 2006; Berk et al 2006; Tasca et al. 2010), as well as criminal history and violence (Berg and DeLisi 2006; Tasca et al. 2010). Yet our findings indicate that criminal history and gang affiliation are associated with prison fights. Prison administrators could address these issues by increasing the number of anti-violence programs in these facilities. Anti-gang programs might be effective¹¹ and pull members out of the gangs, but staff must then work to protect these inmates.

Moreover, social support will be needed for inmates exiting gangs in prison. We interviewed inmates who left gangs in prison. They explain that this happened because someone talked them into leaving:

My cellie is an older man who took me aside and told me that gangs are not everything. He told me that I'd end up dead or in prison forever if I don't get out. I didn't listen to him at first but it started to make sense. I ended up asking to go to the P.C. [protective custody] yard so I could get away from my gang. I no longer run with the Latin Kings because I want a better life. My cellie did that for me. I have to live on the P.C. yard now but it's worth it.

An inmate at the Tecumseh State Correctional Institute explained how he tries to talk younger

¹¹ We discuss anti-gang programs in the recommendation section of this report.

inmates into leaving gangs:

We help each other. I'm the oldest among them and they look up to me. They ask my advice and I ask theirs. I really hate the N word and I talked to some now ex- members and asking what's so important about the gang life? We advise each other.

An inmate at the Tecumseh State Correctional Institute told this story:

The gang unit captain pulled me aside and talked to me about my future. He said that I was heading in a bad direction and I would end up dead if I didn't get my act together. He really put me in my place and helped me see things straight.

We spoke to men in all facilities that try to avoid the gangs. Some of them explain that a staff member or inmate reached out to help them exit a gang or avoid fighting gangs. Others describe having to fight with gangs who try to recruit them. When asked about his history of fights with other inmates, one man at stated that the Tecumseh State Correctional Institute assault occurred because:

I was being recruited by the Crazy White Boys. I'm not a racist and I have no desire to run with the skinheads. They know I can use my hands so they wanted me in their gang. They promise you drugs and cigarettes and anything else you want.

Gang members fight rival gang members and contribute to underground businesses, like gambling or drugs. However, there are periphery acts of violence that affect non-gang members, such as the inmate who was recruited by the Crazy White Boys. Others explain that gang members use violence to initiate their members. A man at the Lincoln Correctional Center stated:

A black guy wanted to get into a gang so he ran up on me for the initiation. I didn't know why he attacked me at first but some guys told me afterwards what happened. I didn't know him. He just ran up on me and hit me on the back of my head so I turned around and hit him back. He didn't get any other hits in and I stomped him down. When he was lying there I asked him why he hit me and he said, "Fuck you." If you join a gang or threat group they tell you who you have to hit and I guess my name came up. That's the problem with the gangs.

A total of 41.4% of the men¹² interviewed for this study claimed that gang activity causes violence in prison. Men in all four facilities discussed the problems with gangs and noted that

¹² Only one female stated that gangs cause problems in the women's prison.

they would like to see these threat groups removed or reduced. Research shows that prison administrators are adept at reducing serious threats such as large-scale gang fights and riots (Useem and Piehl 2006). Increasing the resources for the gang units should help the staff to respond to viable threats. However, our qualitative interviews show that social networking can also pull people out of the gangs and give them other options. Inmates put up barriers between themselves and staff and enforce norms about not working with correctional officers. However, we contend that staff, especially correctional staff, should be willing to work to reduce the number of gang members in their prison.

Assaults on Staff

The breakdown for all 34 fights that we indexed (between inmates and staff) is located in Tables 20 and 21. As reported by the inmates, 6 interviewees admitted that they fought with staff because they refused to follow a direct order or refused to leave their cells. One inmate admitted that the only reason that he, and his fellow inmates, assaulted a caseworker is because they were intoxicated:

My homies and I got drunk off some hooch that one of the guys made in his cell. We were really drunk and this caseworker came by and one of the guys started playing with him, just teasing him and stuff. Then the other guys started picking on him and laughing. The caseworker is kind of a nerd and he got scared pretty quickly. One of the guys pushed him and another guy slammed him against the wall and we all pushed him around. He got away and ran to an office and locked himself in and hit the panic button. We would not have done it if we weren't drunk. This is a cool guy; we had no beef with him. He was in the wrong place at the wrong time. I feel so bad about this. I told him that I was sorry and I never bothered this guy again. I feel sorry for him.

Two inmates admitted that staff was assaulted/injured because they had to break up a gang fight. However, the inmates reported that the leading cause of fights between the inmates and staff is disrespect. The majority of the staff members we interviewed stated that they were assaulted because inmates were retaliating, angry, or because of disrespectful behavior (see Table 21).

Table 20 – The Causes of the Fights between Inmates and Staff – Reported by Inmates

Facility	Disrespect	Inmate Refused to Follow Instructions	Retaliation	Inmate had Mental Health Issues	Gangs	Power	Inmate Was Intoxicated	Total
Lincoln Correctional Center	2	--	1	4	--	--	--	7
Nebraska State Penitentiary	5	3	--	--	--	--	--	8
Tecumseh State Correctional Institution	7	3	4	--	2	2	1	19
Total	14	6	5	4	2	2	1	34

Table 21 – The Causes of the Fights between Inmates and Staff – Reported by Staff

Facility	Retaliation	Disrespect	Inmate Was Angry	Inmate Refused to Follow Instructions	Inmate had Mental Health Issues	Power	Breaking up Fight	Inmate Wanted to Make a Name for Himself	Total
Omaha Correctional Center	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	--	1
Lincoln Correctional Center	3	--	--	1	--	--	--	--	4
Nebraska State Penitentiary	--	1	1	1	1	1	--	1	6
Tecumseh State Correctional Institution	3	1	2	--	--	--	1	--	7
Total	6	2	3	2	1	1	2	1	18

It is important to note that some of these causes are typical in that, we expect fights/assaults to happen because staff members have to break up fights between inmates. It is also expected that some fights happen because an inmate refuses to follow orders and correctional officers have to physically move or handle the inmates. Although regrettable, it is safe to assume that these events are typical in this line of work. However, staff members also describe ongoing problems with some inmates that include violence. A Unit Manager described one of these assaults:

We had a guy who would not keep his hatch closed. He would open it and I would come by and close it. This went on every day. We would argue about it all the time. I put my hand in to close it and he jabbed my arm with a pen. It broke the skin so I had to get a tetanus shot and the guy got some time in seg for it.

A Correctional Officer told this story:

I walked by the guy's cell in Seg and he threw urine on me. He thought it would be funny and they do this all the time. I got soaked and had to take meds. We always had problems with this guy.

A Unit Manager told this story:

A guy walked by me and yelled at me and spit on my face. He was frustrated about the fact that we had to use force on him [a prior incident] so he decided to get payback and spit on me.

A Sargent explained why inmates assault staff:

The guys get frustrated and don't want to follow orders. We lose our temper with them or let our guard down. I think we sometimes forget where we are and the level tension here. I've never been assaulted but I've seen situations get tense and if you can talk with each other, things can be avoided.

Although some of these assaults are labeled as retaliation or cases of disrespect, the anger expressed by the inmate is not necessarily directed at the victim. Staff members explain that inmates are mad at the staff in general. They also explain that inmates lash out because of a prior incident. In this sense, these are cases of generalized retaliation or disrespect rather than specific cases aimed at a particular person. Furthermore, inmates may fight each other because of "disrespect" and then take the opportunity to punch or kick a staff member who breaks up the fight. In these cases, the decision to use violence is linked to a general culture of frustration and disrespect.

A Culture of Mutual Respect

We asked all interviewees whether or not inmates and staff are respectful in prison. Between 56% and 100% of those interviewed at the men's prisons claimed that the inmates are respectful to each other (see Tables 22 and 23). As you recall, we had no volunteers for staff at the Nebraska Correctional Center for Women facility so we cannot evaluate the staff's perception of respectful behavior. However, only 36% the women at the Nebraska Correctional Center for Women facility stated that the inmates are respectful to each other.

Table 22 - Are Inmates Generally Respectful to Each Other in this prison? Staff Response.

Facility	Yes	No	Sometimes	Percent “yes” at This Prison
Omaha Correctional Center	13	4	4	62%
Lincoln Correctional Center	4	0	2	67%
Nebraska State Penitentiary	4	0	0	100%
Nebraska Correctional Center for Women	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Tecumseh State Correctional Institution	9	3	0	75%
Total	30	7	6	

Table 23 - Are Inmates Generally Respectful to Each Other in this prison? Inmate Response.

Facility	Yes	No	Sometimes	Percent “yes” at This Prison
Omaha Correctional Center	41	11	12	64%
Lincoln Correctional Center	33	12	14	56%
Nebraska State Penitentiary	53	17	20	59%
Nebraska Correctional Center for Women	27	30	17	36%
Tecumseh State Correctional Institution	61	12	23	64%
Total	215	82	86	

This was the lowest response rate in this category yet women are less likely to fight. In their qualitative interviews, women describe respect in the context of interpersonal relationships. For example, women show respect by not causing “drama.” One woman said:

The women get stupid, they spread rumors and blame you for stuff you don’t do. I swear it’s like a reality TV show in here. They are just looking for the cameras.

Another woman was asked to describe a situation where an inmate showed her respect, she replied:

I had a bad day and was crying about not seeing my kids. Some of the women came by and hugged me and said “it’s okay” but they didn’t pester me about why I was crying. They gave me support but didn’t pry into my personal business.

Another woman gave this example:

I’ve had women come up to me and tell me that I’m a good person. They tell me that I’ve helped them be a good person.

Women often equate respect with help or social support:

I had a death in the family and I was really upset. My roommate helped me and talked with me. She went to the staff and told them about what happened and they let me use the phone and everyone was real nice about it.

Those who do not show this kind of social support or who cause too much drama are labeled as disrespectful. This can lead to a fight. One woman had this story to tell:

We had this woman who ran her mouth all day. She would curse at us and make our lives hell. You don’t know the kind of stress this woman put on us. I finally told her to shut up and stop being a bully and she said, “make me,” so I did. I pounded her down pretty good and she shut up after that. I went to seg for two weeks but it was totally worth it.

This indicates that many women use violence as a last resort. Instead, they go to staff members or other inmates for help. Conversely, men explain that they are expected to fight and have no other options. However, men also described the importance of social support in prison. An inmate at the Tecumseh State Correctional Institution defined respect like this:

Whenever I have a question or need to talk to someone, I go to my friends and they tell me how to handle a problem or they give me good advice. They tell me how to deal with the small problems and how to handle my issues.

An inmate from Omaha Correctional Center stated:

People who know boundaries and do not cross them do well with each other. People who look at other people’s stuff are shopping and everyone needs to keep their eyes on their own stuff.

This man explained that you stay out of trouble/fights (or “do well”) if you keep your hands off of other people’s things. He also explained that this creates a more respectful community. In other

words, if there are general rules about respecting boundaries, inmates will respect each other and the staff. He told me this story about how he helped out a correctional officer:

A guy had a bloody nose and it was really bleeding. He had blood all over his hands and, for a joke he wiped his bloody hands on the door to an employee bathroom. A few minutes later, a guard started opening the door so I told him about the blood. It was gross and I didn't want him to catch anything. Everyone here is under stress and the little things count.

Although men and women describe the importance of social support and common courtesy, a key difference in their accounts is the expectation to fight in men's prisons. Women state that they have other options. They can go to the staff for help or seek help from other inmates. For example, one woman told this story:

Two people in my cell jumped down my throat because they thought I spread a rumor. I get blamed for everything and don't ever spread rumors. A woman stood up for me and said that I didn't spread some rumor. I didn't say anything about anyone and a woman stood up for me.

Instead of fighting, these women used their words and stuck up for each other. In contrast, an inmate at the Lincoln Correctional Center stated:

The other guy was spreading rumors about me. I confronted him and told him to knock it off. He told me to fuck myself and I punched him.

An inmate at Tecumseh State Correctional Institution fought with a man for calling him names:

A dude called me a punk/bitch. I stood up and hit him and knocked him down. About a dozen of my guys jumped on him and beat his ass into the ground. Don't call names unless you are ready for war.

Question: How could you have avoided physical violence?

I couldn't. If someone calls you a punk or a bitch, you have to fight. There is no way around it. He fucked up and called me a punk/bitch so he was asking for it. I would be a punk if I let it go.

Rumors and name-calling are common examples of disrespect for both men and women.

However, men stated that they have no choice in the matter. If they back down, they risk further

torment because they are marked as an easy target. As we indexed these fights, we always asked how they could have avoided violence. When it came to name calling, men always stated that they had no other choice. This differs from other reasons for fighting. For example, those who fought over gambling would say that they could avoid these situations. One inmate from Tecumseh State Correctional Institute stated:

I was playing cards and got into a disagreement with a guy and he hauled off and hit me. It happened right in the pod and no one saw it. I'm amazing at how many fights they don't see. A lot of guys think that they do see fights but ignore them so they don't have to break it up. I've been hit by two inmates here and no one ever sees it in the big, high-tech prison. It makes you wonder about who is watching the cameras.

Question: Could you report him?

I guess, but it looks better if you just take it like a man and move on. You don't want to look like a little bitch here.

Question: How could you have avoided physical violence?

I didn't play cards with him after that.

One way that men avoid serious violence is to fight in a way so that they intentionally get caught. One man at Tecumseh State Correctional Institute described how this happens:

You have to know the difference between "for show" and "for real." If the guys want to really fight and it's serious, they'll call you out to the shower or the cell. Then they don't get caught, that's "for real" that means you want to really hurt each other. If it's just "for show" that means that they want it to get interrupted and they don't want to get hurt.

A Lieutenant stated:

The guys will fight or hit one another or they'll pick a fight with us. As soon as we get them off the yard they start apologizing and ask to go to P.C. They just have to do this in front of the other guys and then they ask for help.

Using Pearson's and Fisher's Chi-Square tests, we compared inmates in all five prisons along two variables: *If You Found Yourself in Trouble, Are There Staff Members That Would Help You? And Have You Experienced Violence in Prison?* (See Appendix D). The crosstab results

show that inmates in the two prisons reporting the highest rates of violence (Lincoln Correctional Center and the Nebraska State Penitentiary) were significantly different from the inmates in the other three prisons. In these two facilities, a higher proportion of inmates who got into fights also claimed that they could not go to the staff for help. It seems that staff support and positive staff/inmate interactions could make a difference with regard to violent behavior.

Staff and Inmate Interactions

Some inmates at all five facilities talked about a staff member that kept them out of trouble. One man at the Lincoln Correctional Center stated:

There are a couple of correctional officers who take their time and talk with me about my problems. Some of the guards are worthless or ignore us. Some of them are pretty good and reach out to us. There are two who have made my life so much easier here. They talk to me, encourage me to get into programs, tell me how to stay out of trouble and listen to me when I'm down. I really appreciate them.

An inmate at Omaha Correctional Centers stated:

My mental health worker and my caseworker are giving me advice and advising me about work skills. They encourage me to make my life better with education.

An inmate at the Nebraska State Penitentiary explained that his A.V.P. counselor helped him:

My counselor in A.V.P. gave me the tools to not get involved with anger or violence. He taught me to avoid anger and to set reasonable goals. This was the first time someone set reasonable goals with me and I met them all. It was very productive.

A woman at the Nebraska Correctional Center for Women had this to say about her anger issues:

My case manager helped me with my anger issues and with my depression. He really helped me to not go to seg for fighting.

An inmate at Tecumseh explained that some of the staff worked with him in a productive way:

My unit manager helps me with my program needs. He sits me down and tells me what I need and how I need to achieve my goals. He takes no shit and he is very blunt, I really need that. It's different than the guys who bark orders at you. The guards will just yell and bark orders at you and that doesn't work. I like to get direction but don't treat me like a child.

In Tables 24 and 25, we see that the majority of staff interviewed believed that staff members are respectful to inmates. Inmates at three prisons, Lincoln Correctional Center, Tecumseh State Correctional Institute and the Nebraska State Penitentiary are less likely to make this claim.

Table 24 - Are Staff Generally Respectful to the Inmates in this Prison? Staff Response.

Facility	Yes	No	Sometimes	Percent “yes” at This Prison
Omaha Correctional Center	15	2	4	71%
Lincoln Correctional Center	3	1	2	50%
Nebraska State Penitentiary	3	0	1	75%
Nebraska Correctional Center for Women	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Tecumseh State Correctional Institution	8	1	3	67%
Total	29	4	10	

Table 25 - Are Staff Generally Respectful to the Inmates in this Prison? Inmates Response.

Facility	Yes	No	Sometimes	Percent “yes” at This Prison
Omaha Correctional Center	35	14	15	55%
Lincoln Correctional Center	18	21	20	31%
Nebraska State Penitentiary	34	31	25	38%
Nebraska Correctional Center for Women	38	20	16	51%
Tecumseh State Correctional Institution	29	35	31	31%
Total	154	121	107	

Staff members gave specific examples of disrespect aimed at inmates. A correctional officer stated:

Some COs – they’ll frequently refer to inmates they don’t know by name as “inmate.” There are other ways to approach people you don’t know without using the tag. I’ll walk faster or get their attention or something if I don’t know their name. Or if you talk slightly louder than a general conversational tone, they all pay attention. Or, I’ll bring my voice down if they talk loud, so they’ll be quiet so they can all hear what you’re saying. If they don’t hear you, and you give them a direct order, they’ll get written up, so they want to make sure they hear what you say.

A Lieutenant explained why it is important to be humane to the inmates:

You can treat them like dogs and verbally abuse them. I take a different route. I talk to them and learn their name. I reach out to them and notice when they start acting different. Some of the guys here have come to me for help and I help them. I was talking to one guy on the yard once and he told me that, if anything bad ever happened at this prison, he and the other guys would always have my back. We kind of laughed about it but I figure that, it's better to have them humanize us. Bad shit can go down and I don't want to be the guy who tormented them.

A Unit Manager explained how he works to solve problems:

A guy came in to ask some questions and he mentioned that his cellie's ankles were swollen. I know that can be serious so I went and checked it out. It's best to be proactive about these things and take care of small problems before they become big problems.

An interesting theme emerging from the interviews with staff is that some are concerned about their own safety and blame other staff members for putting them in jeopardy. They claim that some staff provoke or openly harass the inmates and this could lead to retaliation. A Corporal stated:

To be honest, it's mostly us. The guys say shit to the inmates and push their buttons all the time. I'm always telling them that they are going to get themselves killed. They are going to get me killed. I think I just need to get out of here.

A correctional officer told this story about name calling between a fellow officer and an inmate:

Staff called him "You piece of shit! You're going to be here forever" and the inmate said, "I'm leaving!" and the staff member said back, "You'll be back, I know for sure." It depends on the relationship. You can say that in a certain way and it's okay, or you can say it another way and they know that they're being disrespectful. We get called on that – it's grievable. It never helps anyone to be like that, especially in this setting. No matter how pissed you are, why make it any worse?

A Lieutenant stated that she has seen correctional staff yell at, and make fun of inmates:

The guys will be leaving and they'll yell, "whatever, you'll be back" and they call names. You can see the anger between them and I'm really surprised that there aren't more fights here.

We asked all interviewees: *When inmates get into verbal fights with staff, what is this typically about?* Responses were coded into two different categories. If they say that the staff are usually at fault (such as the responses above) then we coded “staff at fault” if they stated that the inmates are typically at fault (e.g., inmates refuse to follow orders), then we coded “inmates at fault.”

Some interviewees blamed both so both categories were coded (see Table 26).

Table 26 – Arguments between Staff and Inmates are Caused By?

Facility	Inmate Response		Staff Response	
	Inmates at Fault	Staff at Fault	Inmates at Fault	Staff at Fault
Omaha Correctional Center	56%	72%	95%	24%
Lincoln Correctional Center	61%	88%	100%	--
Nebraska State Penitentiary	46%	84%	67%	75%
Nebraska Correctional Center for Women	72%	60%	N/A	N/A
Tecumseh State Correctional Institution	50%	84%	75%	50%

The responses by inmates and staff indicate that conflict is viewed as a two way street.

Culturally, this becomes a cyclical problem in which inmates and staff call each other names or yell at each other and this triggers hard feelings and resentment. The level of frustration rises and they snap at each other and this creates even more tension.

As you can see from Tables 27 and 28, few interviewees believe that inmates are respectful to the staff. In fact, only 17% of the inmates and 33% of the staff interviewed at the Lincoln Correctional Center believed that inmates are respectful to the staff. The Omaha Correctional Center ranked the highest with 90% of the staff and 53% of inmates we interviewed claiming that the inmates were respectful to the staff. Originally, we wanted this to be a dichotomous variable (yes and no); however, interviewees argued that this is not a black and white issue. Some people are respectful, and some are not. Therefore, we used the response

“sometimes” for those who said things like “it depends on the person” or “people are different every day” or (more commonly) “it’s about 50-50.”

Table 27 - Are Inmates Generally Respectful to the Staff in this prison? Staff Response.

Facility	Yes	No	Sometimes	Percent “yes” at This Prison
Omaha Correctional Center	19	1	1	90%
Lincoln Correctional Center	2	1	3	33%
Nebraska State Penitentiary	3	1	0	75%
Nebraska Correctional Center for Women	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Tecumseh State Correctional Institution	6	3	3	50%
Total	30	6	7	

Table 28 - Are Inmates Generally Respectful to the Staff in this prison? Inmate Response.

Facility	Yes	No	Sometimes	Percent “yes” at This Prison
Omaha Correctional Center	34	19	11	53%
Lincoln Correctional Center	10	31	18	17%
Nebraska State Penitentiary	35	33	22	39%
Nebraska Correctional Center for Women	27	29	18	36%
Tecumseh State Correctional Institution	24	46	26	25%
Total	130	158	95	

The qualitative data indicate that disrespectful behaviors aimed at the staff include: name calling, yelling, slamming doors, and refusing to follow orders. Many times, inmates describe disrespectful behavior that results from a lack of communication that frustrates the inmates. An inmate at the Lincoln Correctional Center told this story:

I had worked in the kitchen all damn day and I was really sweaty. When you work in the kitchen you sweat and you smell like food. I left and went to take a shower and a guard told me that I couldn’t shower because of the modified schedule. You know, I was tired and smelly and I just wanted to shower. I knew I couldn’t get any sleep if I felt disgusting so, I yelled at him. I knew I shouldn’t do it but there’s no discussion, they just

bark their orders and walk away. There's no cooperating and then they wonder why the inmates take a swing at them.

Another inmate at the Lincoln Correctional Center also blamed the staff for making him frustrated:

The problem is that the staff doesn't know how to handle themselves. They need to be trained to manage problems instead of starting them. They have no communication skills and they don't really understand our way of doing things. They will yell when they don't have to and this just gives us an excuse to ignore them or lash out.

However, men and women describe working with some staff members who reach out to them.

The key is to learn with whom you can work with. An inmate at Lincoln Correctional Center explains:

I like to talk with the staff and I have fun with some of them, they are good people. Lots of time, we will give each other shit, just tease each other and stuff and I don't have to worry about getting written up. I'll work out or something and tell a guard, "hey, I bet I can do more push ups than you" and he'll laugh and say "no way" that kind of stuff. I'm not really insulting him or anything, just joking around. Other guys are not that cool. If you even look at them cross-eyed, they write you up. We avoid those guys cuz you can't work with someone who is just looking to bust you. I know who is here to help us and who isn't.

An inmate from the Nebraska State Penitentiary stated:

I usually ask them how their day is if we are just standing around waiting for something. Some of them are nice guys and they'll share some funny story or something. Some will just complain about their day and stuff.

One inmate at the Nebraska State Penitentiary explained that staff members get frustrated and then snap at the inmates:

One of the bubble officers told me, "I have a headache because you keep asking me for things" and I said, "I don't know what you mean, I haven't seen you all day and I've never asked you for anything." He just got mad and told me to mind my own business. What the hell? He started it and I just pointed out that he was wrong.

Some of the men described using humor as a way to defuse a bad situation. An inmate at the Nebraska State Penitentiary explained what happened when an inmate cursed at a correctional officer:

The other day, an inmate told this guard to go fuck himself and we all stopped to see what he'd say and he turned around and said, "I love you too." We all laughed our ass off. That's how they should handle these guys. Just mock them and take the wind out of their sails.

Research shows that inmates often use humor to test each other's boundaries and see whom they bring into their social circle (Terry 1997); the men in this study often described the benefit of using humor to defuse a bad situation. This is one example of how a tense situation was defused with humor.

An important point to make is that interviewees claim that verbal disrespect is the most common cause of conflict in these facilities. Disrespect causes violence between inmates and between inmates and the staff. If staff members, especially correctional staff who are in constant contact with inmates, resort to name-calling or harassing the inmates, they put themselves and their fellow officers in danger. These data show a direct connection between negative social interactions and institutional violence. More troubling is the fact that inmates report witnessing a good deal of conflict between staff members.

Staff Conflict

As pointed out in Tables 29 and 30, some inmates and staff claim that the staff members are disrespectful to each other. Also, 28% (n = 12) of the staff members we interviewed admitted to having at least one fight with a colleague in front of the inmates. If they argue or fight with each other in front of the inmates, this undermines their authority. This raises the tension level in these prisons and promotes a culture of disrespect.

Table 29 - Are Staff Generally Respectful to Each Other? Staff Response.

Facility	Yes	No	Sometimes	Percent “yes” at This Prison
Omaha Correctional Center	13	4	4	62%
Lincoln Correctional Center	4	1	1	67%
Nebraska State Penitentiary	3	0	1	75%
Nebraska Correctional Center for Women	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Tecumseh State Correctional Institution	8	2	2	67%
Total	28	7	8	

Table 30 - Are Staff Generally Respectful to Each Other? Inmate Response.

Facility	Yes	No	Sometimes	Percent “yes” at This Prison
Omaha Correctional Center	57	5	2	89%
Lincoln Correctional Center	43	6	9	74%
Nebraska State Penitentiary	55	16	15	64%
Nebraska Correctional Center for Women	48	12	12	67%
Tecumseh State Correctional Institution	56	23	13	61%
Total	259	62	51	

Inmates discussed three general issues about staff conflict. First, they claimed that some staff do not support one another and undermine each other. For example, one inmate at the Nebraska State Penitentiary stated that a correctional officer complained about other officers:

A guard told me that some of the guards here are young and immature and they eat each other’s food and think it’s funny. I think that’s very disrespectful. You shouldn’t eat other people’s lunch.

One inmate at the Nebraska State Penitentiary stated that this detracts from their ability to help the inmates:

I knew of a caseworker that pissed off another guy and they took turns fighting and writing each other up all the time. They have zero time to help us because they want to carry out their own drama.

Some claim that the staff calls each other names:

A guard called a female guard a bitch to the other guys and they laughed. They tell each other all the time that they are useless. Very disrespectful to each other.

Inmates often stated that these incidents waste time that the staff could spend doing their job or helping inmates with their problems. This also lowers the level of discourse and gives the inmates an excuse to be rude to the staff.

Inmates also stated that some staff members discuss personal things in front of the inmates. They talk about parties they all attend and who is dating whom. For example, one inmate at the Tecumseh State Correctional Institute stated:

There are a couple of guards here who party a lot. They come in hungover and I can still smell the alcohol on them. They talk to each other about who got the most drunk or who ended up going home with who. They don't really try to be quiet about it. It's a youth thing. They just like to brag to each other about how much they party.

Another inmate at the Tecumseh State Correctional Institute had this to say:

They get upset about being furloughed without pay and talk about it. They really talk some serious smack about each other and who is lazy and who sleeps around.

One inmate at the Nebraska State Penitentiary stated that the staff is nicer to him than each other:

I went to a correctional officer and asked a question, he said he'd check and he called another guy and they got into a fight on the phone. He called the other guy a bunch of names and cursed at him. I just stood there until he was done and then he said, "sorry, I don't have an answer for you." He was nicer to me than the guy on the other end.

Inmates claim that these events usually waste their time or make them uncomfortable. However, they describe a third kind of problem between staff that can lead to bigger problems. Some inmates claim that male staff members undermine the female staff. They do this in two ways.

First, inmates claimed that staff make sexual comments about the female staff or say unflattering

things about these women. For example, one inmate at Nebraska State Penitentiary told this story:

We were in line once and a male guard told the other male guards that a female guard needed to lose weight. They all laughed. One of the inmates said, “hey man, that’s not cool” and the guy said, “it’s just a joke, she’d think it was funny.” I told him “you know, I know a lot of women and I can’t think of one that would think that was funny” and they all shut up. I think I embarrassed them.

Inmates also stated that women are sometimes ignored. An inmate at the Nebraska Correctional Center for Women stated:

I saw a female caseworker go ask a male caseworker a question. I guess he didn’t know the answer or something because he ignored her. He acted like he didn’t even hear her and he walked away.

Another female inmate stated:

The lieutenant is horrible to one of the corporals. He could not be more rude to her. He’s nice to the other guys but talks to her like she’s dirt. Maybe he just doesn’t like women. She doesn’t say anything back but I feel sorry for her.

Inmates also claim that staff members discuss dating or having sexual relationships with female staff:

The guys, the officers, they talk to each other all the time about who they are with. You know, their partners. They talk about passing around the women in here a lot. I don’t know what to believe. I can’t believe some of these women would actually do these guys but maybe it happens. I just don’t know why they talk about it so much. I guess they are young guys who are getting laid and want to brag about it.

The main problem with staff harassing other staff members is that this makes these inmates view these staff members as *female first* and *authority figure* second. This sets the tone for inmate misconduct and opens the door to sexual harassment. Indeed, inmates admitted that they harass the female staff. They stated that fellow inmates hit on the female staff members and yell sexually inappropriate things to them on the prison yard. An inmate at Tecumseh State Correctional Institute stated:

The females are called bitches or whores. It really only happens here and at NSP. Lots of talk about the women and they talk about them like they are prostitutes. You heard what they said to you and your friends on the yard? That's nothing; I've heard it all. No respect for women here and it's not just the chi-mos, [child molesters] it's the normal guys.

Another problem that emerged was that inmates claim that male staff members were distrustful of the female staff. For example, one inmate at the Tecumseh State Correctional Institute stated:

If a male guard talks to me about getting a job after I get out, he's helping me and no one seems to care. If a female guard does the same thing, they will come over and take her aside and ask what's going on. I think the women here resent the implication. How are they supposed to do their job if they can't talk with us? I have not hit on any women here and I haven't been hit on but they do try to drive a wedge between us and the women. I would never want to work here as a female.

From the perspective of the inmates, this was indicative of a larger issue where inmates feel disconnected from the prison staff. In some ways, inmates discussed the problem of social distancing at all facilities. However, inmates at the Tecumseh State Correctional Institute were more likely to discuss this issue (according to our qualitative interviews) because of two things that are specific to this prison. First, inmates blame the technology used at this prison for depersonalizing the prison environment. They state that this decreases the level of contact between the inmates and staff. One inmate stated:

The staff only has to go on the yard once in a while. They don't have to come out and deal with interpersonal problems so they look at us on camera and then lock us down. It makes us less human to them and they don't know what's really going on here. Every day the guys on the yard talk about taking over the prison. I didn't hear that at the Lincoln Correctional Center or the Pen. Every day the guys talk about how they have no one here and I worry about the day that they do something about it.

Another inmate stated:

They don't want to do their job. They hide from us all day and use their cameras to see what we're doing. They don't want to know what's really going on so they write us up, send us to the hole or ignore us. I can't blame them. There are some horrible people here. I wouldn't want to work with these guys either. I wouldn't want their job.

Inmates also discussed the segregation unit at the Tecumseh State Correctional Institute. Inmates transfer from one prison to another so they know that segregation is used at other facilities (i.e., the Lincoln Correctional Center or The Nebraska State Penitentiary) as a “cooling off” tool where you typically spend 14 days after a fight. However, segregation is considered a more severe punishment at the Tecumseh State Correctional Institute:

They send you down there 45-60 days for your first fight. You zone out when you fight, and they don't expect you to have that. If you don't stop fighting when they tell you, that's a year in the hole. They don't expect you to have natural human reactions. They don't have an understanding of natural human behavior. Even chipmunks have natural reactions.

Moreover, inmates believe that the staff at the Tecumseh State Correctional Institute avoids working with inmates because they have these tools at their disposal.

The staff here has easy jobs. They have this high tech prison and they drag people down to their SMU housing all the time. They have to keep that filled up or they can't justify having it when the prisons are all overcrowded. This means that they have to find busy work to do and they write up every little, nitpicky thing. This pisses off they guys who feel like they are in kindergarten.

As inmates transfer from one prison to the next, they learn the cultural differences at each facility. One inmate (from the Tecumseh State Correctional Institute) explained that women are treated differently at these prisons:

I've been to LCC and the Pen, the women staff here [the Tecumseh State Correctional Institute] are treated like dirt. The guys [inmates] constantly yell at them and they are constantly harassed. The guys either yell at them and call them a bitch, or they scream sexual stuff at them. I've never seen such harassment in my whole life. I hear what they say to you [the researchers] on the yard and I'm sorry. It's very disrespectful.

Inmate Interactions With Researchers

Methodologically, the research team spent time in each of the facilities and interacted with inmates in offices, the prison yard, and hallways. Five of the six researchers are women. In

all of the men's prisons, inmates flirted with researchers or asked us personal questions¹³. We were all trained to handle these situations and, at no time, did we feel threatened or stop an interview because of this behavior. Inmates were respectfully told that they could continue the interview or leave. While this was a nuisance, it did not stop our work.

Inmates also shouted at us on the yard but mostly made jokes or called out to us by name. For example, while we walked across the yard at the Lincoln Correctional Center, an inmate yelled "hey, are you guys a new prison gang?" All of the research team, staff, and inmates laughed at his remark. However, inmates at the Tecumseh State Correctional Institute were the only inmates to yell catcalls or whistle at us in the yard. Interestingly, though, during the actual interviews, they were not more likely to flirt with the researchers than inmates at other institutions; only their public displays were different.

By the third day of data collecting, this behavior stopped. We were given two explanations for why this happened. First, the Tecumseh State Correctional Institute representative, Danny Hayes, spoke with some of the more vocal inmates and directly asked them to stop¹⁴. After observing the interactions between Mr. Hayes and the inmates, and hearing what the inmates say about him, it became obvious to the research team that the inmates respect Mr. Hayes and his opinions. Secondly, some of the inmates (such as the man quoted above) were apologetic about these interactions. They explained that they spoke to the men on the yard as well. For example, a gang leader stated:

I'm a gang leader here and I saw how the guys reacted to you on the yard. I'm sorry about that. You know, it's not the Mexican guys, we know better than that. It's mostly the brothers. I'll talk to the guys on the yard and tell them to cut it out. They just don't know who you are so I'll have a talk with them.

¹³ For example, an inmate at the Nebraska State Penitentiary asked the researcher what kind of birth control she uses. He noted that this information was relevant to him because he has a latex allergy, thereby implying that some sort of sexual contact would occur between the inmate and the researcher.

¹⁴ This was not done in front of the researchers, nor was it done at the researchers' request.

This man wanted to distance himself from those who publically harass women. The most interesting thing about this quote is that he believes that the reason why the men do this is because *they do not know us*. In other words, once they get to know someone, they would not publically embarrass them. Getting to know someone also raises the level of respect shown between the inmates and non-inmates. For example, a female Lieutenant at the Lincoln Correctional Center stated:

When I first got this job, the guys would catcall us on the yard and say stuff to us. After a while, it's more about a working relationship. They may flirt and stuff but it's different. They talk to me now and come to me with their problems.

To be fair, this is a high security prison, and some of the inmates at the Tecumseh State Correctional Institute were probably sent there because they had discipline issues at other facilities. In other words, this is a high-risk population that is prone to violence. Prison staff should take every precaution with these inmates and not develop personal friendships with them. However, if they can cultivate more productive working relationships with the inmates, they could reduce the chance of an inmate-on-staff assault. This may also increase the number of positive social interactions between inmates and female staff members.

In the men's prisons, the inmates are male and the staff is still mostly male. This creates a hyper-masculine environment where gender becomes salient. Women who work in these prisons must deal with sexual harassment from the inmates and, if the staff is not supporting them *as colleagues*, this sends a message to the inmates that women are different and inferior. For example, an inmate the Omaha Correctional Center told this story about two caseworkers who fought on the job:

There were these two women caseworkers that got into a fight about the inmates. One thought that the other one was being too nice to the inmates and she yelled at her to stop it. The bitchy one set the nice one up and got her fired.

This inmate described this issue in gendered terms. They are “women” caseworkers. One of them is “bitchy.” He describes this as a *female problem*, rather than a *staff problem*. Of course, we cannot hide our gender or force people to think in gender-neutral terms. However, staff members should do everything they can to project the idea that the staff is capable of doing their job, regardless of gender. If female staff members are discouraged from working with the inmates, this sends the wrong message and brings unwanted attention to these women.

Considering the job they do, it is dangerous to make these women look weak in front of the inmates. If staff members discuss these women in sexual terms, they further undermine the credibility of all female staff by highlighting gender differences and sexualizing their colleagues. Male inmates do not have safe and legal access to women while incarcerated. This is one of the reasons why there is a high degree of transitional homosexuality in men’s prisons (Fleisher and Krienert 2009; Trammell 2011). Discussing these women in sexual terms increases the sexual tension in these facilities.

The staff members are human beings who will slip up and may say derogatory things in front of the inmates, but it is also important to note that it seems as if the inmates have also witnessed more serious events that put women at risk of harassment or violence. Staff should be aware of the implications of such actions and should show inmates that female staff is just as competent and capable as their male counterparts. If staff members want to increase the level of respect shown by the inmates, they must model appropriate behavior in front of them.

Sexual Abuse

In our sample, a total of 16 (4.1%) inmates stated that they were involved in some form of sexual abuse with other inmates in prison. A total of 5 inmates stated that they were sexually abused on two occasions, so the total number of incidents is 21. The type and level of abuse

varies and is outlined in Table 31. There were three inmates who stated that they were not sexually abused and they did not sexually abuse anyone but witnessed sexual abuse between inmates. One woman at the Nebraska Correctional Center for Women stated that she was sexually assaulted twice at the Douglass County Jail.

Table 31 – Sexual Abuse Between Inmates

Facility	Inmate was Sexually Assaulted		Inmate Sexually Assaulted Another	Attempted Sexual Assault		Inmate Witnessed a Sexual Assault		Inmate Was Sexually Assaulted in County Jail	
Omaha Correctional Center	--		1 (reported)	--		--		--	
Lincoln Correctional Center	5	3 reported and 2 not reported	--	1 (not reported)		1 (not reported)		--	
Nebraska State Penitentiary	1 (not reported)		--	3 (not reported)		1 (not reported)		--	
Nebraska Correctional Center for Women	--		--	4	3 reported and 1 not reported	--		2	1 reported and 1 not reported
Tecumseh State Correctional Institution	--		--	1 (not reported)		1 (not reported)		--	
Total	6		1	9		3		2	

Table 32 – The Cause of the Sexual Assault

Causes of Sexual Abuse	Frequency
Disrespect	1
Gangs	3
Sex	10
Pressured to have sex	7
Total	21

We asked these 16 people about the cause of the assault and their responses are listed in Table 32. The most common reason listed was sex, and seven other respondents stated that they were being pressured to have sex. A total of three male inmates stated that they were sexually

assaulted because of gang activity. An inmate at the Lincoln Correctional Center explained that he was raped because his gang offered another man protection and could not protect him:

These black guys raped this other guy and he asked me if I would protect him. He paid me for protection and I didn't let anyone rape him. One time, a group of three guys came at him and I, and they were going to rape him again. I was paid to protect him so I had to offer myself up to them instead. He didn't get raped but they all raped me. They took me anally. I could have killed these guys or took the money and did nothing but I did the right thing. I was raped as a kid so I knew what to expect and it was not too hard for me.

Unfortunately, these men sexually assaulted him again on another day. Another man at the Tecumseh State Correctional Institute stated that some gang members attempted to rape him because he refused to join their gang. He was able to defend himself and stop the rape:

Two guys ran up on me and jumped me. One of them held me down and the other one tried to rape me. I pulled away from one of the guys and swung on him. I hit him pretty hard and he passed out. The other guy backed off and told me to be cool. I told him to back the fuck off. They are the biggest bunch of pussies I have ever seen. I took down two of them at once, that's how lame they are. The one guy was still unconscious and bleeding pretty bad when I walked away.

Neither of these cases was reported; the men stated that they “took care” of the problem and did not see any reason to involve the prison staff. A total of 11 or 53% of these assaults were reported to the prison staff.

Table 33 – Sexual Abuse – Inmates and Staff

Facility	Inappropriate/Uncomfortable Interaction With Staff	Sexual Relationship With a Staff Member	Sexual Relationship in Another State
Omaha Correctional Center	--	--	--
Lincoln Correctional Center	--	1	1
Nebraska State Penitentiary	2	--	--
Nebraska Correctional Center for Women	--	--	1
Tecumseh State Correctional Institution	1	4	
Total	3	5	2

No inmates in our study reported being raped or forced to have sex with staff members (see Table 33). One inmate at the Tecumseh State Correctional Institute reported that some of

the staff is careless or inept at strip searches and he had to report one staff member after an aggressive pat down:

I was coming out of the visitor's area and getting patted down. They put this young guy on the job and he checked my butt too many times and took too long checking my privates. I have never had this happen before. The guy looked like he was about twelve years old. I asked him if he was new and he said yes. I told him that he wasn't doing it right and he apologized. I ended up reporting it. I don't believe that I was sexually assaulted or anything. I just think that, if they are going to put people in the position of touching someone so intimately, they need to train them. This guy could have done this to the wrong guy and got hurt. The problem is that they turn these guys over so often because no one wants to work here. Then they get these young guys and they don't train them.

A man from Nebraska State Penitentiary told this story:

I think a caseworker is gay because he came into the shower and looked at my junk and said, "what do you have going on down there." I guess I should have reported that.

Some men stated that some staff are homosexual and "really enjoy" the strip searches. These men do not claim to be sexually abused by the staff but are uncomfortable with the pat downs or men that are presumed to be homosexual, or both.

A total of five inmates admitted to having a sexual relationship with a staff member in Nebraska. These were all male inmates and the staff members are all female. These inmates understand that these relationships were illegal and that these women broke official protocol. However, they describe these relationships as "consensual." According to the 2010 Prison Rape Elimination Act (PREA) study, 39,121 prison inmates in the United States were victims of staff sexual misconduct in 2008-09. Approximately 69% of the perpetrators were female staff members (Beck and Harrison 2010).

We presume that the aforementioned concern about female staff and inmate interaction is connected to this issue. It is deeply troubling to think that anyone would abuse a position of power by having a sexual relationship with an incarcerated felon. Considering the data presented

by PREA researchers, it is understandable to be concerned about female staff. However, these relationships can develop between men as well. In fact, an alleged sexual relationship between a male correctional officer and male inmate at the Omaha Correctional Center resulted in a recent arrest (Womack 2012). Last August, a male correctional officer was arrested for allegedly having sex with a recent Nebraska Correctional Center for Women parolee (Duggan 2011). It is unreasonable to presume that only female staff is at-risk of having sexual relationships with inmates. While it is understandable to want to protect female staff members, we contend that staff should be treated the same, regardless of gender.

According to the 2010 Prison Rape Elimination Act (PREA), approximately 4.4% of inmates report being sexually abused in American prisons (Beck and Harrison 2010). Although previous research showed that the Nebraska State prison system (and Tecumseh in particular) had a higher than average rate of inmate sexual abuse (Struckman-Johnson et al 1996), we find no current evidence that this is the case. The rate of sexual abuse reported in our random sample is on par with the national average of sexual abuse in American prisons.

Female Inmates

Much of this report focuses on the behaviors in men's prisons. The simple fact is that men are more violent than women in prison. However, conflict does occur in women's institutions; it is just very different than conflict in men's prisons. Our findings show that 31% of the reported fights at the Nebraska Correctional Center for Women involved fights between sexual partners. Also, 65% of the women we interviewed stated that verbal arguments between inmates happen because of "girlfriend" issues and 68% stated that physical violence happens because of "girlfriend" issues. When asked for more details about what "girlfriend issues" meant

in this environment, women stated that female inmates fight with their girlfriends and fight with other female prisoners over issues related to their girlfriends (such as jealousy, cheating, etc.).

Interviewees explain that these intimate relationships negatively affect inmate culture because they disrupt the daily lives of the inmates. Many described these relationships as abusive:

There is a lot of domestic abuse here. The women get girlfriends and then they beat each other up. I think they learn that from their homes. Their dads beat up their moms and their man beat them up. This is all they know and they just bring it into the prison. They also get possessive and beat up girls who hit on their girlfriends. They don't get it. When they leave, these women will go back to men. They don't really own these women and this is only temporary.

Another woman explained that these relationships are dysfunctional:

I have to say the girlfriends are a problem. These romantic relationships are unhealthy. They involve two dysfunctional women who thrive on the fights they have. I think they just want to know that someone cares for them so they get totally jealous over each other all the time and they beat each other up. It's not a gay thing; I'm fine with that. It's the abuse.

Often, these women have public fights. This brings a lot of unnecessary chaos into the inmates's lives. One woman told a story about a public fight she had with an ex-girlfriend:

I was going to put my tray in the window. We were fighting when we were seeing each other. She went back to her ex-girlfriend. She saw me and came and dumped her tray all over me. I didn't fight her or hit back or nothin'.

Research shows that approximately 57% of incarcerated women have a history of abuse. Men in prison report less abuse: an average of 15% of male inmates are survivors of childhood abuse, and 5.8% of male inmates are abused as adults (Chesney-Lind 2002). Studies confirm that prison girlfriends can, and do, abuse each other (Alarid 2000; Greer 2000). It is quite likely that these women model their prison relationships after their non-prison relationships that are equally troubling.

It is quite possible that these relationships offer positive social interactions. The women in this study, however, often stated that these relationships negatively impacted prison culture.

Moreover, they described the fact that women become possessive of each other:

It's always about the girlfriends. They hook up with each other and then fight. It bothers me because it's about women as property. They say, "You are mine" and then get upset if the girl looks at another woman. I don't like to see anyone like property and that's what they're doing.

Overall, women stated that they crave social interactions and positive reinforcement, and, unlike the men, they are willing to report disruptive behavior. The women in this study described the social needs of their fellow inmates and how their girlfriends meet some of these needs. The problem is that incarcerated women are often drug-addicted and survivors of abuse. Therefore, the relationships and lifestyles they have prior to going into prison will shape the relationships they develop while incarcerated, as well as their ability to cope with life in this institutional environment.

VII Recommendations

Drawing from these data, we offer some suggestions for the Nebraska Department of Correctional Services. These suggestions center on four basic areas: Conflict Management, Threat Groups, Female Offenders, and Public Image. Some suggestions come from the inmates and staff we interviewed. We asked them how they would raise the level of respect in prison. For example, inmates routinely complained about the "passing and receiving" rule. They understand the possible problems that this behavior causes but claim that sharing food or drinks sends a positive message and raises social cohesion. Inmates and prison staff offered us other ideas about how to decrease conflict and increase social cohesion in these facilities.

Conflict Management

Inmates generally want positive social interactions with staff members and each other. We interviewed no one that wants chaos or an uncontrollable prison facility. Furthermore, interviewees stated that inmates and staff should find better and more effective ways to communicate with each other in order to reduce tension, frustration, and violence. This was the most common recommendation from the interviewees. Social psychological research finds that some groups become divided as “out-groups” or “enemies” and each side depersonalizes each other (Tajfel 2010). This leads to a culture of hostility between these groups and lowers the chance of cooperation.

This also leads to situations where you tune out or ignore the other because 1) the other person is a subordinate and 2) you are not willing to take an interest in his/her life because of the difference in statuses. Erving Goffman (1959) was the first to describe the subordinates as the “non-person.” Inmates describe how staff talks about their sex lives or their drinking habits in a way that indicates that they are treating the inmate as a non-person. This is dangerous because this means that staff members are letting down their guard and bringing the inmates into their personal lives. More importantly, this shows the inmates that the staff is sometimes divided which is an indication of weakness. Finally, inmates describe this as unprofessional behavior and believe that this impedes their ability to get anything done. However, this can be addressed by increasing the level of contact and cooperation between these groups.

At one of the prisons, we were told that they set up a committee that included staff and inmates to determine the supply needs for the different housing units. People on both sides were hesitant at first but, in time, this committee worked well together with relatively few problems. We suggest that you create more of these kinds of committees. Research indicates that hostile groups can overcome their prejudices and work together if given a specific task to accomplish

(Tajfel 2010). These committees could focus on things like housing issues or conflict management. Ideally, inmates would represent their housing units and work as a liaison between the inmates and staff.

This could raise the level of professionalization between these two groups. This also allows both groups to see the other as problem solvers rather than instigators. This would allow inmates to talk through their problems instead of being told “yes or no” with no explanation. It is not possible to solve all of the inmate problems. Therefore, it may be best to reduce the level of frustration that comes from having a lack of a “voice” in this community. This could give prison staff and inmates a chance to calmly listen to the social reality of the “out-group” and talk through these problems in a safe environment.

We interviewed inmates in all facilities who were self-described “leaders¹⁵” among the inmates. Some of them were leaders of their club or were recognized by their boss as the “go to” person at their work detail. This empowered them to help others and solve problems. These are the types of inmates that would work well as an inmate liaison because they can be trusted by both inmates and staff members. We also suggest that inmates and staff coordinate efforts that reward staff members for helping inmates overcome specific problems. We spoke with inmates at each facility who stated that some staff members go out of their way to help them get into a program or get out of a gang. These staff members should be recognized in a way that inspires others to do so. In other words, staff members who are mentoring inmates in a pro-social fashion should be recognized as community leaders.

Staff members should be made aware of our findings. They should understand the connection between disrespect and inmate violence. When staff members contribute to a culture of disrespect, they put themselves and others at risk of harm. The fact that staff members were

¹⁵ Not shot-callers. These inmates were the president of their club or a leader in their religious group.

willing to discuss the inappropriate behaviors of their colleagues indicates that they are well aware of the problems that these behaviors cause.

These ideas are meant to address two specific issues. First, this allows inmates and prison staff to communicate with each other in a functional manner. Secondly, this allows inmates to discuss their problems in a productive way. In other words, this gives inmates other options to work out their problems. Clearly, the women in this study learned to solve problems by using social networks and friendships. Research shows that women are better at using social networks to solve problems (Chodorow 1978; Thorne 1993). While it is not possible to force men to act like women, we could focus on improving their communication skills. Male inmates do value the social support they receive from each other and the prison staff. It may help to formalize these arrangements and open the lines of communication between inmates and staff.

Inmates in all five facilities believe that the inmates and the prison staff would benefit from classes or seminars on cultural diversity. Nebraska is not a racially or culturally diverse state. According to the data from the United States Census, 86% of Nebraskans are white, 4.5% are African-Americans, 9.2% are Hispanics, and 1% is Native American¹⁶ (U.S. Census 2010). In these five facilities, 56% of the inmates are white, 26% are African-Americans, 12% are Hispanics, and .04% is Native Americans. Although race is not the leading cause of violence in this system, gangs are racially identified. Many inmates stated that they met someone of another race *for the first time* in prison. Inmates are also concerned about staff communicating with minorities in a way that increases tension because of racial or ethnic differences¹⁷. These classes or events could build community and raise awareness of other cultures for both inmates and staff.

¹⁶ Nationally, whites make up 72%, African-Americans make up 13%, Hispanics make up 16% and Native Americans make up .9% of the U.S. population.

¹⁷ As an inmate from the Nebraska Correctional Center for Women stated, "They could use some cultural sensitivities classes. They know nothing about minorities here. These are people right off the farm who don't have a clue about inner-city stuff."

This approach was used by the administration at the Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction in order to reduce racism and hostility in their prison system. The Ohio DRC hired more minority correctional officers. More importantly, they created cultural diversity programs for the inmates. These programs cover a wide variety of issues. For example, several months per year, they focus on multicultural activities. Instead of focusing on one event (e.g., Cinco de Mayo), they have multicultural events that focus on diversity and cultural awareness. Also, the employees were trained in handling and defusing hostile situations surrounding race, ethnicity, and religion. If the staff is more tolerant and shows respect to all people, this models appropriate behavior for the inmates (Wilkinson and Unwin 1999).

If the goal were to increase a culture of mutual respect, cultural events would show inmates that the staff members are dedicated to building community and finding productive ways to communicate. There are several universities in Nebraska that have sociology, anthropology, women's studies, and even ethnic studies¹⁸ departments. There are professors and graduate students in these departments that specialize in issues pertaining to race and ethnicity. Representatives from the Nebraska Department of Correctional Services should create alliances with these professionals to develop meaningful workshops or events that include staff members and inmates.

We should note that violent offenders were more likely to assault inmates at the Omaha Correctional Center, the Nebraska State Penitentiary and the Nebraska Correctional Center for Women. Violent offenders at the Tecumseh State Correctional Institute are more likely to assault staff (see Appendix C). We assume that violent offenders are enrolled in anti-violence programs or anger management classes. If not, we recommend that they be placed in these programs to help reduce the chances of assaulting inmates or staff.

¹⁸ For example, the University of Nebraska, Lincoln houses an Institute for Ethnic Studies.

Threat Groups

Drawing from these data, we see that gangs are a problem in this prison system. Gangs run underground businesses such as the drug trade, commit violence, and lower the quality of life for the inmates. A common tactic used against prison gangs is that of *identification and suppression*. For example, the Security Threat Group program used by the Arizona Department of Corrections evaluates inmates to determine if they are gang members. If, after evaluating the evidence, they identify an inmate as a gang member, the “validated” inmate is confronted and told that he or she can renounce their gang, refuse to renounce, or appeal the decision. Those that are found to be valid gang members who refuse to renounce their gang are put into super-max units for the duration of their sentence (Griffin 2007). Fisher (2002) evaluated this study and found that few inmates renounced their gang (14%) and those that did often remained in the super-max units. In other words, there was little incentive for gang members to renounce. Moreover, those who renounce their gangs still committed violations at a higher rate than the general prison population (Fisher 2002). He found that removing the 625 validated inmates from the general population reduced riots, drug violations, and fighting by 50%¹⁹.

There are problems with these programs. First, validating inmates as gang members targets associations, rather than behaviors and is based on whether or not someone meets the gang criteria. This opens the door for abuse or mistakes that could be costly. For example, Mr. Ernesto Lira was validated as a prison gang member in California and spent 8 years in segregation. After experiencing mental health problems as a result of this long-term social isolation, Mr. Lira successfully sued the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation. The court found that the evidence used to validate Mr. Lira as a gang member was unreliable and violated his right to due process (United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth

¹⁹ Between 1994-2000.

Circuit 2011). This opens the door for other lawsuits aimed at these gang suppression programs and the overuse of segregation units by prison administrators. This could also push periphery gang members or associates further into the prison gangs because of the labeling process. In other words, verifying gang members may actually increase the number of gang members (Toch 2007).

Secondly, the identification and suppression technique does little to rehabilitate gang members. Validated gang members serve time in segregation units and this keeps them out of prison programs. Studies show that gang members entering prison often suffer from psychiatric problems, histories of physical and sexual abuse, histories of substance abuse, and post-traumatic stress disorder (Davis and Flannery 2001). Once these inmates are released, they still suffer from these ailments and now deal with the problems associated with long-term isolation. This does little to help them return to their community and avoid criminal behavior (Griffin 2007). In other words, we may make the prison community safer in the short-run but the non-prison communities less safe after these inmates are released.

In fact, Krienert and Fleisher (2001) studied gang members in Nebraskan prisons and found that gang members were in dire need of rehabilitative programs. They state:

What should alarm correctional officials is the high level of social deficiencies in the self-reported gang cohort. These inmates are poorly educated, have little meaningful employment history, have a propensity toward aggressive and violent behavior, and have high levels of drug addiction (57).

They recommend that gang members should be targeted for prison programs such as substance abuse programs, educational programs, and job training programs. They also argue that

correctional staff should see gang membership as an indicator of “social deficiencies” rather than just a security threat (Krienert and Fleisher 2001).

Finally, these programs do not necessarily target the replacement effect of gang membership. Prison gangs are responsible for underground businesses such as the drug trade. We find that gangs also offer protection in exchange for money or force some inmates to “pay rent” for protection. These behaviors threaten the safety of the inmates and cause a good deal of hostility between gang members and non-gang members. Separating gang members or isolating gang leaders (shot-callers) does not prevent recruitment. As long as gangs provide money, drugs, and protection for the inmates, inmates will join gangs.

Researchers show that other techniques, such as using inmates as confidential informants (Hunt et al 1993), raise legal and constitutional questions and can put inmates at risk of harm (Pyrooz et al 2011). Segregating the gangs was standard operating procedure in California. This resulted in institutionalized racial segregation, which is unconstitutional (Trulson and Marquart. 2009). Another option is to transfer gang leaders out of state to break up the gang. The problem is that this could result in the spread of gangs as leaders leave one prison and transfer to another. In Texas, prison officials started using the Gang Renouncement and Disassociation Process (GRAD) program in which gang members can isolate themselves from their gangs and learn to resolve conflict in a productive manner (Knox 2005). Upon completion of this program, the gang officers determine if they have been successfully removed from the gang and they return to the general population. Winterdyk and Ruddell (2010) find that a few jurisdictions in the U.S. have “no gang” prisons. Gang members are put into one facility and non-gang members are put in another.

In sum, there is no one-size-fits-all solution to the plight of prison gangs. Moreover, there is very little research that focuses on the long-term effects or benefits of any of the current programs (Pyrooz et al 2011). Considering the current problem we see in this prison system, we recommend several things. First, the Nebraska Department of Correctional Services should do a comprehensive evaluation of their current gang policies and procedures. This should include reviewing official policies, interviewing gang unit officers, and interviewing current gang members. Considering our findings, this would be especially helpful in the Lincoln Correctional Center, the Nebraska State Penitentiary, and Tecumseh State Correctional Institute. Our data are limited and a study should focus solely on this issue.

Existing anti-gang programs may not be applicable to this prison system. For example, the Security Threat Group program used in Arizona puts the State at risk of lawsuits brought on by inmates “validated” and placed in long-term isolation. Transferring gang members to other facilities means that prison gangs spread from one prison to the next.

Intervention may be the best option to reduce the replacement effect of gang members. Our qualitative findings indicate that some men exit gangs because of the social support of fellow inmates and staff members. Using our data, we cannot determine if this is entirely effective. However, social support (Griffin 2007; Winterdyk and Ruddell 2010) along with meaningful rehabilitative programs (Krienert and Fleisher 2001) may help curb gang recruitment. Considering the fact that gangs are racially identified, the aforementioned recommendation about cultural awareness seminars/events could help prison staff to understand and communicate with inmates of all races or ethnicities. This would be especially helpful when dealing with gang members.

Female Offenders

Women report that sexual/romantic relationships cause a good deal of problems in their facility. Women fight their girlfriends and fight *over* their girlfriends. This behavior is common in women's prisons and they fight their prison girlfriends more than anyone else (Foster 1975; Giallombardo 1974; Owen 1998). It is estimated that 60% of incarcerated women have prison girlfriends (Owen 1998). While it is common for men to have consensual sex in prison, they do not describe these relationships as romantic or loving (Fleisher and Krienert 2009).

It is important to remember that the majority of incarcerated women in the United States suffer from histories of sexual and physical abuse (Chesney-Lind Media 2002). Also, some women engage in criminal behavior because they have relationships with men who are criminals (Alarid 2006). This being said, it is possible that women model their prison relationships on their non-prison relationships. This opens the door for abuse or dysfunction a women engage in the same behaviors they experienced back on the streets.

We suggest that prison staff develop a program that targets the issue of domestic/interpersonal abuse. We realize that technically, prison officials cannot acknowledge or condone these prison relationships. However, they could focus on helping women develop healthier relationships in general. We interviewed only 2 women who underwent some kind of domestic violence program in prison. Within our study, 10 women completed anger management classes, 16 completed mood management classes, 2 completed the A.V.P. program, and 5 completed the victim's impact class. We realize that they learn to deal with their anger or violent tendencies in these programs. In fact, interviews revealed that women sometimes learn about appropriate relationships in these programs.

For example, one woman stated that she was being harassed in the shower²⁰ and her S.A.U. counselor found out about it and told her that this is sexual harassment and then put a stop to it. The interviewee claimed that she never thought about sexual harassment in this way. She stated that she now knows that “her body is her own.” She also stated that she is now able to recognize abusive behavior and she knows that reporting this behavior is the appropriate thing to do.

We do not believe that you can stop women from having these relationships in prison. We do believe that women would benefit from specific classes that focus on healthy relationships. At the very least, this should be a main topic discussed in current rehabilitative programs. This could benefit women in the short-run by making them more aware of abuse, even abuse between women. In the long run, this gives them the tools to choose healthier relationships outside of prison. Of course, this does not have to be a gender specific class or topic. However, we believe that women will be more receptive to these topics.

Another suggestion came from one of the women interviewed for this project. She pointed out that the food available for purchase at the prison is typically high-calorie non-nutritional food. She pointed out that this helps women gain weight in prison and lowers their self-esteem. She also stated that this is one of the reasons why women use crystal methamphetamine and this means that women might gain weight in prison and start using this drug when they parole. She was correct that women report using this drug to lose weight (Morgan and Beck 1997).

Studies also show that women use this drug for the purpose of enhancing sexual self-confidence (Semple et al 2004). We suggest that the prison staff encourage healthier eating habits and offer healthier choices for food. Programs should include additional nutritional

²⁰ Another woman would interrupt her shower and throw cold water on her.

counseling and women should see the connection between food, self-esteem, and drug use. Again, this could be done for the men as well. They could also benefit from healthier food options and nutritional counseling.

Public Image

Inmates and prison staff must work together and coordinate their behaviors in a productive way. Prison staff should make every effort to project a professional image while on duty. When staff members snap at one another or undermine each other's authority, inmates interpret these behaviors in several ways. First, they believe that staff members have too many personal problems to effectively do their job. For example, inmates routinely stated that they become frustrated because of "petty write-ups" and believe that some prison staff are angry and take their frustrations on them by writing them up for minor infractions. Inmates believe that they use these write-ups to avoid working with, or communicating with, the inmates. Whether or not this is true, this frustrates inmates and makes them avoid staff members.

Furthermore, they disrespect the staff members who engage in such behavior and this makes them less likely to want to follow direct orders. Staff members are role models for the inmates. They can be positive or negative role models and those who make derogatory remarks about or undermine their colleagues, send the message that this is appropriate behavior. For example, if male staff members interrupt conversations between female staff members and inmates, inmates interpret this to mean that women cannot take care of themselves. This also highlights gender differences in a way that puts women at risk for sexual harassment. Male inmates use catcalls or hit on women in these facilities. Staff members should model appropriate behavior by showing each other the utmost respect and allowing women to do their jobs in an

effective manner. This shows the inmates that the employees are completely capable at doing their job.

This is not to say that sexual harassment (or any kind of harassment) should ever be tolerated. It should be addressed in a way that shows a united front. In the aforementioned example of the researcher/inmate interactions at Tecumseh, we noted that Mr. Hayes and some gang leaders asked some of the more vocal men on the yard to stop catcalling members the research team. The fact that respected leaders intervened, outside of the presence of the female researchers, sent the message that this behavior is inappropriate. The public displays of harassment stopped. These same leaders²¹ modeled appropriate behaviors in the yard by interacting with the research team in a professional manner. Female staff members in this study talked about sexual harassment but typically stated that this behavior waned as inmates got to know and respect them.

Another issue that should be discussed is the sexual relationships between staff members and inmates. In our sample, a total of 5 male inmates admitted to having sexual relationships with female staff members. This is a serious problem in prisons across the United States and the majority of the offending staff members are female (Beck and Harrison 2010). There is probably no way to stop these events from happening altogether. However, staff can model appropriate behavior by reducing the sexualized culture in these facilities. This means that all staff members must refrain from harassing each other. While this will not stop this problem, it might raise the social status of women in these facilities and make inmates view all staff members as positive authority figures. The reports of inmate-on-inmate sexual violence are on par with national reports of inmate sexual violence. It is encouraging that 53% of our indexed cases were reported to prison staff.

²¹ The shot-callers who made these claims routinely spoke with us as we walked across the yard.

VIII Limitations of This Study

As previously mentioned, these are self-reported data. Inmates and prison staff may have intentionally or accidentally given false information about their personal experiences. We took every precaution to interview them privately to allow them to speak freely. Furthermore, research indicates that inmates are generally forthcoming and want to talk about their prison experiences (Fleisher and Krienert 2009). The research team agreed that the only question that made inmates uncomfortable was the question about gang affiliation. To that extent, our numbers are probably low for this variable. Inmates seemed comfortable with other questions including questions about sexual violence.

Due to IRB limitations, we could not interview anyone under the age of 19. This limits the scope of our study because violence is always a more serious problem in youth facilities. We recommend that the Nebraska Department of Corrections commission a similar study that focuses on inmates under the age of 19 in order to broaden our understanding about inmate violence and prison culture.

We had a low response rate from prison staff. We understand their concerns about their job and reputation. However, this means that our findings rely heavily on the interviews with inmates which gives us a limited understanding about these serious issues. Future studies would benefit from having a higher number of staff volunteers.

References

- Akers, Ronald L., Norman S. Hayner, and Werner Gruninger. 1977. "Prisonization in Five Countries: Type of Prison and Inmate Characteristics." *Criminology* 14:527-554.
- Alarid, Leanne Fital. 2000. "Sexual Assault and Coercion Among Incarcerated Women Prisoners: Excerpts from Prison Letters." *Prison Journal* 80:391-406.
- Alarid, Leanne Fital and Paul Cromwell. 2006. *In Her Own Words: Women Offenders' Views on Crime and Victimization*. Los Angeles: Roxbury Publishing Company.
- Babbie, Earl. 1986. *Observing Ourselves*. Belmont: Wadsworth.
- Babbie, Earl. 1989. *The Practice of Social Research*. Belmont: Wadsworth.
- Beck, Allen J., Paige M. Harrison, Marcus Berzofsky, Rachel Caspar, and Christopher Krebs. 2010. "Sexual Victimization in Prisons and Jails Reported by Inmates, 2008-09." U.S. Department of Justice, Washington D.C.
- Berg, Mark, and DeLisi, Matt. 2006. "The Correctional Melting Pot: Race, Ethnicity, Citizenship, And Prison Violence." *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 34: 631-642.
- Berk, Richard, Kriegler, Brian, and Baek, Jong-Ho. 2005. Forecasting Dangerous Inmate Misconduct: An Application Of Ensemble Statistical Procedures. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, 22:131-145.
- Blumer, Herbert. 1969. *Symbolic Interactionism: Perspective and Method*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Bryman, Alan. 1984. "The Debate About Quantitative and Qualitative Research: A Question of Method or Epistemology?" *The British Journal of Sociology* 35:75-92.
- Campbell, Donald T. and Donald W. Fiske. 1959. "Convergent and Discriminant Validation by the Multitrait-Multimethod Matrix." *Psychological Bulletin*.
- Chesney-Lind, Meda. 2002. "Imprisoning Women: The Unintended Victims of Mass Imprisonment." Pp. 79-94 in *Invisible Punishment: The Collateral Consequences of Mass Imprisonment*, edited by M. Mauer and M. Chesney-Lind. New York: New Press.
- Chodorow, Nancy. 1978. *The Reproduction of Mothering*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Cloward, Richard A. 1960. "Social Control in Prison." in *Theoretical Studies in Social Organization of the Prison*, edited by R. A. Cloward, D. R. Cressey, G. H. Glosner, R. McCleery, L. E. Ohlin, G. M. Sykes, and S. Messinger. New York: Social Science Research Council.
- Cohen, Jacob. 1992. "A Power Primer." *Psychology Bulletin* 112:155-159.
- Davis, Mark and Daniel Flannery. 2001. "Institutional Treatment of Gang Members" *Corrections Management Quarterly* 5:37-46.
- Denzin, Norman. 1989. *The Research Act: A Theoretical Introduction to Sociological Methods*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.
- Denzin, Norman and Yvonna Lincoln, S. 1998. "Entering the Field of Qualitative Research." Pp. 1-34 in *Strategies of Qualitative Inquiry*, edited by N. Denzin and Y. Lincoln, S. Beverly Hills: Sage Publishing.
- Donaldson, Stephen. 2003. "Hooking Up: Protective Pairing for Punks." Pp. 348-353 in *Violence in War and Peace: An Anthology*, edited by N. Scheper-Hughes and P. Bourgois. Williston: Blackwell Publishing Limited.

- Duggan, Joe. 2011. "Guard Accused of Sex with 'Elkhorn Eight' Parolee." *Omaha World Herald*. August 26, 2011. Online Article Accessed August 30, 2011: <http://omaha.com/article/20110826/NEWS97/708259778/0>
- Fischer, Daryl. 2002. "Arizona Department of Corrections: Security Threat Group (STG) Program Evaluation, Final Report." United States Department of Justice.
- Fischer, Ryan. 2005. "Are California's Recidivism Rates Really the Highest in the Nation? It Depends on What Measure of Recidivism You Use." Center for Evidence-Based Corrections, Irvine.
- Fleisher, Mark and Scott Decker. 2001. "An Overview of the Challenge of Prison Gangs." *Corrections Management Quarterly* 5: 1-9.
- Fleisher, Mark and Jessie Krienert. 2009. *The Myth of Prison Rape: Sexual Culture in American Prisons*. Lanham: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers.
- Fong, Robert S., Ronald E. Vogel, and Salvador Buentello. 1992. "Prison Gang Dynamics: A Look Inside the Texas Department of Corrections." in *Corrections: Dilemmas and Directions*, edited by P. J. Benekos and A. V. Merlo. Cincinnati: Anderson Press.
- Foster, Theresa. 1975. "Make-Believe Families: A Response of Women and Girls to the Deprivations of Imprisonment." *International Journal of Criminology and Penology* 3:71-78.
- Fox, James A., and Zawitz Marianne. 2004. "Homicide Trends in the United States: 2002 Update." Washington, DC: US Department of Justice.
- Giallombardo, Rose. 1974. *The Social World of Imprisoned Girls*. New York: John Wiley Publishing.
- Gibbons, John J. and Nicholas de B. Katzenbach. 2006. "Confronting Confinement: A Report of the Commission on Safety and Abuse in America's Prisons." Commission on Safety and Abuse in America's Prisons, Washington D.C.
- Giddens, Anthony. 1974. *Positivism and Sociology*. London: Heinemann Publishing.
- Goffman, Erving. 1963. *Stigma: Notes on the Management of Spoiled Identity*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Gorad, Stephen. 2003. *Quantitative Methods in Social Sciences*. New York: Continuum International Publishing Group.
- Greenfeld, Lawrence A., and Tracy L. Snell. 1999. "Women Offenders." Washington, DC: US Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics.
- Greer, Kimberly R. 2000. "The Changing Nature of Interpersonal Relationships in a Women's Prison." *Prison Journal* 80:442-468.
- Griffin, Marie. 2007. "Prison Gang Policy and Recidivism: Short-Term Management Benefits, Long-Term Consequences" *Criminology and Public Policy* 6: 223-230.
- Harer, Miles D., and Neal P. Langan. 2001. "Gender Differences in Predictors of Prison Violence: Assessing the Predictive Validity of a Risk Classification System." *Crime and Delinquency* 47:513-536.
- Hassine, Victor. 2007. *Life Without Parole: Living in Prison Today*, Edited by R. Johnson and A. Dobrzanska. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hunt, Geoffrey, Stephanie Reigel, Thomas Morales, and Dan Waldorf. 1993. "Changes in Prison Culture: Prison Gangs and the Case of the 'Pepsi Generation'." *Social Problems* 40:398-409.
- Irwin, John. 1970. *The Felon*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.
- Irwin, John. 1980. *Prisons in Turmoil*. Boston: Little, Brown & Co.

- Irwin, John and Donald R. Cressey. 1962. "Thieves, Convicts and the Inmate Culture." *Social Problems* 10:142-155.
- Jacobs, James B. 1977. *Stateville: The Penitentiary in Mass Society*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Jenness, Valerie, Cheryl L. Maxson, Kristy N. Matsuda, and Jennifer M. Sumner. 2007. "Violence in California Correctional Facilities: An Empirical Examination of Sexual Assault." Report to the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation. Sacramento, California.
- Knox, George. 2005. "The Problem of Gangs and Security Threat Groups (STGs) in American Prisons Today: Recent Research Findings from the 2004 Prison Gang Survey." National Gang Crime Research Center.
- Krienert, Jessie and Mark Fleisher. 2001. "Gang Membership as a Proxy for Social Deficiencies: A Study of Nebraska Inmates." *Corrections Management Quarterly* 5: 47-58.
- Kupers, Terry A. 2001. "Rape and the Prison Code." Pp. 111-126 in *Prison Masculinities*, edited by D. Sabo, T. A. Kupers, and W. London. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Lahm, Karen. 2009. "Inmate Assaults on Prison Staff: A Multilevel Examination of an Overlooked form of Prison Violence." *The Prison Journal* 89: 131-150.
- Lofland, John. 1976. *Doing Social Life: The Qualitative Study of Human Interaction in Natural Settings*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Martin, Michael. 1999. *Verstehen the Uses of Understanding in Social Science*. New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers.
- Mauer, Marc. 1999. *Race to Incarcerate*. New York: The New Press.
- Maxfield, Michael and Earl Babbie. 2008. *Research Methods of Criminal Justice and Criminology*. Belmont: Wadsworth Publishing.
- Meachum, Larry. 2000. "Prisons: Breeding Grounds for Hate?" *Corrections Today* 62:130-133.
- Miles, Matthew B. and Michael Huberman. 1994. *Qualitative Data Analysis: An Expanded Sourcebook*. Beverly Hills: Sage Publishing.
- Moore, Joan W. 1991. *Going Down To The Barrio: Homeboys and Homegirls in Change*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Morgan, Patricia and Jerome Beck 1997. "The legacy and the Paradox: Hidden contexts of Methamphetamine use in the United States" Pp. 135-162 in *Amphetamine Misuse: International Perspectives on Current Trends* edited by H. Klee. New York: Taylor and Francis Publishing.
- Natanson, Maurice. 1973. *Phenomenology and the Social Sciences*. Chicago: Northwestern University Press.
- Nebraska Department of Correctional Services. 2010. "Programs." <http://www.corrections.nebraska.gov/>.
- Orlando-Morningstar, Denise. 1997. "Prison Gangs." Federal Judicial Center, Washington D.C.
- Owen, Barbara. 1998. *In the Mix: Struggle and Survival in a Woman's Prison*. New York: State University of Albany Press.
- Parenti, Christian. 1999. *Lockdown America: Police and Prisons in the Age of Crisis*. London: Verso.
- Pollock, Joycelyn M. 1997. *Prison: Today and Tomorrow*. Gaithersburg: Aspen Press.

- Pyrooz, David, Scott Decker, and Mark Fleisher. "From the Street to the Prison, From the Prison to the Street: Understanding and Responding to Prison Gangs" *Journal of Aggression, Conflict, and Peace Research*, 3: 12-25.
- Robinson, T. Hank, Molly Brown, Rebecca Murray, and Nicole Kennedy. 2006. "Final Report to the Nebraska Community Corrections Council: Metropolitan Community Justice Recidivism Reduction Center Study." State Of Nebraska, Omaha.
- Renzetti, Claire M. 2006. "Gender and Violent Crime." Pp. 93–107 in *Rethinking Gender, Crime, and Justice*, edited by C. M. Renzetti, L. Goodstein, and S. L. Miller. Los Angeles: Roxbury.
- Rubin, Allen and Earl Babbie. 1993. *Research Methods for Social Work*. Pacific Grove: Brooks/Cole Publishers.
- Schrag, Clarence. 1954. "Leadership Among Prison Inmates." *American Sociological Review* 19:37-42.
- Semple, Shirley and Igor Grant and Thomas Patterson. 2004. "Female Methamphetamine Users: Social Characteristics and Sexual Risk Behavior." *Women and Health*, 40: 35-50.
- Stephan, James and Jennifer Karberg. 2003. Census of state and federal correctional facilities 2000 (No. NCJ 198272). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics.
- Strauss, Anselm and Juliet Corbin. 1990. *Basics of Qualitative Research: Grounded Theory*. Newbury Park: Sage.
- Struckman-Johnson, Cindy, David Struckman-Johnson, Lila Rucker, Kurt Bumby, and Stephen Donaldson. 1996. "Sexual Coercion Reported by Men and Women in Prison." *The Journal of Sex Research* 33:67-76.
- Sykes, Gresham M. 1958. *The Society of Captives: A Study of a Maximum Security Prison*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Tajfel, Henri. 2010. *Social Identity and Intergroup Relations*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Tasca, Melinda, Griffin, Marie, and Rodriguez, Nancy. 2010. "The Effect Of Importation And Deprivation Factors On Violent Misconduct: An Examination Of Black And Latino Youth In Prison." *Youth Violence And Juvenile Justice* 8: 234-249.
- Terry, Charles. 1997. "The Function of Humor for Prison Inmates." *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice* 13:23-40.
- Thorne, Barrie. 1993. *Gender Play: Girls and Boys in School*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.
- Tittle, Charles R. and Drollene P. Tittle. 1964. "Social Organization of Prisoners: An Empirical Test." *Social Forces* 43:216-221.
- Toch, Hans. 2002. *Acting Out: Maladaptive Behavior in Confinement*. Washington D.C.: American Psychological Association.
- Toch, Hans. 2007. "Sequestering Gang Members, Burning Witches, and Subverting Due Process" *Criminal Justice and Behavior* 34: 274-288.
- Trammell, Rebecca. 2009a. "Relational Violence in Women's Prison: How Women Describe Interpersonal Violence and Gender." *Women and Criminal Justice* 19:267-285.
- Trammell, Rebecca. 2009b. "Values, Rules and Keeping the Peace: How Men Describe Order and the Inmate Code in California Prisons." *Deviant Behavior: An Interdisciplinary Journal* 32:334-350.

- Trammell, Rebecca. 2011. "Symbolic Violence and Prison Wives: Gender Roles and Protective Pairing in Men's Prisons." *The Prison Journal* 91: 305-324.
- Trammell, Rebecca and Scott Chenault. 2009. "We Have to Take These Guys Out: Motivations for Assaulting Incarcerated Child Molesters." *Symbolic Interaction* 32:334-350.
- Trammell, Rebecca. 2011. *Enforcing the Convict Code: Violence and Prison Culture*. Boulder: Lynne Rienner Publishers.
- Trulson, Chad R. and James W. Marquart. 2009. *First Available Cell: Desegregation of the Texas Prison System*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- United States Census. 2010. "Race: Nebraska"
- United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit. February 18, 2011. "Lira v. Fielder et al" Number: 09-17446.
- Useem, Bert and Anne M. Piehl. 2006. "Prison Buildup and Disorder." *Punishment and Society* 8:87-115.
- Van Maanen, John. 1979. "Reclaiming Qualitative Methods for Organizational Research: A Preface." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 24:520-526.
- Wacquant, Loïc. 2001. "Deadly Symbiosis: When Ghetto and Prison Meet and Mesh." in *Mass Imprisonment: Social Causes and Consequences*, edited by D. Garland. London: Sage Publishers.
- Webb, Eugene J., Donald T. Schwartz, Richard D. Schwartz, and Sechrest Lee. 1966. *Unobtrusive Measures*. Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Wilkinson, Reginald A. and Tessa Unwin. 1999. "Intolerance in Prison: A Recipe for Disaster." *Corrections Today* 61:98.
- Winfrey, Tom, Greg Newbold, and Huston Tubb. 2002. "Prisoner Perspectives on Inmate Culture in New Mexico and New Zealand." *The Prison Journal* 82:213-233.
- Winterdyk, John and Rick Ruddell. 2010. "Managing Prison Gangs: Results from a Survey of U.S. Prison Systems." *Journal of Criminal Justice* 38: 730-736.
- Wooldredge, John 1994. "Inmate Crime And Victimization In A Southwestern Correctional Facility." *Journal of Criminal Justice*. 22:367-381.
- Womak, Sam. 2012. "Guard Accused of Sex With Inmate" *Omaha World Herald*. January 5, 2012. Online article accessed January 6, 2012.
<http://www.omaha.com/article/20120105/NEWS97/701059867>

Appendix A – Chi-Square Analysis of Reported Versus Non-Reported Fights – Results That Are Significant

Crosstab					
			DID RECENT ASSAULT GET REPORTED?		Total
			NO	YES	
Nebraska Correctional Center for Women Only	Nebraska Correctional Center for Women	Count	4	18	22
		% within Nebraska Correctional Center for Women Only	18.2%	81.8%	100.0%
		% within DID RECENT ASSAULT GET REPORTED?	5.9%	18.0%	13.1%
		% of Total	2.4%	10.7%	13.1%
	All Other Prisons	Count	64	82	146
		% within Nebraska Correctional Center for Women Only	43.8%	56.2%	100.0%
		% within DID RECENT ASSAULT GET REPORTED?	94.1%	82.0%	86.9%
		% of Total	38.1%	48.8%	86.9%
Total	Count	68	100	168	
	% within Nebraska Correctional Center for Women Only	40.5%	59.5%	100.0%	
	% within DID RECENT ASSAULT GET REPORTED?	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	
	% of Total	40.5%	59.5%	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	5.223 ^a	1	.022		
Continuity Correction ^b	4.212	1	.040		
Likelihood Ratio	5.729	1	.017		
Fisher's Exact Test				.034	.017
Linear-by-Linear Association	5.191	1	.023		
N of Valid Cases	168				
a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 8.90.					
b. Computed only for a 2x2 table					

Crosstab					
			DID ASSAULT #2 GET REPORTED?		Total
			NO	YES	
Nebraska Correctional Center for Women Only	Nebraska Correctional Center for Women	Count	1	9	10
		% within Nebraska Correctional Center for Women Only	10.0%	90.0%	100.0%
		% within DID ASSAULT #2 GET REPORTED?	1.6%	16.7%	8.6%
		% of Total	.9%	7.8%	8.6%
	All Other Prisons	Count	61	45	106
		% within Nebraska Correctional Center for Women Only	57.5%	42.5%	100.0%
		% within DID ASSAULT #2 GET REPORTED?	98.4%	83.3%	91.4%
		% of Total	52.6%	38.8%	91.4%
Total	Count	62	54	116	
	% within Nebraska Correctional Center for Women Only	53.4%	46.6%	100.0%	
	% within DID ASSAULT #2 GET REPORTED?	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	
	% of Total	53.4%	46.6%	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	8.303 ^a	1	.004		
Continuity Correction ^b	6.502	1	.011		
Likelihood Ratio	9.233	1	.002		
Fisher's Exact Test				.006	.004
Linear-by-Linear Association	8.231	1	.004		
N of Valid Cases	116				
<p>a. 1 cells (25.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 4.66.</p> <p>b. Computed only for a 2x2 table</p>					

Crosstab

			DID #3 ASSAULT BETWEEN INMATES GET REPORTED?		Total
			NO	YES	
Nebraska Correctional Center for Women Only	Nebraska Correctional Center for Women	Count	0	4	4
		% within Nebraska Correctional Center for Women Only	.0%	100.0%	100.0%
		% within DID #3 ASSAULT BETWEEN INMATES GET REPORTED?	.0%	14.8%	4.9%
		% of Total	.0%	4.9%	4.9%
	All Other Prisons	Count	54	23	77
		% within Nebraska Correctional Center for Women Only	70.1%	29.9%	100.0%
		% within DID #3 ASSAULT BETWEEN INMATES GET REPORTED?	100.0%	85.2%	95.1%
		% of Total	66.7%	28.4%	95.1%
Total	Count	54	27	81	
	% within Nebraska Correctional Center for Women Only	66.7%	33.3%	100.0%	
	% within DID #3 ASSAULT BETWEEN INMATES GET REPORTED?	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	
	% of Total	66.7%	33.3%	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	8.416 ^a	1	.004		
Continuity Correction ^b	5.556	1	.018		
Likelihood Ratio	9.212	1	.002		
Fisher's Exact Test				.011	.011
Linear-by-Linear Association	8.312	1	.004		
N of Valid Cases	81				

a. 2 cells (50.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.33.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Appendix B – Gang Membership and Violence – Results That Are Significant

Lincoln Correctional Center

Crosstab					
			Did Inmate Fight Another Inmate		Total
			No	Yes	
WERE YOU A MEMBER OF A STREET GANG PRIOR TO GOING INTO PRISON?	NO	Count	24	24	48
		% within WERE YOU A MEMBER OF A STREET GANG PRIOR TO GOING INTO PRISON?	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
		% within Did Inmate Fight Another Inmate	96.0%	70.6%	81.4%
		% of Total	40.7%	40.7%	81.4%
	YES	Count	1	10	11
		% within WERE YOU A MEMBER OF A STREET GANG PRIOR TO GOING INTO PRISON?	9.1%	90.9%	100.0%
		% within Did Inmate Fight Another Inmate	4.0%	29.4%	18.6%
		% of Total	1.7%	16.9%	18.6%
Total		Count	25	34	59
		% within WERE YOU A MEMBER OF A STREET GANG PRIOR TO GOING INTO PRISON?	42.4%	57.6%	100.0%
		% within Did Inmate Fight Another Inmate	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
		% of Total	42.4%	57.6%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	6.133 ^a	1	.013		
Continuity Correction ^b	4.573	1	.032		
Likelihood Ratio	7.169	1	.007		
Fisher's Exact Test				.017	.013
Linear-by-Linear Association	6.030	1	.014		
N of Valid Cases	59				
a. 1 cells (25.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 4.66.					
b. Computed only for a 2x2 table					

Nebraska State Penitentiary

Crosstab					
			Did Inmate Fight Another Inmate		Total
			No	Yes	
ARE YOU A MEMBER OF A PRISON GANG?	NO	Count	32	41	73
		% within ARE YOU A MEMBER OF A PRISON GANG?	43.8%	56.2%	100.0%
		% within Did Inmate Fight Another Inmate	97.0%	74.5%	83.0%
		% of Total	36.4%	46.6%	83.0%
	YES	Count	1	14	15
		% within ARE YOU A MEMBER OF A PRISON GANG?	6.7%	93.3%	100.0%
		% within Did Inmate Fight Another Inmate	3.0%	25.5%	17.0%
		% of Total	1.1%	15.9%	17.0%
Total		Count	33	55	88
		% within ARE YOU A MEMBER OF A PRISON GANG?	37.5%	62.5%	100.0%
		% within Did Inmate Fight Another Inmate	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
		% of Total	37.5%	62.5%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	7.335 ^a	1	.007		
Continuity Correction ^b	5.835	1	.016		
Likelihood Ratio	9.000	1	.003		
Fisher's Exact Test				.007	.005
Linear-by-Linear Association	7.251	1	.007		
N of Valid Cases	88				
a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 5.63. b. Computed only for a 2x2 table					

Nebraska State Penitentiary

Crosstab					
			Did Inmate Fight Another Inmate		Total
			No	Yes	
WERE YOU A MEMBER OF A STREET GANG PRIOR TO GOING INTO PRISON?	NO	Count	30	37	67
		% within WERE YOU A MEMBER OF A STREET GANG PRIOR TO GOING INTO PRISON?	44.8%	55.2%	100.0%
		% within Did Inmate Fight Another Inmate	90.9%	67.3%	76.1%
		% of Total	34.1%	42.0%	76.1%
	YES	Count	3	18	21
		% within WERE YOU A MEMBER OF A STREET GANG PRIOR TO GOING INTO PRISON?	14.3%	85.7%	100.0%
		% within Did Inmate Fight Another Inmate	9.1%	32.7%	23.9%
		% of Total	3.4%	20.5%	23.9%
Total	Count	33	55	88	
	% within WERE YOU A MEMBER OF A STREET GANG PRIOR TO GOING INTO PRISON?	37.5%	62.5%	100.0%	
	% within Did Inmate Fight Another Inmate	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	
	% of Total	37.5%	62.5%	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	6.342 ^a	1	.012		
Continuity Correction ^b	5.108	1	.024		
Likelihood Ratio	7.061	1	.008		
Fisher's Exact Test				.019	.010
Linear-by-Linear Association	6.270	1	.012		
N of Valid Cases	88				
a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 7.88.					
b. Computed only for a 2x2 table					

Nebraska Correctional Center for Women

Crosstab					
			Did Inmate Fight Another Inmate		Total
			No	Yes	
WERE YOU A MEMBER OF A STREET GANG PRIOR TO GOING INTO PRISON?	NO	Count	49	17	66
		% within WERE YOU A MEMBER OF A STREET GANG PRIOR TO GOING INTO PRISON?	74.2%	25.8%	100.0%
		% within Did Inmate Fight Another Inmate	94.2%	77.3%	89.2%
		% of Total	66.2%	23.0%	89.2%
	YES	Count	3	5	8
		% within WERE YOU A MEMBER OF A STREET GANG PRIOR TO GOING INTO PRISON?	37.5%	62.5%	100.0%
		% within Did Inmate Fight Another Inmate	5.8%	22.7%	10.8%
		% of Total	4.1%	6.8%	10.8%
Total		Count	52	22	74
		% within WERE YOU A MEMBER OF A STREET GANG PRIOR TO GOING INTO PRISON?	70.3%	29.7%	100.0%
		% within Did Inmate Fight Another Inmate	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
		% of Total	70.3%	29.7%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	4.611 ^a	1	.032		
Continuity Correction ^b	3.020	1	.082		
Likelihood Ratio	4.175	1	.041		
Fisher's Exact Test				.046	.046
Linear-by-Linear Association	4.548	1	.033		
N of Valid Cases	74				
a. 1 cells (25.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2.38.					
b. Computed only for a 2x2 table					

Tecumseh State Correctional Institute

Crosstab					
			Did Inmate Ever Assault Staff		Total
			No	Yes	
ARE YOU A MEMBER OF A PRISON GANG?	NO	Count	81	5	86
		% within ARE YOU A MEMBER OF A PRISON GANG?	94.2%	5.8%	100.0%
		% within Did Inmate Ever Assault Staff	93.1%	62.5%	90.5%
		% of Total	85.3%	5.3%	90.5%
	YES	Count	6	3	9
		% within ARE YOU A MEMBER OF A PRISON GANG?	66.7%	33.3%	100.0%
		% within Did Inmate Ever Assault Staff	6.9%	37.5%	9.5%
		% of Total	6.3%	3.2%	9.5%
Total	Count	87	8	95	
	% within ARE YOU A MEMBER OF A PRISON GANG?	91.6%	8.4%	100.0%	
	% within Did Inmate Ever Assault Staff	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	
	% of Total	91.6%	8.4%	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	8.001 ^a	1	.005		
Continuity Correction ^b	4.830	1	.028		
Likelihood Ratio	5.288	1	.021		
Fisher's Exact Test				.026	.026
Linear-by-Linear Association	7.917	1	.005		
N of Valid Cases	95				

a. 1 cells (25.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .76.
 b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Tecumseh State Correctional Institute

Crosstab					
			Did Inmate Fight Another Inmate		Total
			No	Yes	
ARE YOU A MEMBER OF A PRISON GANG?	NO	Count	49	37	86
		% within ARE YOU A MEMBER OF A PRISON GANG?	57.0%	43.0%	100.0%
		% within Did Inmate Fight Another Inmate	98.0%	82.2%	90.5%
		% of Total	51.6%	38.9%	90.5%
	YES	Count	1	8	9
		% within ARE YOU A MEMBER OF A PRISON GANG?	11.1%	88.9%	100.0%
		% within Did Inmate Fight Another Inmate	2.0%	17.8%	9.5%
		% of Total	1.1%	8.4%	9.5%
Total	Count	50	45	95	
	% within ARE YOU A MEMBER OF A PRISON GANG?	52.6%	47.4%	100.0%	
	% within Did Inmate Fight Another Inmate	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	
	% of Total	52.6%	47.4%	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	6.875 ^a	1	.009		
Continuity Correction ^b	5.158	1	.023		
Likelihood Ratio	7.614	1	.006		
Fisher's Exact Test				.012	.010
Linear-by-Linear Association	6.802	1	.009		
N of Valid Cases	95				
a. 2 cells (50.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 4.26.					
b. Computed only for a 2x2 table					

Appendix C – Chi-Square Analysis of Violent Offenders and Inmate Violence

Omaha Correctional Center

Crosstab					
			Did Inmate Fight Another Inmate		Total
			No	Yes	
IS SENTENCED OFFENSE #1 VIOLENT?	non-violent	Count	21	2	23
		% within IS SENTENCED OFFENSE #1 VIOLENT?	91.3%	8.7%	100.0%
		% within Did Inmate Fight Another Inmate	43.8%	13.3%	36.5%
		% of Total	33.3%	3.2%	36.5%
	violent	Count	27	13	40
		% within IS SENTENCED OFFENSE #1 VIOLENT?	67.5%	32.5%	100.0%
		% within Did Inmate Fight Another Inmate	56.3%	86.7%	63.5%
		% of Total	42.9%	20.6%	63.5%
Total	Count	48	15	63	
	% within IS SENTENCED OFFENSE #1 VIOLENT?	76.2%	23.8%	100.0%	
	% within Did Inmate Fight Another Inmate	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	
	% of Total	76.2%	23.8%	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	4.562 ^a	1	.033		
Continuity Correction ^b	3.344	1	.067		
Likelihood Ratio	5.121	1	.024		
Fisher's Exact Test				.037	.030
Linear-by-Linear Association	4.489	1	.034		
N of Valid Cases	63				
a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 5.48. b. Computed only for a 2x2 table					

Nebraska State Penitentiary

Crosstab					
			Did Inmate Fight Another Inmate		Total
			No	Yes	
IS SENTENCED OFFENSE #1 VIOLENT?	non-violent	Count	13	8	21
		% within IS SENTENCED OFFENSE #1 VIOLENT?	61.9%	38.1%	100.0%
		% within Did Inmate Fight Another Inmate	38.2%	14.5%	23.6%
		% of Total	14.6%	9.0%	23.6%
	violent	Count	21	47	68
		% within IS SENTENCED OFFENSE #1 VIOLENT?	30.9%	69.1%	100.0%
		% within Did Inmate Fight Another Inmate	61.8%	85.5%	76.4%
		% of Total	23.6%	52.8%	76.4%
Total	Count	34	55	89	
	% within IS SENTENCED OFFENSE #1 VIOLENT?	38.2%	61.8%	100.0%	
	% within Did Inmate Fight Another Inmate	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	
	% of Total	38.2%	61.8%	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	6.541 ^a	1	.011		
Continuity Correction ^b	5.293	1	.021		
Likelihood Ratio	6.399	1	.011		
Fisher's Exact Test				.019	.011
Linear-by-Linear Association	6.467	1	.011		
N of Valid Cases	89				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 8.02.
b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Nebraska Correctional Center for Women

Crosstab					
			Did Inmate Fight Another Inmate		Total
			No	Yes	
IS SENTENCED OFFENSE #1 VIOLENT?	non-violent	Count	18	6	24
		% within IS SENTENCED OFFENSE #1 VIOLENT?	75.0%	25.0%	100.0%
		% within Did Inmate Fight Another Inmate	81.8%	40.0%	64.9%
		% of Total	48.6%	16.2%	64.9%
	violent	Count	4	9	13
		% within IS SENTENCED OFFENSE #1 VIOLENT?	30.8%	69.2%	100.0%
		% within Did Inmate Fight Another Inmate	18.2%	60.0%	35.1%
		% of Total	10.8%	24.3%	35.1%
Total	Count	22	15	37	
	% within IS SENTENCED OFFENSE #1 VIOLENT?	59.5%	40.5%	100.0%	
	% within Did Inmate Fight Another Inmate	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	
	% of Total	59.5%	40.5%	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	6.844 ^a	1	.009		
Continuity Correction ^b	5.132	1	.023		
Likelihood Ratio	6.920	1	.009		
Fisher's Exact Test				.015	.012
Linear-by-Linear Association	6.659	1	.010		
N of Valid Cases	37				

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 5.27.
b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Tecumseh State Correctional Institute

Crosstab					
			Did Inmate Ever Assault Staff		Total
			No	Yes	
IS SENTENCED OFFENSE #1 VIOLENT?	non-violent	Count	29	0	29
		% within IS SENTENCED OFFENSE #1 VIOLENT?	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
		% within Did Inmate Ever Assault Staff	33.7%	.0%	30.5%
		% of Total	30.5%	.0%	30.5%
	violent	Count	57	9	66
		% within IS SENTENCED OFFENSE #1 VIOLENT?	86.4%	13.6%	100.0%
		% within Did Inmate Ever Assault Staff	66.3%	100.0%	69.5%
		% of Total	60.0%	9.5%	69.5%
Total		Count	86	9	95
		% within IS SENTENCED OFFENSE #1 VIOLENT?	90.5%	9.5%	100.0%
		% within Did Inmate Ever Assault Staff	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
		% of Total	90.5%	9.5%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	4.368 ^a	1	.037		
Continuity Correction ^b	2.923	1	.087		
Likelihood Ratio	6.962	1	.008		
Fisher's Exact Test				.053	.032
Linear-by-Linear Association	4.322	1	.038		
N of Valid Cases	95				
a. 1 cells (25.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2.75.					
b. Computed only for a 2x2 table					

Appendix D – If you Found Yourself in Trouble Here, Are there Staff Members That Would Help You?
 Have you Ever Experienced Violence? Results that Are Significant

Lincoln Correctional Center:

IF YOU FOUND YOURSELF IN TROUBLE, ARE THERE STAFF HERE THAT WOULD HELP YOU? * HAVE YOU EVER EXPERIENCED VIOLENCE IN PRISON? Crosstabulation					
			HAVE YOU EVER EXPERIENCED VIOLENCE IN PRISON?		Total
			NO	YES	
IF YOU FOUND YOURSELF IN TROUBLE, ARE THERE STAFF HERE THAT WOULD HELP YOU?	NO	Count	3	14	17
		% within IF YOU FOUND YOURSELF IN TROUBLE, ARE THERE STAFF HERE THAT WOULD HELP YOU?	17.6%	82.4%	100.0%
		% within HAVE YOU EVER EXPERIENCED VIOLENCE IN PRISON?	12.5%	40.0%	28.8%
		% of Total	5.1%	23.7%	28.8%
	YES	Count	21	21	42
		% within IF YOU FOUND YOURSELF IN TROUBLE, ARE THERE STAFF HERE THAT WOULD HELP YOU?	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
		% within HAVE YOU EVER EXPERIENCED VIOLENCE IN PRISON?	87.5%	60.0%	71.2%
		% of Total	35.6%	35.6%	71.2%
Total	Count	24	35	59	
	% within IF YOU FOUND YOURSELF IN TROUBLE, ARE THERE STAFF HERE THAT WOULD HELP YOU?	40.7%	59.3%	100.0%	
	% within HAVE YOU EVER EXPERIENCED VIOLENCE IN PRISON?	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	
	% of Total	40.7%	59.3%	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	5.249 ^a	1	.022		
Continuity Correction ^b	3.994	1	.046		
Likelihood Ratio	5.660	1	.017		
Fisher's Exact Test				.039	.021
Linear-by-Linear Association	5.160	1	.023		
N of Valid Cases	59				
a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 6.92. b. Computed only for a 2x2 table					

Nebraska State Penitentiary:

IF YOU FOUND YOURSELF IN TROUBLE, ARE THERE STAFF HERE THAT WOULD HELP YOU? * HAVE YOU EVER EXPERIENCED VIOLENCE IN PRISON? Crosstabulation					
			HAVE YOU EVER EXPERIENCED VIOLENCE IN PRISON?		Total
			NO	YES	
IF YOU FOUND YOURSELF IN TROUBLE, ARE THERE STAFF HERE THAT WOULD HELP YOU?	NO	Count	8	31	39
		% within IF YOU FOUND YOURSELF IN TROUBLE, ARE THERE STAFF HERE THAT WOULD HELP YOU?	20.5%	79.5%	100.0%
		% within HAVE YOU EVER EXPERIENCED VIOLENCE IN PRISON?	24.2%	54.4%	43.3%
		% of Total	8.9%	34.4%	43.3%
	YES	Count	25	26	51
		% within IF YOU FOUND YOURSELF IN TROUBLE, ARE THERE STAFF HERE THAT WOULD HELP YOU?	49.0%	51.0%	100.0%
		% within HAVE YOU EVER EXPERIENCED VIOLENCE IN PRISON?	75.8%	45.6%	56.7%
		% of Total	27.8%	28.9%	56.7%
	Total	Count	33	57	90
		% within IF YOU FOUND YOURSELF IN TROUBLE, ARE THERE STAFF HERE THAT WOULD HELP YOU?	36.7%	63.3%	100.0%
% within HAVE YOU EVER EXPERIENCED VIOLENCE IN PRISON?		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	
% of Total		36.7%	63.3%	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	7.734 ^a	1	.005		
Continuity Correction ^b	6.555	1	.010		
Likelihood Ratio	8.027	1	.005		
Fisher's Exact Test				.008	.005
Linear-by-Linear Association	7.648	1	.006		
N of Valid Cases	90				
a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 14.30.					
b. Computed only for a 2x2 table					