

K-9 : Patrol Dogs In Jail

by
Robert J. Bodnar

Literature Review:

A number of anecdotal articles have been published in the past extolling the benefits of working K-9 Patrol teams in jails and prisons, but very little empirical data has been collected to support the stories (**O'Connor, 1990; Bodnar, 1990, 1995**). As part of a Master's Paper for Penn State University, research on correctional K-9 usage nation-wide was undertaken, and a survey questionnaire formulated to measure perceptions of staff and inmates at Lancaster County Prison (PA) on the K-9 Patrol Teams used at that facility. At the time of the two surveys, Lancaster County Prison had been successfully using patrol dogs for over 20-30 years respectively and was felt to be an established program to study. The initial survey was conducted in 1995 and then repeated in 2004 to see if perceptions had changed over time. Both survey results will be incorporated into this article as a resource for any jail/prison contemplating the use of K-9 Patrol Teams as part of their security operation.

This study has significance because there has been very little research done to explain the social and behavioral dynamics that occur inside the nation's jails (**Houston et al, 1988**). Journal articles studying institutional violence attempt to explain causal factors of disorder, but ignore correlations between use-of-force practices and violence prevention. A review of the literature on inmate violence shows that most of the research has been done at the prison level, and suggest poor prison management as a root cause (**McCorkle et al, 1995; Light, 1990; McShane et al, 1989**). Good prison management dictates that disruptive inmate behavior be swiftly minimized so attention to other strategic initiatives can be maximized. One form of intervention that has proven effective in controlling inmate behavior is the K-9 Patrol Team. For example, use of K-9 Patrol Teams in Wicomico County (MD) reduced serious inmate disturbances in the jail by 60% over a six year period (**Welch, 1995**). Inmates and staff at the Wicomico jail verbalized sentiments of "*healthy respect*" for the K-9's based on their experiences, which matches well with the K-9 history at Lancaster County.

When inmates first enter a new jail, there is a high level of uncertainty until the inmate becomes more familiar with the environment and they can increase a sense of control about their surroundings (**Paulus et al, 1993**). McCorkle (1992) found that inmates will adopt certain precautionary behaviors to fend off the threat of violence in the institutions if they feel the institution is lacking operational safeguards and showed in his study that over 69% of inmates admitted to using violence or the threat of violence as a preemptive self-defense method to deter their own victimization. The jail's ability to convey feelings of safety, security and order are important to the internal operation for staff and inmate morale. The better the jail does its job of maintaining social control in the prison environment, the less maladaptive behaviors the inmate needs to adopt to survive the stress of incarceration (**Rison et al, 1994**).

As much as podular Direct Supervision has attempted to soften the jail culture, indications are that it is not the cure-all it once envisioned to be (**Senese et al, 1992; Stohr et al, 1995; Charles et al, 1992; Dawe et al, 1995**). Jails are also experiencing an influx of youthful offenders who equate violent behavior as a status symbol . As Beard (**1994**) found , assault on a staff member or another inmate is a way for younger inmates to establish their reputation in the jail. This acts to heighten apprehension of personal safety by both the jailer and the jailed. Close social contact within the correctional institutions creates strains that are usually vented in the form of inmate disciplinary problems (**Ekland-Olson et al, 1983**). The sad truth is that correctional officers expect to get assaulted in the line of duty. Surveys have shown occurrences as high as 89% for threats of physical harm to jail officers, with 56% actually being physically assaulted on the job (**Jefferis, 1994**).

In addition to the violence, overcrowding plays a factor in the violence/safety equation. In a survey done on jail administrators by the National Sheriff Association, 85% agreed that crowded jail conditions resulted in increased violence between inmates, and 81% also felt that these same conditions increased acts of violence between inmates and staff (**Kinkade et al, 1995**). As the U.S. Bureau of Justice Statistics reflects, jail populations nationally have risen from 482,600 in 1994 to 701,100 in 2004; a 31% jump in prisoner population over a ten year period, with related overcrowding concerns (**BJS, 2005**).

Despite the challenges facing jail administrators, the corrections system retains a legal responsibility under the 8th Amendment of the U.S. Constitution to keep inmates free of “*cruel and unusual punishments*,” including unreasonable fear of harm. A vexing problem for correctional administrators at all levels is how to increase the scope of current use-of-force technology with non-lethal methods (**Boyd, 1994**). Electronic stun devices, foams, rubber projectiles, smokes, sprays, chemical agents and batons appear to lack several unique advantages that a K-9 Patrol Team possess. Correctional policy and statutory law is cautious to specify that weapons should not be carried inside the jail during routine patrols since inmates may gain access to them and turn the weapons back upon the staff members. In contrast, dogs are trained and bonded to react only to their assigned handler in any given situation. This limits the number of correctional officers trained as handlers, but increases both flexibility and timeliness to disturbance situations through roving patrols, with priority given to any transmitted calls for assistance within the jail.

The constant threat of inmate violence requires correctional administrators to employ various use-of-force options to control aberrant inmate behavior, to quell the negative undercurrents of fear and hostility that exist within the inmate population, and to maintain good order in the jail (**Perroncello, 1995**). Inmates have an expectation of safety while incarcerated, and they will respond positively or negatively to force depending on the dynamics of the situation and nature of the staff response used to regain control (**Henry et al, 1994**). This study seeks to understand if inmate and staff perceptions of using K-9 Patrol Teams is a legitimate form of “*social control*” to increase security and enhance safety in the daily jail operation.

Legal Issues:

As emphasized by the U.S. Court of Appeals in the case of **MILLER v LEATHERS**, “confrontations between correctional officers and inmates in the prison setting are legion”, with an expectation of being punched, pushed or bitten as a fundamental employment experiences. As such, correctional staff are justified in the use-of-force to maintain order and discipline over prisoners when the circumstances warrant (**885 F. 2d 151, 4th Cir. 1989**). Accepted legal standards and statutory law support the use-of-force in prison to maintain order and instill discipline. The question is not whether force can be used, but WHEN and HOW can it be used (**del Carmen, 1992**). The U.S. Supreme Court decision of **HUDSON v MCMILLION, 112 S. Ct. 995 (1992)**, the test on whether use-of-force by staff meets standards set by the court in determining liability is “...*whether the force was applied in good faith to maintain or restore discipline, or maliciously and sadistically to cause harm.*” Tied very closely to the use-of-force concerns are training liability issues. The U.S. Supreme Court decision in **CANTON v HARRIS, 109 S. Ct. 1197 (1989)** specified that “*failure to properly train staff*” in critical tasks can amount to “*deliberate indifference*” of prisoner’s constitutionally protected rights. The continuum of force dictates that the officers use only the minimum level of force necessary to control the situation at hand. Failure to react within the training can lead to individual and agency liability. Correctional officers must be trained to react appropriately to threats in the work environment, and must adhere to continuum of force models when responding to these threats (**Brown, 1994; Thornton et al, 1993; Wolford et al, 1993; Drapkin et al, 1994**).

Several U.S. District Court decisions regarding Police K-9 incidents carry over to the correctional setting. They emphasize the need for proper training required under the balancing test set out in HUDSON for public safety agencies that employ K-9 Teams as a use-of-force in their departments. In **ROBINETTE v BARNES, 854 F. 2d 909, 6th Cir. (1988)** the U.S. Court of Appeals in Tennessee determined that the K-9 dog was trained to track and seize criminal suspects by biting and holding them until their handler arrived to apply restraints. In this particular case, the dog located the burglary suspect hidden in a building under a car, then seized the suspect by the throat. By the time the handler found the suspect, he had died as a result of the bite wounds. The court found that even if the use of a properly trained police dog constituted deadly force, it was not unreasonable under the circumstances. The court found that the extensive training of both the dog and handler were significant factors for ruling in favor of the K-9 Team as a “*reasonable*” use-of-force. In a similar ruling in California, the case of **CHEW v GATES, 744 F. Supp. 952 (1990)** relied on training standards and adherence to canine manuals to support the K-9 Team as a reasonable use of force. In this case, the dog was trained to seek, find and restrain the suspect by biting until the dog was called off by the handler. Although the suspect suffered severe injuries to his left arm and side, the court found the dog to be “*objectively reasonable*” as a use-of-force under the circumstances presented. The court was clear to point out that neither federal law nor California statutes prohibited training and use of police dogs to find, hold and immobilize suspects by biting if necessary. Subsequent case law in **MATTHEWS v JONES, 35 F. 3rd 1046 (1994)** and other decisions nationally have upheld the legal standards cited in ROBINETTE and CHEW.

The court took the opposing view in the subsequent U.S. District Court 3rd Circuit E.D. case of **MARLEY v ALLENTOWN, 774 F. Supp. 343 (1991)** ruling that the dog was objectively unreasonable as a use-of-force, even though the dog merely inflicted bite wounds to

the thigh and calf of the suspect. The K-9 Team in MARLEY failed to comport to departmental policy and practice regarding the K-9 unit's use-of-force standards. The court found the threat of harm as relatively insignificant in light of the overall circumstances involved, and as such, unreasonable in the situation. In a similar ruling, **KERR v WEST PALM BEACH, 875 F. 2d 1546 (11th Cir. 1989)** the court found inadequate training and lack of supervision resulting in an excessive number of bites by dogs; many in unwarranted situations where the level of threat did not match the use-of-force applied, determining a misapplication of the K-9 Patrol Teams in this case. The federal courts clearly delineating what is and what is not acceptable practices via these case decisions.

Although correctional officers duties do not involve arrests of felony suspects, parallels of dangerousness can be drawn and these cases still set the parameters for law enforcement / correctional K-9 units today. These established precedents are nicely outlined on the web page of the U.S. Police K-9 Association at www.uspcak9.com. Also, the "eight points of negligence" (appointment, retention, entrustment, assignment, direction, training, supervision & discipline) that would trigger "*vicarious liability*" of a K-9 Patrol Team are listed with appropriate subsections at www.k9fleck.org/k9neg.htm. Until the courts rule differently, these cases and guidelines set the legal standards that any agency contemplating K-9 Teams should incorporate into their policy & procedures manuals.

Approach:

Research for this study was conducted at Lancaster County Prison, a local detention facility designed to meet the incarceration needs of police and court systems within its jurisdiction. The jail complex is a walled castle-like compound occupying an entire city block, situated near the center of a medium sized city. At the time of the 1995 study, average daily inmate population was 824 prisoners, with that daily average rising to 1,131 for the 2004 study (a 27% increase), which parallels national jail inmate increases for the same time frame (30%). The prisoners were assigned to one of 14 different housing areas in 1995 and 16 different areas in 2004 ranging from maximum security "hard" style cells, to minimum security open dormitory and barracks style housing units. During both periods, the facility operated above 90% of rated bed capacity, and used double bunking and temporary overflow housing to alleviate some of the overcrowding pressures (**Allen et al, 1992; Champion, 1990**). In accordance with Pennsylvania law, the jail was holding both pre-trial and sentenced adult offenders for periods of time up to 23 months in length. Crimes ranged from non-violent domestic relations "failure to pay support" charges to violent "criminal homicide" charges. Demographically, the inmate population closely represented the characteristics of the national jail population (**BJS, 2005**).

Prison security was maintained by a workforce of 167 uniformed correctional staff assigned to one of three duty shifts in 1995, with an increase to 175 uniformed officers in 2004. Within the uniformed ranks there are five individual K-9 dog/handler teams that comprise the K-9 unit. The K-9 Unit is scheduled primarily to cover the "active" duty hours, with overlap coverage during peak inmate movement periods, seven days a week when staff levels permit. The K-9 Handlers are selected from the security officers based on the results of a formal promotional exam process. Selected officers are then assigned exclusively to K-9 training and patrol duties until completion of their canine training certification. Dogs within the unit are

restricted to males only, and the breeds used over the two survey periods have included Rottweiler, Belgian Malinois, and German Shepherd dogs. These breeds possess the size, intelligence, athleticism and temperament to work effectively in the jail environment, while also being physically hardy enough to endure Pennsylvania's seasonal climatic changes.

Methodology:

Data for this study were gathered through a series of interviews and semi-structured questions with resident inmates, staff correctional officers and regional jail administrators in an attempt to glean their attitudes and perceptions on relevant jail issues (e.g. safety, security, speed of response, institutional violence, use-of-force policies, ETC). From the interviews, two sets of survey questionnaires were designed to elicit inmate and staff perceptions of the jail's K-9 Unit in a more measurable format. In an attempt to assure representativeness with staff, the duty rosters were reviewed to select the day of the week having the most diverse (age, race, gender & time of service) group of correctional officers assigned to work. A total of 104 staff questionnaires were handed out on 1995 with a response rate of 53% (N=55), and 110 questionnaires handed out to staff on 2004 with a response rate of 59% (N=65).

To gain a representative balance of inmate survey samples, ten inmates from each housing unit in the maximum, medium and minimum security level housing units were randomly selected to participate in the questionnaire. Cell numbers for each housing unit were arranged in a numerical sequence to list every third cell in the unit. Inmates were advised of a "special detail" being conducted in the school classrooms and asked if they "wished to participate" in it. If they declined, the next cell number on the list was called until ten residents from each housing unit agreed to participate. Following a brief introductory statement as to the survey's purpose, the inmates not wishing to participate were instructed to simply place a blank form into the sealed collection box at the end of the group exercise. This process was repeated until all the housing units had participated. Ninety inmate survey questionnaires were distributed in 1995 with a response rate of 98% (N=89), and 130 questionnaires handed out in 2004 with a response rate of 95% (N=123).

Finally, a daily log was maintained by the K-9 Unit to track all *Service Calls* involving the duty K-9 Teams to measure the type of disturbance situations they responded to, and the general time of the day disturbances were most likely to occur. The findings coincide with **Kratcoski's (1988)** study that the vast majority of staff assault occur between 8AM - MN when inmate movement is at the highest level. The jail administration at Lancaster County Prison felt that K-9 Teams were most valuable as a "*psychological deterrence*" during a disturbance and wished to test this hypothesis as part of the study.

Findings:

This section presents the results of the 1995 and 2004 surveys with concentration on measuring perceptions of safety, acceptance, effectiveness, training and deterrence.

SAFETY: Since the research literature points toward a correlation between good management and feelings of safety within an institution as being of primary importance, the first question posed to staff and inmates in the survey was a generalized question to obtain a baseline measurement regarding safety. The Staff question was *How would YOU rate your personal feelings of safety in enforcing rules and facing daily confrontations with inmates in the jail?* The inmate question was *“How safe do YOU feel in this jail?”* The Likert scale for both questions ranged from Very Unsafe (1) to Very Safe (5).

Question #1	V. Unsafe	Unsafe	Normal	Safe	V. Safe
Staff - 1995	5%	15%	29%	36%	15%
Staff - 2004	3%	17%	45%	31%	4%

1995 Mean = 3.4 / S.D. = 1.08

2004 Mean = 3.17 / S.D. = 0.87

Question #1	V. Unsafe	Unsafe	Normal	Safe	V. Safe
Inmate - 1995	6%	14%	43%	26%	11%
Inmate - 2004	9%	12%	54%	20%	5%

1995 Mean = 3.2 / S.D. = 0.98

2004 Mean = 3.00 / S.D. = 0.94

The next question was on the inmate and staff questionnaires was phrased a bit different, with inmates being asked *“How much does the K-9 unit help in keeping inmate fights or disturbances under control?”* while the staff question was *“Do you feel that K-9 increases or decreases your feelings of safety in daily rule enforcement / confrontations?”* The Likert scale ranged from Much Worse (1) to Helps Greatly (5) for the inmate question and from Greatly Decrease(1) to Greatly Increase (5) for the staff question.

Question #2	Much Worse	Slight Worse	No Effect	Somewhat	Helps Great
Inmate-1995	8%	9%	18%	40%	25%
Inmate-2004	8%	16%	39%	33%	8%

1995 Mean = 3.6 / S.D.= 1.17

2004 Mean = 3.66 / S.D. = 1.12

Question #2	G. Decrease	Slight Decre	Just as Safe	Slight Incre	G. Increase
Staff-1995	2%	0%	13%	34%	51%
Staff-2004	0%	1%	30%	26%	43%

1995 Mean = 4.3 / S.D. = 0.84
2004 Mean = 4.11 / S.D. = 0.88

A related question was asked of staff: *“If the jail disbanded the K-9 unit tomorrow, how would it affect your job duties?”* The scale Likert ranged from Significantly Less Hazardous (1) to Significantly More Hazardous (5).

Question #3	Sig Less Haz	Slight L. Haz	No Change	Slight More	Sig More Ha
Staff-1995	2%	0%	22%	40%	36%
Staff-2004	0%	0%	29%	34%	37%

1995 Mean = 4.1 / S.D. = 0.86
2004 Mean = 4.08 / S.D. = 0.81

ACCEPTANCE: For any use-of-force technique to be effective, it should be recognized, accepted, and respected as a use-of-force tool.

In a direct **yes** or **no** question to inmates and staff, both were asked, *“If you were the warden of a jail, would you support the use of K-9 Patrol Dogs as a security tool based on your experience with the dog?”*

Question-4	Yes	No	*****	Question-4	Yes	No
Staff-1995	94%	6%	*****	Inmate-95	61%	39%
Staff-2004	89%	11%	*****	Inmate-04	70%	30%

In an attempt to measure acceptance, a compliance question was posed to the inmates as *“In the event of a fight / group disturbance in your housing unit, do YOU walk away from the disturbance when K-9 enters the area?”* The Likert scale ranged from Never (1) to All The Time (5).

Question #5	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Rather Often	All the Time
Inmate-1995	2%	3%	22%	8%	65%
Inmate-2004	10%	3%	13%	9%	65%

1995 Mean = 4.3 / S.D. = 1.06
2004 Mean = 4.16 / S.D. = 1.33

Staff were asked the question “*When K-9 responds as a back-up to a fight / disturbance in your patrol area, does this boost your self-confidence in handling the situation?*” The Likert scale ranged from Never (1) to All The Time (5).

Question #5	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Rather Often	All the Time
Staff - 1995	2%	16%	18%	20%	44%
Staff - 2004	4%	19%	22%	17%	38%

1995 Mean = 3.8 / S.D. = 1.20
2004 Mean = 3.64 / S.D. = 1.29

Staff were asked the question: *If you had to rate the K-9 Dog’s value in terms of doing your job, where would you place the dog in terms of worth?*” The Likert scale ranged from No Value (1) to Very Valuable (5).

Question #6	No Value	Little Value	Moderate	Valuable	Very Value
1995 - Staff	5%	5%	13%	38%	38%
2004 - Staff	6%	8%	19%	41%	26%

1995 Mean = 4.0 / S.D. = 1.11
2004 Mean = 3.73 / S.D. = 1.13

EFFECTIVENESS: Part of the measure of effectiveness is attempting to determine which attribute of the K-9 team registers the strongest impression on inmates and staff when employed at a disturbance situation. The question asked to the staff/inmates was *During a fight / disturbance situation, what would to rate as the dog’s most useful effect in helping to regain control?*” The following list of five characteristics and one open-ended category were presented to both staff and inmates on the questionnaire with the instructions of selecting the **MOST USEFUL** effect. The five characteristics were *No Useful Effect, Visual Presence, Loud Barking/Growling, Physical Movements with the Handler, and Fear of the Dog’s Bite*. The open-ended category was Other-please describe.

Question-7	No Use	Visual	Loud Bark	Physical	Fear Bite	Other
Staff 1995	2%	24%	18%	19%	30%	7%
Staff 2004	4%	23.5%	23.5%	12%	34%	3%
Inmate-95	9%	11%	26%	15%	34%	5%

Inmate-04	9%	7%	32%	14%	34%	4%
-----------	----	----	-----	-----	-----	----

In a mild twist of irony, *Fear of the Dog's Bite* was consistently the highest rated characteristic in all four polls even though a serious dog bite has not occurred to an inmate in the unit's history. This is reflected in the "Other" open-ended comments from both staff and inmates: "No history of dog bites...Never saw the dog bite...Inmates seem to back down when K-9 is in the area...The dog leaves a fierce impression...Fear." It might be concluded that the overall presence of the K-9 team provided psychological deterrence without having to physically inflict a bite. This aspect will be pursued in more depth via staff questions in a latter portion of the article. Suffice it to say that over 90% of those questioned agreed that K-9 presence had some useful effect in a jail disturbance.

During the formulation phase of the study, five regional jail administrators were interviewed. The theme that repeated amongst the wardens was that their inmate populations were growing, as was the jail's physical plant. The size of the inmate population combined with the larger size of the institutions created logistical problems for rapid response to disturbances. Although most had a CERT type unit for a major disturbance, all wanted an everyday intermediary resource such as a roving K-9 team for quick deployment to shut down a disturbance before it could escalate. In the five wardens' opinions, K-9 Patrol Teams would fill this void in their Emergency Preparedness Plans. To measure this, timeliness to the disturbance was selected as one means to assess this effectiveness quality. The following question was asked of both staff and inmates: "How would you rate the K-9 unit's response time to a call for assistance or a fight/disturbance situation?" The Likert scale ranged from Very Slow (1) to Very Rapid (5)

Question #8	Very Slow	Slow	Fair	Rapid	Very Rapid
Staff - 1995	0%	0%	15%	58%	27%
Staff - 2004	3%	3%	12%	54%	28%
Inmate-95	6%	10%	34%	39%	11%
Inmate-04	5%	11.5%	42%	30%	11.5%

1995 Staff Mean = 4.1 / S.D. = 0.64

2004 Staff Mean = 4.00 / S.D. = 0.90

1995 Inmate Mean = 3.4 / S.D. = 1.01

2004 Inmate Mean = 3.31 / S.D. = 1.33

A list of more specific "Effectiveness" questions were presented on the staff questionnaire for cross-reference of responses and perceptions. The chart listed nine operational areas of utilization and asked the staff to answer "On a scale of 1-5, with 1 being the least useful and 5 being highly useful, rate the K-9's Effectiveness in the following situations. The top

four uses indicate that staff prefer K-9 assistance at disturbance and while handling aggressive inmates, but not in the less routine tasks.

Highest in both surveys was *Crowd Control in Disturbance Situations*, with the Likert scale ranged from No Use (1) to Highly Useful (5).

Question #9	No Use	Slightly	Useful	Very Useful	Highly Use
Staff - 1995	2%	0%	15%	15%	68%
Staff - 2004	5%	6%	6%	24%	59%

1995 Mean = 4.5 / S.D. = 0.87
2004 Mean = 4.25 / S.D. = 1.13

The next highest response was *Psychological Deterrent to inmates*:

Question #10	No Use	Slightly	Useful	Very Useful	Highly Use
Staff - 1995	0%	2%	9%	36%	53%
Staff - 2004	2%	5%	19%	14%	60%

1995 Mean = 4.4 / S.D. = 0.67
2004 Mean = 4.29 / S.D. = 1.03

Escort of Hostile/Aggressive Inmates:

Question #11	No Use	Slightly	Useful	Very Useful	Highly Use
Staff - 1995	7%	6%	7%	26%	55%
Staff - 2004	5%	3%	14%	29%	49%

1995 Mean = 4.2 / S.D. = 1.22
2004 Mean = 4.19 / S/D. = 1.12

Back-up Response in Disturbance Situations:

Question #12	No Use	Slightly	Useful	Very Useful	Highly Use
Staff - 1995	4%	7%	9%	22%	58%
Staff - 2004	2%	6%	14%	32%	46%

1995 Mean = 4.2 / S.D. = 1.12
2004 Mean = 4.14 / S.D. = 0.99

The lowest rated category in this series was *Intake of New Commitments*:

Question #13	No Use	Slightly	Useful	Very Useful	Highly Use
Staff - 1995	4%	11%	22%	36%	27%
Staff - 2004	29%	23%	29%	11%	8%

1995 Mean = 3.7 / S.D. = 1.09
2004 Mean = 2.47 / S.D. = 1.28

Routine Patrol of the Institution registered a Mean of **3.8** in both the 1995 & 2004 surveys with Standard Deviations of **0.99** and **1.10** respectively. Slightly below this in the **3.38 - 3.69** ranges were *Impact as a Public Relations Tool to Enhance Correctional Officer Image to the Public*, *Psychological Boost to Correctional Officers* and *Weapon to Incapacitate* in that order. Such ratings match open-ended responses from staff where they viewed their line duties under normal operational conditions to be more in line with Direct Supervision principles and effective in controlling the day-to-day routines, whereas K-9 under quiet conditions tends to escalate. The feelings of line staff are summed up best in two of the comments: *The K-9 officer has to be reminded that he is also a correctional officer and not just a K-9 officer. He is part of a much larger team and not just K-9.* and *“Correctional officers are as good as K-9. We as a whole when banded together are as forceful as K-9.”*

TRAINING: Many of the staff and inmate answers to open-ended questions why they would “*oppose*” a K-9 unit centered on **liability** and training issues, especially for a “*bad bite*” or “*apathy*” within the unit. Issues very germane to the Legal Issues section already discussed and defined by case law. Staff were asked the question: *Do you feel that the K-9 Unit has been adequately trained in the use-of-force?* The Likert scale ranged from Very Inadequate (1) to Very Adequate (5).

Question #14	Very Inad	Inadequate	No Opinion	Adequate	Very Adeq
Staff - 1995	4%	2%	7%	45%	42%
Staff - 2004	0%	2%	21%	34%	37%

1995 Mean = 4.2 / S.D. 0.92
2004 Mean = 4.18 / S.D. = 0.82

When staff were asked a similar question to rate their own use-of-force training to that of K-9 in disturbances, their survey ratings came in with lower Means of **3.1** This may best be explained in the open-ended responses of: *C.O.’s usually can control the situation, but fights*

stop when K-9 shows up, inmates immediately return to their cells.” Also, “Several situations would have turned into full scale riots has K-9 not been there to assist.” “I have seen three separate occasions where a K-9 unit has disbanded and moved a large group of inmates during a major disturbance.”

DETERRENCE: The last series of questions centered on staff’s perceptions of the inmates’ reaction to the K-9 Teams. The questions were a series of eight perception related assessments where the officer was asked to interpret the inmates’ reactions to situations involving the K-9 Unit . The staff were asked to answer “*Next to each of the statements, rate why you think the INMATES react to the K-9 Unit.*”

The highest response was *Fear of receiving a dog bite*, with the Likert scale ranged from Never (1) to All The Time (5).

	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	All the Time
Staff - 1995	4%	5%	11%	35%	45%
Staff - 2004	5%	13%	16%	18%	48%

1995 Mean = 4.1 / S.D. = 1.05
2004 Mean = 3.92 / S.D. = 1.26

K-9 has more deterrent value than an officer, with the Likert scale ranged from Never (1) to All The Time (5).

Question #16	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	All the Time
Staff - 1995	7%	0%	24%	45%	24%
Staff - 2004	3%	12%	27%	27%	31%

1995 Mean = 3.8 / S.D. = 1.04
2004 Mean = 3.71 / S/D. = 1.11

K-9 draws the focus of the on looking crowd away from the disturbance and toward the dog, with the Likert scale ranged from Never (1) to All The Time (5).

Question #16	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	All the Time
Staff - 1995	2%	2%	14%	55%	27%
Staff - 2004	5%	8%	31%	32%	24%

1995 Mean = 4.0 / S.D. = 0.81
2004 Mean = 3.63 / S.D. = 1.09

The other questions asked in this series were: “*Respect for the K-9 Unit’s reputation*”, “*K-9 Allows an inmate to walk away from a confrontation without losing status with peers*”, “*K-9 is more of a physical force than officers*” and “*Confrontation with an officer tends to escalate a situation, while a dog de-escalates confrontation.*” The Mean ranged from a low of **3.06** for the *Respect Reputation* question, with the other three ranging between **3.34** to **3.38** averaged.

The open-ended responses from staff repeated prior sentiments that K-9 had a useful deterrent value in specific situations, especially disturbances. Staff quoted as “*K-9 has a psychological impact during codes.*” “*It makes the inmates think.*” “*Time after time K-9 has demonstrated the ability to deter potential out-of-control situations.*” The open-ended responses from the inmates were more direct and pointed out the fear aspects, even though no serious bites have occurred on inmates in the course of K-9 duties. “*Dogs provide a primal fear.*” “*Dogs scare the hell out of people.*” “*No one wants to get bit by a Rottweiler.*” “*Dogs are too dangerous and will seriously injure a person.*”

CONCLUSIONS:

Results from this study hold promise for K-9 Patrol Dogs as a use-of-force option. As Henry (1989) pointed out, inmates and officers are stakeholders in the correctional organization. Both groups must view K-9 as a legitimate form of social control for the dog to be an effective control device. As seen from the questionnaire results, staff feedback was supportive of the K-9 Unit as a use-of-force alternative. Inmate survey responses were less supportive than staff, but were surprisingly positive in nature. Had inmates viewed the K-9 Unit as an improper use-of-force, their survey ratings and comments would have generated significant responses on the negative aspects of the dogs use. Normally a very outspoken group on subjects of disagreement, the inmates expressed relatively little disapproval toward the K-9 unit in these two studies. It would appear that when properly utilized, K-9 Patrol Dogs function as an effective crowd control device, assist in deterring major inmate disturbances via rapid response and may even help increase feelings of safety in the jail by lowering the opportunity for serious harm.

Inmates expect the jail to monitor violence in the institution and take prudent steps toward ameliorating the threat of harm during their incarceration (McCorkle, 1992). A good basis for violence prevention is to deter inappropriate behavior. Inmate culture condones intimidation through the use of size, strength and force as a means of self-protection. In this respect, the K-9 Patrol Dog’s projection of fear through the use of a bite is a valuable psychological deterrent to thwart inmate misbehavior. The inmates aptly reflect this in their questionnaire statements by citing “*primal fear*” of the dog as a deterrent. Less preoccupation with safety makes it easier to manage inmates. When a jail can soften its culture by creating a safer means of incarceration, it can direct its energies toward more productive treatment oriented programs for inmate rehabilitation.

The practice of using K-9 Units as part of the jail security force may hold important consequences for jail administrators as well. If the data are representative of inmate and staff attitudes in other Direct Supervision jails, then K-9 Teams offer a fit in the continuum of force between Correctional Officer and CERT team activation. A selling point of the Direct

Supervision jail is to allow fewer number of officers to manage larger number of inmates (**Dawe et al, 1995**). With spiraling inmate populations and expanding physical plants to patrol, the K-9 Team offers an efficient yet cost effective means of controlling larger groups of prisoners, but with reduced personnel costs.

All-in-all, the survey results at Lancaster County Prison support the K-9 Unit's existence. It appears that the institution's K-9 Unit policies and practices fall within the requirement for 'balanced response' set out in MARLEY v ALLENTOWN 774 F. Supp. 343, and are viewed as an acceptable use-of-force option by staff and inmates in the jail. Although this is an isolated study focusing on one single county jail, the implications might be applicable on a wider national scale. The data suggest a very close correlation in staff and inmate responses during both studies. The surveys were nine years apart and the turnover in staff and inmates answering the questionnaire were comprised of a different respondent pool, allowing for new views on the same topic. An argument could even be made that based on the diverse demographics of the inmate population, that Lancaster County inmates mirror and are a heterogeneous representation of the national jail profile (**BJS, 2005**). At a minimum, it is hoped that this article serves as a template for further study or as an outline for drafting a K-9 utilization proposal at other correctional facilities.

REFERENCES

- Allen, Harry E. & Clifford E. Simonsen, *Corrections In America - An Introduction*, (6th Edition), MacMillan Publishing Co.: NY, 1992, pp 219-236 / 510/514
- Beard, Jeffery A., *Using Special Management Units to Control Inmate Violence*, **Corrections Today**, Aug 1994, pp 88-91
- Bureau of Justice Statistics, U.S. Dept of Justice webpage
www.ojp.usdoj.gov/bjs/glance/tables/jailagtab.htm Dec 28th, 2005
- Bodnar, Robert J., *K-9 Dogs in Jail*, American Correctional Association - **Jail Operations Bulletin**, Vol. VI No 5, 1995, pp 1-6
- Bodnar, Robert J., *K-9 Patrols - Physical & Psychological Deterrence*, **American Jails**, July/Aug 1990, pp 35-38
- Boyd, David G., *NIJ Enhances Weapons Technology*, **Corrections Today**, April 1994, pp 160-162
- Brown, Paul W., *The Continuum of Force in Community Supervision*, **Federal Probation**, Dec 1994, pp 31-37
- Champion, Dean J., *Corrections in the U.S. - A Contemporary Perspective*", Prentice-Hall Inc: Englewood Cliffs, NJ, 1990, pp 176-193
- Charles, Michael T., Sessa Kethineni & Jeffery L. Thompson, *The State of Jails in America*,

Federal Probation, June 1992, pp 56-61

Dawe, Brian & James Kirby, *Direct Supervision Jails and Minimum Staffing*, **American Jails**, March/April 1995, pp 97-100

del Carmen, Rolando V., *The Supreme Court and Prison Excessive Use of Force Cases: Does One Test Fit All?*, **Federal Probation**, June 1992, pp 44-47

Drapkin, Martin & Gary T. Klugiewicz, *Use of Force Training in Jails (Part I & II)*, **American Jails**, Jan/Feb & March/April 1994, pp 9-12 / 93-98

Ekland-Olson, Sheldon, Dennis M. Barrick & Lawrence E. Cohen, *Prison Overcrowding and Disciplinary Problems: An Analysis of the Texas Prison System*, **The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science**, Vol. 19 No 2, 1983, pp 163-176

Henry, Nicholas, *Public Administration and Public Affairs*, (4th Edition), Prentice-Hall Inc: Englewood Cliffs, NJ, 1989, pp 99-142

Henry, Patrick, Jeffery D. Senese & Gwyn Smith Ingley, *Use of Force in America's Prisons: An Overview of Current Research*, **Corrections Today**, July 1994, pp 108-114

Houston, James G., Don C. Gibbson & Joseph F. Jones, *Physical Environment and Jail Social Climate*, **Crime & Delinquency**, Vol 34 no 4, Oct 1988, pp 449-466

Jefferis, Eric S., *Violence in Corrections Institutions*, **American Jails**, Sept/Oct 1994, pp 25-32

Kinkade, Patrick, Matthew Leone & Scott Semond, *The Consequences of Jail Crowding*, **Crime & Delinquency**, Vol 41 No 1, Jan 1995, pp 150-161

Kratcoski, Peter C., *The Implications of Research Explaining Prison Violence and Disruption*, **Federal Probation**, March 1988, pp 27-32

Light, Stephen C., *The Severity of Assaults on Prison Officers: A Contextual Study*, **Social Science Quarterly**, Vol 71 No 2, June 1990, pp 267-284

McCorkle, Richard C., *Personal Precautions to Violence in Prisons*, **Criminal Justice and Behavior**, Vol 19 No 2, June 1992, pp 160-173

McCorkle, Richard C., Terence D. Miethe & Kriss A. Drass, *The Roots of Prison Violence: A Test of the Deprivation, Management and Not-so-Total Institutional Model*, **Crime & Delinquency**, Vol 35 No 2, July 1995 pp 317-331

McShane, Marilyn D. & Frank P. Williams III, *The Prison Adjustment of Juvenile Offenders*, **Crime & Delinquency**, Vol 35 No 2, April 1989, pp 254-269

O'Connor, Vincent, *Alaska Canine Units Keep Inmates on a Tight Leash*, **Corrections Today**,

July 1990, pp 52-58

Paulus, Paul B. & Mary T. Dzindolet, *Reactions of Male and Female Inmates to Prison Confinement, Further Evidence for a Two-Component Model*, **Criminal Justice and Behavior**, Vol 20 No 2, June 1993, pp 149-166

Perroncello, Peter, *Toward a New Direct Supervision Paradigm*, **American Jails**, July/Aug 1995, pp 38-42

Rison, Richard H. & Peter M. Wittenberg, *Disaster Theory: Avoiding Crisis in a Prison Environment*, **Federal Probation**, Vol 58 No 3, Sept 1994, pp 45-50

Senese, Jeffery D., Joe Wilson, Arthur O. Evans, Robert Aguirre & David B. Kalinich, *Evaluating Inmate Infractions and Disciplinary Responses in a Traditional and a Podular/Direct Supervision Jail*, **American Jails**, Sept/Oct 1992, pp 14-23

Stohr, Mary K., Nicholas P. Lourich, Ben A. Menke & Linda L. Zupan, *Staff Management in Correctional Institutions: Control Model and Employee Investment Model- Outcomes in Five Jail Settings, (Parts I & II)*, **American Jails**, May/June & July/Aug 1995, pp 35-43 / 28-34

Thornton, Robert L. & John Shireman, *New Approaches to Staff Safety*, National Institute of Corrections, USGPO, Washington, D.C., 1993, pp 1-44

Welch, John W. Jr., *K-9 and Corrections*, **American Jails**, July/Aug 1995, pp 61-64

Wolford, Bruce I. & Karla E. Kowalski, *National Survey Offers Insights Into Staff Training Budgets*, **Corrections Today**, Feb 1993, pp 56-58