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Chapter 1: Introduction

*Just the other day, one of the handlers was telling the dog “No! Get over here!” and then an officer said “Hey, you got the problem that we have. You treat him like an inmate. He thinks you’re the officer.” That’s a bad thing, but it is no doubt a us/them attitude in this system. There’s a superior and inferior idea of anybody, [but as] an inmate, no matter what your charge is, you’re inferior. Flat out, you inferior. You’re unintelligent, and you lack any potential to produce. That’s just one of the realities of bein’ in prison. However, we are superior to the dogs. The dog handlers recognize the fact that just because you have a sense of superiority over somethin’ doesn’t mean you have to necessarily misuse it or mistreat it. And I think that’s where a lot of officers go wrong. They feel their superiority, just in the sense of them having a job, makes them better, more educated. In all actuality, that’s the opposite in most circumstances.*

These words, spoken by a handler in the dog program where this study takes place, speaks to important points in this study. First, his words characterize society’s notion of those in prison and the current sentiments towards rehabilitative programming. Secondly, it highlights a power structure operating within the program, that of the institution over the inmates and the inmate handlers over the dogs, a sense of discipline within discipline. Throughout this study, I will come back to both of these ideas, highlighting their roles within these kinds of programs.

Dog programs are rapidly increasing in popularity in prison systems throughout the United States. In fact, there at least 38 dog programs across facilities which make up the Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Corrections (Appendix A). However, there is little research on dog programming components, objectives, curriculum, or effects. This study seeks to provide a preliminary contribution to this research through a case study of the dog program at a prison located in north-central Ohio. Through the use of interviews and observations I hope to provide an in depth account of one specific program. My
goals are to explore 1) what constitutes dog programming; 2) how dog programming originated at this institution; 3) what core elements make up this kind of programming; 4) the perceptions and justifications for these programs by staff and inmate participants; 5) the contradictions that exist between the dog program and the process of punishment.

For this study, I have developed the following research questions:

**Descriptive Questions**

1. What constitutes dog programming?
2. What are the key components of that programming?
3. What are its formal objectives and goals?

**Theoretical Questions**

1. In the context of dog programming, why do inmates participate in the program? Do they relate participation to rehabilitation?
2. In the context of dog programming, do the coordinators see the program as directed at rehabilitation?
3. What are the contradictions between the dog program and the process of punishment? How does this affect the participants and how do they negotiate these contradictions?

While information on the subject is slowly emerging, the use of animals in U.S. prisons dates back to over 25 years ago. In 1981, Sister Pauline Quinn, a Dominican nun, began the first dog program in United States prisons. According to Quinn (2004:8), “the prison animal programs help to bring back respect, dignity and especially love, which is the main ingredient in motivating change,” thus emphasizing a rehabilitative component within the program’s foundational beliefs.
Prison dog programs are often described as win-win situations for all parties that are involved. As Quinn (2004:7) describes:

Since the first program in 1981, other Prison Dog programs developed around the United States and other countries, helping forgotten and unwanted people find meaning in their lives, saving unwanted dogs and helping the prison system learn the importance of allowing inmates to give something back to society.

As of 2005, Quinn’s program alone “has placed over 700 dogs as service dogs or pets” (Neal 2005:100).

As stated above, dog programs are rapidly increasing in popularity. Magazine and newspaper articles and television newscasts are helping to increase public awareness about dog programs in prisons. In fact, an article about dog programming, specifically inmates training service dogs for wounded Iraq veterans, recently made the front page of the Yahoo! Website. Furthermore, animal therapy has recognized the legitimacy of the uses of animals in prison settings from the beginning, and benefits are reflected in the animal therapy literature.

However, despite growing media coverage and recognition within the field of animal therapy, little has been written on this topic empirically or theoretically within the field of criminology. My aims for this project are to increase understandings about what dog programs are designed to do and to explore the perceptions and justifications behind them, ultimately providing a complete case study to further the knowledge that currently exists on the subject. This kind of research is new and emergent, with little qualitative data existing on the subject. In one of the most relevant articles on dog programming, “A History of Prison-Animal Interaction Programs” (Strimple 2003) provides a brief history of animal programs and the benefits that these programs provide, yet it gives no in-depth
qualitative context for such programs. Also, little attention has been given to the role of these programs in larger theoretical frameworks, including discussions of rehabilitation and the role of programming in disciplinary thought.

**Dog program description**

As part of my research goals, I spent time within the institution and with those involved in the program, allowing me to get a full understanding of this specific program’s operations, starting first with the role descriptions of the individuals involved in the program.

The dog program at this institution, started in 1999, consists of seven primary handlers, one secondary handler, a program aide (all of whom are inmates), and a staff program coordinator. Having previously completed the requirements for the program, each primary handler has his own dog, and they live with their dogs in the former day room of a housing unit within the institution. They are responsible for the dogs 24 hours a day, seven days a week. The secondary handler is in the process of learning how to train and attends classes and training sessions with the goal of advancing into a primary position, if and when he is ready and space is available. The number of secondaries varies according to interest in the program, but the program will generally allow whoever is qualified and willing to participate in the secondary role.

The program aide, who has been with the program from its first year, acts as a liaison between the handlers and the program coordinator and also makes sure the program is on track, monitoring the training schedule and the other handlers. Finally, the coordinator of the program is also the unit manager of the housing unit where the
program is located, and is responsible for overseeing the inmates, coordinating the dogs’ entrance and exit with the local rescues that provide the dogs, and keeping the positions in the program filled.

I was also able to observe the training methods used by the handlers. The handlers use two formal training methods while working with their dogs. In the regimented morning classes, they use the AKC Standard method, which is the recognized training method of the American Kennel Club. This method emphasizes positive and negative reinforcement in training. In this case, positive reinforcement involves verbally praising the dogs, while negative reinforcement is giving the dog a correction, using a pop and release motion on a zip collar to refocus the dog’s attention. With the outside trainers, who are discussed below, they use the Volhard method, which uses treat training to reinforce behavior. It is interesting to note that within the prison, which itself operates through positive and negative reinforcement of behavior, the handlers prefer the AKC method. However, the outside trainers favor treat training that involves minimal negative corrections.

In terms of program operations, the handlers in the program keep to a strict schedule. Everyday, they are up with the dogs by 7:00 a.m. They have regimented training classes on the prison yard from 9:30 to 10:15 a.m., and then allow the dogs to play outside on the yard until count, at which time they must report to their dorms and remain there until staff can account for each inmate within the prison. For the rest of the day, they have individual training time with their dogs, where they work both on bonding with the dog and teaching it commands. At the end of each day, the handlers fill out a journal sheet, detailing their dog’s activities for that day (Appendix B). They record its
progress and any successes or problems that they encountered during the course of the day. When the dog is adopted, the journal follows the animal and is given to its new owners, allowing the owner to see how the dog was trained and what it is able to do. Additionally, on Tuesday afternoons from 1:30 to 2:30, two outside trainers, who have been volunteering regularly with the program for the past few years, come into the institution to teach a training class to the handlers and their dogs.

The program operates on seven-week cycles, with trained dogs exiting and untrained dogs entering the institution on the same day. The changeover happens on a Thursday, and the handlers spend the weekend bathing, temperament testing, and bonding with the new dogs. Since the dogs are brought in from four local rescues, it is important that the handlers temperament test the dogs so that they know what to expect. The temperament test consists of laying the dog on its back and holding him in that position to see how it reacts. Different reactions convey different levels of dominant personalities. This first weekend is also important in that it allows the handlers to bond with the dogs, establishing the trust necessary for the training process.

Training starts on the following Monday, with the handlers teaching the dogs the five basic commands of come, sit, stay, down, and heel. They teach the dogs to follow both verbal and silent versions of the commands and often switch dogs to ensure that the dog will work for anyone, not just one particular person. Additionally, they housebreak and socialize the dogs, making sure that the dogs are comfortable around other dogs and humans before they leave. Each week, the training gets more complex, eventually leading to the dog being able to follow commands from a distance while unleashed. At the end of the seven weeks, on the Tuesday before the dogs leave, a graduation ceremony is held by
the outside trainers. The trainers give the handlers different commands of varying difficulty, and the handlers show the outside trainers what their dogs can do. The handlers and the dogs both get certificates with their names on them, and on that Thursday, the process begins again.

While training takes up much of the handlers’ time, the program also has additional components outside of training. There is a lot of writing done within the program, of which the nightly journals are a part. The handlers are also responsible for book reports that are written on articles about dogs from dog magazines donated to the program. The trainers also attend classes where they learn dog breeds, animal medical terminology, and animal first aid.

Finally, through their participation in the program, the handlers earn many community service hours, which can potentially shorten their sentence length, and also have the ability to use the program to achieve part of an apprenticeship certificate that they can finish once they are released.

*Significance*

At this particular moment in United States history, the prison population has exploded, though the rate of increase is slowing (Mauer 2006, Bureau of Justice Statistics 2006). The majority of offenders now incarcerated will one day be released. The study of rehabilitative programming is thus crucial not only to the offenders’ well-being once released, but to the safety of society as a whole. Furthermore, the foundational beliefs upon which dog programming rests are relevant to those with and without release dates and speak to the potential within both humans and dogs alike. Currently, in the field of
punishment, scholars are caught between the competing frameworks of discipline and rehabilitation in their understanding of prison operations. The rest of this study will examine the disciplinary aspects and operations of power within the prison and the program, the value of dog programming as a rehabilitative program, and the contradictions that exist between the two in this specific case study.

**Chapter Overview**

In chapter one, I have provided a brief overview of my research questions and goals, a description of the dog program in place at my research site, and highlighted the significance of this particular study.

Chapter two places this study within a relevant theoretical framework. Starting from a discussion of the sociology of punishment, I then extend into an examination of the sociology of imprisonment. Using existing literature, I locate dog programming in both disciplinary and rehabilitative fields. This chapter sets up the remainder of this study.

The methods used to complete this study are detailed in chapter three.

Chapters four and five are dedicated to the findings of this research. Chapter four examines dog programming in relation to Foucault’s ideas of discipline, normalization, and power. Chapter five explores this programming’s relationship to the concepts of rehabilitation and rehumanization and how the contradictions between the two frameworks are negotiated within the program.
In the conclusion, chapter six, the findings are summarized and the reasons as to the significance of this study are presented in greater detail and are placed within a framework of hope.
Chapter 2: Theoretical Framework

Punishment has been removed from the social sphere of life. In American society today, it is not something people wish to talk about, nor is it something in which they have much interest. When looking back at the history of punishment, the development of the penitentiary is a relatively recent occurrence. Through the eighteenth century, punishment was a public affair. Devices such as the stocks and scaffold were the primary sites of punishment during this time. “Eighteenth century criminal codes fixed a wide range of punishments. They provided for fines, for whippings, for mechanisms of shame like the stocks, pillory and public cage, for banishment, and for the gallows” (Rothman [1990] 1997:38). During this time, jails “had only limited functions. They held persons about to be tried or awaiting sentence or unable to discharge contracted debts” (Rothman 1997:38).

However, between 1790 and 1830, the United States saw a massive population increase, and as David Rothman (1990:xx) explains:

Over the course of the eighteenth century the spectacle fell out of favor, both with the authorities and with the audience… Over the next 150 years… the use of torture declined, executions moved indoors, and capital punishment itself was dramatically reduced, in some places even eliminated.

The changes that the United States was undergoing during this time were an important factor in the shift towards the use of the penitentiary as punishment. “Under the influence of demographic, economic and intellectual developments, [Americans] perceived that the traditional mechanisms of social control were obsolete” (Rothman [1990] 1997:40).

During this time of change, the idea “of the asylum took form in the perception, in fact
the fear, that once-stable social relationships were now in the process of unraveling, threatening to subvert social order and social cohesion” (Rothman 1990: xxix).

Furthermore, to the reformers of the time, “incarceration seemed more humane than hanging and less brutal than whipping. Prisons matched punishment to crime precisely: the more heinous the offense, the longer the sentence” (Rothman [1990] 1997:41). The shift to the penitentiary also alleviated another concern held by the reformers, regarding the conditions of punishment and perception of law. “The reformers were insistent that physical punishments like whipping, as well as the squalor of prisons, were eroding respect for law among offenders and the general public at large” (Ignatieff 1978: 73).

This move to penitentiaries began in the early nineteenth century and soon spread throughout the United States. Within these newly favored institutions, “the doctrines of separation, obedience, and labor became the trinity around which officials organized the penitentiary” (Rothman 1990:105). At this time, unlike the public spectacle that punishment had previously relied upon, “the permeability of eighteenth-century institutions gave way to sealed-off space… and successfully separated inmate from outsider,” a condition of imprisonment that remains true today (Rothman 1990:xxv).

“For those who manage to stay out of trouble with the law, prisons and punishment occupy the marginal place in the social awareness reserved for facts of life” (Ignatieff 1978:x). Today, prisoners are kept at a distance from the public, their lives within the institution unknown to the public, and are often at risk of becoming completely separated from the outside world. Garland (1990:240) points out the “tendency of ‘civilized’ societies to ‘lock away’ offenders, thus putting them ‘out of sight and out of
mind.” Through first an overview of the sociology of punishment and then an examination of the sociology of imprisonment, this chapter serves as the theoretical base for the findings chapters, where I will show how this study fits within the current frameworks of power and rehabilitation and the ways in which it challenges them as well.

**The Sociology of Punishment**

“To understand ‘punishment’ at a particular time one has to explore its many dynamics and forces and build up a complex picture of the circuits of meaning and action within which it currently functions” (Garland 1990:17). At the same time, one must also understand the historical views of punishment that has led up to its current state. Today, the United States incarcerates more citizens per capita than any other industrialized nation. Through the examination of various historical theoretical perspectives on punishment, I will attempt to examine the state of punishment today and its relation to rehabilitative programming, specifically to dog programming.

Though writings about the nature of punishment date back to ancient times, this framework will start with the work of Cesare Beccaria (1764), who advocated the proportionality of punishment to crime, and argued that the three factors of certainty, celerity, and severity were key to maximizing the effectiveness of punishment. To him, the purpose of punishment was deterrence, with it being only severe enough to dissuade recidivism in the offender and to keep others from offending in the first place.

Though Beccaria’s work dates back to over 200 years ago, historically his work has been highly influential on United States legal and criminal justice practices. Since his time different perspectives on punishment have emerged. Within those 200 years,
punishment has been viewed as strengthening social bonds, highlighting and furthering class divisions in society, and as further evidence of the rationalization of society.

**Punishment as the expression of values**

In this perspective, crime is seen as normal and necessary to a society, in that it defines norms and strengthens people’s belief in those norms (Durkheim [1895]1982). Durkheim’s idea of the conscience collective is essential to this, as when the beliefs that a society holds in high regard are violated, confidence in their beliefs might waiver. By punishing the offender, confidence is restored. Thus, the act of punishing crime both expresses and reaffirms society’s values.

Related to this is the idea of society and outsiders. Outsiders violate society’s norms; therefore, punishing them arouses and reinforces society’s negative feelings toward the outsider while simultaneously increasing the identification with the in-group (Mead 1918). This, however, differs from the above-mentioned idea in that it is group hostility rather than group solidarity that results in punishment. Elements of an ‘us’ and ‘them’ division and group hostility are seen on many levels within the dog program. As illustrated in the opening quote of this study, handlers are aware of the division between them and the prison staff and society in general. Additionally, as will be discussed later, the handlers see a division between themselves and other inmates who do not participate in the program.
Punishment, and prison in particular, can also be viewed from the perspective that it is a direct result of class division in society. While Marx rarely addressed punishment in his work, the idea of class separation of the bourgeoisie and the proletariat, and the struggles between the two, have been used by others when examining punishment. In this view, the economy is the base of the social institution. Those who are unable to keep up with society’s economic demands are often relegated to the ‘ghettos’ or poor neighborhoods. A constant prejudice against them prevents them from improving their life, while the presence of crime is a constant (Garland 1990). By sending the poor to prison, it could be said that society is using prisons and the criminal justice system to control what it deems the “dangerous classes” (Shelden 2001). These “dangerous classes”, as interpreted through Marxian ideas, are a negative consequence of capitalism, occurring when “large segments of the population… are not needed to produce profits” (Shelden 2001:18). Viewing these groups as a threat, the bourgeoisie then label them as “dangerous” and “because [our society] is too civilized to murder or torture this group… and we can no longer transport it to another country, it must be in some way ‘managed’ and ‘controlled,’” in this case through the use of the criminal justice system (Shelden 2001:18). In addition, Crouch (1996:468) hypothesizes the reason for the disproportionately large number of the lower classes currently imprisoned is because the economy “demands skills and attitudes that poor, urban populations have little chance of acquiring.” Therefore, they are more likely to engage in criminal behavior, resulting in their incarceration.
As stated earlier, the majority of these offenders will one day be released. It would therefore seem wise to provide them with skills while incarcerated so that they may elevate themselves and those depending on them out of a life dependent upon crime for survival. The dog program accomplishes this, emphasizing responsibility and accountability while at the same time providing the handlers with a skill that they can use to earn a living once released.

_Punishment and Rationalization_

The ideas of Max Weber have had a significant influence on the studies of both the history of the prison and the prison as it exists today. More and more, “the modern Western world managed to become increasingly rational- that is, dominated by efficiency, predictability, calculability, and nonhuman technologies that control people” (Ritzer 2000:25). This Weberian theme also applies to punishment. The penal bureaucracy is growing everyday and shows no plans of slowing anytime soon. “The most evident result of the convergent processes of centralization, bureaucratization, and professionalization has been that modern penal systems have been able to cope, reasonably effectively, with very large numbers of offenders” (Garland 1990:183). Even the prisons themselves are “tightly organized, brightly lit, and maximally visible in every corner” (Rhodes 2004:28).

Finally, the prison setting fits the description of a rationalized setting “in which people cannot always behave as human beings- where people are dehumanized” (Ritzer 2000:27). For the very large number of offenders who are currently imprisoned, this means being locked up in a place where they are treated like objects and submitted to an
“amoral and dehumanizing rhetoric of a regime” (Garland 1990:261). Rhodes (2004:39) argues “in the contemporary prison, technological innovation is combined with bureaucratic management in a similar attempt to organize every detail of the prisoners’ lives.” This kind of treatment will have a significant impact on the way the inmate views his time spent in the institution. Over the past few decades, this increase in the rationalization and efficiency within punishment has come at the expense of the abandonment of the rehabilitative ideal. What follows is an exploration of the current thought regarding both rationalization on an individual level and the conception of rehabilitation within prisons today.

The Sociology of Imprisonment

When prison emerged as an alternative to the physical punishments used before the nineteenth century, it brought with it a social world filled with new concepts and problems. The works of Erving Goffman (1957), Donald Clemmer (1958), and Gresham Sykes (1958) outline the basic features of the sociology of imprisonment.

In his work, Goffman ([1957] 1997:97) conceives prisons to be total institutions whose “encompassing or total character is symbolized by the barrier to social intercourse with the outside that is often built right into the physical plant: locked doors, high walls, barbed wire, cliffs and water, open terrain, and so forth.” With all of their basic needs (food, shelter, clothing, etc.) met within the institution, inmates have little contact with the outside world. This, according to Goffman ([1957] 1997:98), is precisely the reason for this type of total institution, as the prison is “organized to protect the community
against what are thought to be intentional dangers to it; here the welfare of the persons thus sequestered is not the immediate issue.”

Goffman ([1957] 1997:98) also defines key totalistic features that characterize these institutions, writing:

First, all aspects of life are conducted in the same place and under the same single authority. Second, each phase of the member’s daily activity will be carried out in the immediate company of a large batch of others, all of whom are treated alike and required to do the same thing together. Third, all phases of the day’s activities are tightly scheduled, with one activity leading at a prearranged time into the next, the whole circle of activities being imposed from above through a system of explicit formal rulings and a body of officials. Finally, the contents of the various enforced activities are brought together as parts of a single overall rational plan purportedly designed to fulfill the official aims of the institution.

While he discusses these features in the context of total institutions, these four features apply specifically to the dog program as well. Handlers live together and report directly to the program coordinator. They also follow strict training schedules and adhere to program rules and regulations established by those in charge of the program.

Additionally, there are distinct divisions between the staff and inmates in total institutions. Within the prison, “each grouping tends to conceive of members of the other in terms of narrow hostile stereotypes, staff often seeing inmates as bitter, secretive and untrustworthy, while inmates often see staff as condescending, highhanded and mean” (Goffman [1957] 1997:99). This division and hostility is reflected in the opening quote of the thesis, and will be emphasized throughout the rest of this study.

During his time spent in the institution, the inmate undergoes the process of prisonization, or “the taking on in greater or lesser degree of folkways, mores, customs, and general culture of the penitentiary” (Clemmer [1958] 1997:109). According to
Clemmer ([1958] 1997:109), there are certain universal factors of prisonization that affect all incarcerated.

Acceptance of an inferior role, accumulation of facts concerning the organization of the prison, the development of somewhat new habits of eating, dressing, working, sleeping, the adoption of local language, the recognition that nothing is owed to the environment for the supplying of needs, and the eventual desire for a good job are aspects of prisonization which are operative for all inmates.

While confined to the total institution and having undergone the process of prisonization, the inmate must then contend with the pains of imprisonment. Sykes ([1958] 1997:115) uses five categories of deprivations—Deprivation of Liberty, Goods and Services, Heterosexual Relationships, Autonomy, and Security—to define these pains of imprisonment and argues that “these deprivations or frustrations of the modern prison may indeed be the acceptable or unavoidable implications of imprisonment, but we must recognize the fact that they can be just as painful as the physical maltreatment which they have replaced.” Additionally, Sykes (1958 [1997]:115) also believes that it is important to recognize how these pains of imprisonment “pose profound threats to the inmate’s personality or sense of personal worth.”

Ultimately, the work of these and other sociologists shed light upon the details of prison life. In what follows, keeping these ideas in mind, I will shift to the two dominant frameworks of prison research today—discipline and reinforcement.

*Discipline*

While Weberian themes previously discussed speak to the rationalization of punishment itself, the work of Michel Foucault, specifically *Discipline and Punish,*
isolates and focuses this rationalization and its results on individuals within institutions. Though central to the sociology of imprisonment as a whole, it is also relevant to dog programming in institutions. Throughout this analysis of Foucault, I rely heavily on the perspective of sociologist David Garland. Major points are highlighted below, and his work further serves as the framework for chapter four and will be revisited then in greater detail.

In their writing, Dreyfus and Rabinow (1983:144) state that within *Discipline and Punish*, “the object of study is not really the prison; it is disciplinary technology.” Further, they write, “Foucault’s approach to prison is a way of isolating the development of a specific technique of power” (143). For Foucault, punishment views the body as the central target for power. Disciplinary technology is practiced upon offenders’ bodies, thereby creating what Foucault (1977:136) terms ‘docile bodies,’ or bodies “that may be subjected, used, transformed and improved.” He traces this idea back to the development of the prison, at a time when “punishment was seen as a technique for the coercion of individuals” by “training the body… in the form of habits, in behaviour…” (Foucault 1977:131). Through this, he states, “discipline produces subjected and practised bodies, ‘docile’ bodies” (Foucault 1977:138). He traces the production of these docile bodies by writing “the genealogy of the modern individual as a docile and mute body by showing the interplay of a disciplinary technology and a normative social science” (Dreyfus & Rabinow 1983:143). Important to this study, dog programming contains elements of this disciplinary technology that results in the regulation and normalization of handlers’ behavior.
According to Garland (1990:153):

Foucault’s singularity lies in his identification of power relations in the intimate details of penal measures—at the points where specific forms of power and knowledge actually make contact with the offender—and his analysis of the different practical forms which these can take.

Elaborating on the definition of power, he writes, “what is meant by ‘power’ here is the idea of controlling—or rather ‘producing’—behaviour, whether directly through the disciplinary training of offenders or, more indirectly, by way of deterrent threat and example to the general population” (Garland 1990: 162).

Furthermore, knowledge over an individual is crucial to the operation of power. “The more it is known, the more controllable it becomes. For Foucault, the relationship between knowledge and power is thus an intimate and internal relationship in which each implies and increases the other” (Garland 1990:139). While Foucault only imagined bodies being controlled through knowledge, within the dog program, the dogs are controlled through it as well. The handlers learn breed characteristics and dog behavior in an effort to better control the animals.

The ideas of power, discipline, and knowledge can be applied to the dog program, however there are certain inherent contradictions. The inmate voluntarily submits himself to participating in the program and all that it entails. In fact, participation is seen as a privilege reserved for only those inmates whose crimes and behavior while incarcerated do not disqualify them. But it also serves to control behavior and teach the inmate discipline, coercing their good behavior, as if they fail to adhere to program rules, they risk expulsion. By giving the handlers something they value above all else, the institution uses the dogs as a form of power and is able to keep them in line. And yet, despite this
coercive and controlling element, it also serves as a rehabilitative program that provides the inmates with valuable social and vocational skills, thus teaching us something fundamental about punishment and its conflicted nature and core contradictions.

**Rehabilitation**

In his study on rehabilitative programming, sociologist Robert Martinson (1974:25) famously declared that ‘nothing works’ after finding that “with few and isolated exceptions, the rehabilitative efforts that have been reported so far have had no appreciable effect on recidivism.” He ultimately concluded that there was “very little reason to hope that we have in fact found a sure way of reducing recidivism through rehabilitation” (49).

Shortly after this study was released, critics responded to Martinson’s findings. Ted Palmer (1975) argued that Martinson had inconsistencies when stating that ‘nothing works’ while at the same time reporting that some programs had positive or partly positive results. Additionally, three years later, Palmer (1978:14) went on to write:

> It should be kept in mind that the reduction of illegal behavior is not the only goal of intervention... Primary emphasis is on helping the offender come to grips with his life and obtain, in nondestructive ways, greater satisfaction from his interactions with others. The achievement of this goal may often be reflected in but cannot be directly measured by recidivism alone.

Fitting with Palmer’s ideas, the dog program serves the exact purpose mentioned above. While this study is not examining the program’s effects on recidivism, it is looking at the ways in which programming adds a positive element to the handlers’ lives.
Unfortunately, rehabilitation never recovered from the cultural shift that occurred in the 1970s, partly due to Martinson’s conclusion that nothing works. One of the major problems with ‘rehabilitation’ today is that prisoners are systematically dehumanized, with prisons being places where “needs are met, but souls are dishonored” (Ignatieff 1986: 13,50). In his discussion of the pains of imprisonment, Sykes ([1958] 1997: 117) elaborates on this idea, stating:

Now it is true that the prisoner’s basic material needs are met—in the sense that he does not go hungry, cold, or wet. He receives adequate medical care and he has the opportunity for exercise. But a standard of living constructed in terms of so many calories per day, so many hours of recreation, so many cubic yards of space per individual, and so on, misses the central point when we are discussing the individual’s feeling of deprivation.

Though basic needs are provided, attention to deeper social needs of inmates are neglected. These are not new problems, however, as Mead (1918:592) stated that “it is quite impossible psychologically to hate the sin and love the sinner.” This statement continues to hold true today, as society fails to distinguish a separation between an offender and his crime, thus further reflecting the conflicting elements present within punishment.

For the past few decades, the rehabilitative ideal has struggled to find support among the American public. In a time where we have resorted to the warehousing of inmates and the idea that prisons are for punishing prevails, some argue against any form of programming in prisons, in that would detract from its purpose in punishing offenders.

However, the majority of these offenders have release dates and will one day rejoin society. It is therefore crucial that they are given something in prison that will not only make their transition from the institution to the outside go more smoothly, but also
something that will help them survive without re-offending. However, this program is also relevant and worth examining for reasons other than reentry. In a democracy, how we punish is inherently important, as it speaks to the possibilities of hope, change, and human dignity, and to their limits as well.

**Conclusion**

Using the framework constructed in this chapter, the remaining chapters will build upon these ideas in an application of my research questions to the dog program within the institution of the prison.
Chapter 3: Methods

For this project, the definition of ‘case study’ is as follows: an empirical enquiry “that investigates a contemporary phenomenon within its real-life context; when the boundaries between phenomenon and context are not clearly evident; and in which multiple sources of evidence are used” (Yin 1989:21). While some may disregard the use of case studies in the attempt to gather scientific knowledge, the use of a case study for this particular project has its benefits: 1) As this is a single program at a single facility, I will use observations and interviews to construct a clear picture of the elements that make up this dog program; 2) Data from this case will prove useful for generating hypotheses and theoretical frameworks to be tested and applied in other and future research; 3) The results will have the potential to be compared to other programs, when and if similar studies are conducted in different institutions; 4) Ethnographic and qualitative research have a longstanding emphasis upon the case study as an essential method when seeking depth rather than breadth in strategical research contexts. This makes the case study a particularly beneficial research approach in the collection of preliminary data.

For this study, I have developed the following research questions that I will answer within the findings chapters.

Descriptive Questions
1. What constitutes dog programming?
2. What are the key components of that programming?
3. What are its formal objectives and goals?

Theoretical Questions
1. In the context of dog programming, why do inmates participate in the program? Do they relate participation to rehabilitation?
2. In the context of dog programming, do the coordinators see the program as directed at rehabilitation?
3. What are the contradictions between the dog program and the process of punishment? How does this affect the participants and how do they negotiate these contradictions?

While in the process of obtaining approval for this project, the Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction (ODRC) suggested that I use a minimum-security prison located in north-central Ohio as my research site, providing me with the name and phone number of the program coordinator at this institution. After speaking to the program coordinator on the phone and learning about the structure of the program, I agreed with the ODRC’s recommendation.

However, because of the small number of handlers at this site, the Ohio University Institutional Review Board (IRB) insisted on keeping the name of the institution confidential. Due to this restriction, I will use the general terms of ‘institution’ and ‘prison’ to refer to this research site. Additionally, as the sample size is small, I have chosen not to specifically identify the handlers in the program when I discuss the data gathered through interviews. Instead, they will all be referred to by the general term ‘handler.’ The only exception to this is the program aide, who while a handler, is in a special position within the program, offering a point of view that makes it necessary to distinguish him from the other handler participants.

Data Collection

This research was conducted at a minimum-security prison located in north-central Ohio and data collection took place throughout the late summer/early fall of 2006.
During this time, I made two to three visits per week throughout one full seven-week program cycle. Two forms of data—participant observation and semi-structured interviews with the warden, the program coordinator, and inmate handlers in the program—serve as the primary source of information for this research.

Participant observation was conducted at each visit, during both the regimented morning training classes and the Tuesday afternoon classes with the volunteer outside trainers. During these, the program aide proved to be an invaluable resource, explaining what the handlers were doing and providing insights into the program, the handlers, and their interactions with the dogs. In fact, the majority of my notes each day were comprised of information learned from speaking to the program aide while watching the other handlers train the dogs. After every visit, I typed the notes into fieldnote form, documenting observations and information gathered that day and formatting it so that it could be easily referenced once I began the writing process.

After spending three weeks observing and informally talking with the handlers, I began interviewing them regarding their participation in the program. A conscious decision was made to wait as long as possible before conducting interviews, to allow the handlers to become comfortable with my research and to give them an opportunity to ask questions and decide if they would be comfortable participating in the interview. I believe this was a key decision in my research that not only allowed me to gain the handlers’ trust, but also to collect detailed data that conducting cold interviews would have been unlikely to produce. During the fourth week of the research, the handlers and prison staff associated with the program sat for semi-structured interviews. The participants were asked questions about prison life before and after their joining the dog
program and their experiences within the program. The staff were asked questions about the origins and results of the programs, and also their experiences with it (Appendix D). Some interviews were held in an empty office with no staff member present, while others were held in the program coordinator’s office while she was present, working at her computer and returning phone calls. Due to the nature of the questions and the handlers’ positive relationships with the program coordinator, I do not believe her presence made a significant difference in the handlers’ responses to questions.

Data Analysis

Each interview was recorded for the purpose of transcription. After the interviews were transcribed and proofread for accuracy, they were compiled into a single Word document. At this stage, I used elements of grounded theory to code the interview transcripts. Within grounded theory, coding of data occurs in three stages. In the first stage, open coding, “events/actions/interactions are compared with others for similarities and differences. They are also given conceptual labels” (Corbin & Strauss 1990:12). I examined the transcripts looking for emergent concepts. Themes that appeared relevant were listed and assigned a number on a spreadsheet. Using a hard copy of the completed transcript, corresponding quotes were marked with the assigned number, and its page number was entered on the spreadsheet. This process of open coding allows for the researcher to guard against bias, as “fracturing the data forces the preconceived notions and ideas to be examined against the data themselves” (Corbin & Strauss 1990:13).

Following this first round of coding, there were 46 concepts. I then moved on to the second stage of coding- axial coding. “In axial coding, categories are related to their
subcategories, and the relationships tested against data. Also, further development of categories takes place and one continues to look for indications of them” (Corbin & Strauss 1990:13). I reviewed the 46 concepts looking for commonalities among them and collapsed them into ten categories that were present across all interviews, organizing them by theme in a new spreadsheet.

Once this stage was completed, I used the themed spreadsheet to pull related quotes within each of the ten categories, placing the actual quotes in a new, separate document. I then selected the most representative quotes, writing introductions and placing the quotes in context as I went along. Through this, I was able to turn 75 pages of transcripts into 25 pages of usable data.

During this time, I was also reading relevant literature related to this study, pulling quotes that best expressed the authors’ main ideas. I then used these quotes to structure the framework of the two findings chapters. Once I had a basic structure, I returned to the 25 pages of data. Considering my data to be discourse, or “a group of statements which structure the way a thing is thought, and the way we act on the basis of that thinking,” I began constructing a discourse analysis of my data around the two themes of discipline and rehabilitation, as these two themes are at the center of debates about punishment (Rose 2007:142).

A discourse analysis “is interested in how people use language to construct their accounts of the social world” (146), and also “as a method… pays careful attention to images, and to their social production and effect” (Rose 2007:147). Additionally, Rose (2007:165) describes:
Discourse analysis thus depends on reading with care for detail. It assumes that the efficacy of discourse often resides in the assumptions it makes about what is true, real or natural, in the contradictions that allow it interpretive flexibility, and in what is not said, and none of these is accessible to superficial reading or viewing.

Through careful readings of both existing literature and my data, I compiled key quotes and ideas into two separate word documents- one for each findings chapter. At this point, I incorporated the third stage of grounded theory coding- selective coding. “Selective coding is the process by which all categories are unified around a ‘core’ category, and categories that need further explication are filled-in with descriptive detail… The core category represents the central phenomenon of the study” (Corbin & Strauss 1990:14). Using the two frameworks of discipline and rehabilitation as my core categories, I then printed these documents out and cut each block of text, arranging them on a large table. By doing this, I was able to see the entire framework for the chapter at once, allowing me to determine where ideas fit best within the framework and also to establish relationships between the ideas. Once the arrangement was set, I stapled the blocks of text onto blank sheets of paper in their new order, and proceeded to write the chapters using these constructed chapter outlines.

Upon completion of a rough draft, I returned to the beginning, proofreading and establishing connections between and within chapters. Ultimately, this allowed me to trace my arguments from beginning to end, making sure that they were presented in a logical and consistent manner.

In the two chapters that follow, my findings are presented as an examination of dog programming using both disciplinary and rehabilitative frameworks.
Chapter 4: Findings- Discipline and Normalization

The historical moment of the disciplines was the moment when an art of the human body was born, which was directed not only at the growth of its skills, nor at the intensification of its subjection, but at the formation of a relation that in the mechanism itself makes it more obedient as it becomes more useful, and conversely (Foucault 1977: 137-8).

While perhaps not applicable to prisons today that merely serve to warehouse individuals, this statement does apply to the dog program. Within the program, while the handlers’ training skills grow, their attachment to the program increases, and therefore, so does their obedience. Extending on the ideas presented in chapter two, the following chapter will explore Foucault’s ideas of discipline and normalization, examining the ways in which dog programming mirrors and departs from the processes Foucault describes in *Discipline and Punish*. The two concepts of discipline and normalization, or the ways in which the institution controls and transforms the inmates, are central to the prison’s operation. It is through the process of normalization especially that the program ensures the handlers’ adherence to the dog program’s rules and expectations.

Foucault’s discussion of power-knowledge and its enduring presence within prisons serves to provide important context for the dog program’s operation within the institution. Institutions strive to “know” the individual, in hopes that this knowledge will contribute to the institution’s control over the inmate.

Whereas the law viewed offenders as being no different from anyone else, except in so far as they happened to have committed an offense, the prison aimed to individualize offenders, to find out what kind of people they were, and to determine the relationship between their character and their criminality (Garland 1990:148).
Additionally, Foucault states “this ever-growing knowledge of the individuals made it possible to divide them up in the prison not so much according to their crimes as according to the dispositions that they revealed” (Foucault 1977:126).

In prisons today, inmates are classified into security levels, with their crimes and personalities determining whether they will end up in minimum security institution, a maximum security institution, or somewhere in between. Job and program placement are also dependent on the institution’s classification of the offender.

The dog program exemplifies this connection of power, knowledge, and division. Before an inmate is allowed to enter the program, his records are checked by prison staff. To get into the program, an inmate must kite, or send a note to, the coordinator, who is also the unit manager of the dorm where the program is located. The coordinator then conducts a background check on the interested inmate. While only a small number of crimes automatically disqualify an inmate from participation, there are multiple personality traits that can be used to exclude an inmate from the program.

The inmate is barred from participating in the program if he has committed a sex crime, a crime involving violence against animals, or a crime that had sexual undertones. The concern is not that the inmate will try to sexually abuse the dog, but rather that sexual crimes are about dominance and control, and the coordinator worries that the inmate will try to dominate and control the animal in an unhealthy way. The coordinator often reads everything in the inmate’s file, as oftentimes the undertones of the crime are not represented in the charges that resulted in the inmate’s incarceration.

Once the inmate clears the background check, he is interviewed by the program coordinator and the program aide. They ask him questions about his experiences with
dogs and his motivations for wanting to participate in the program, looking for clues into his personality and hints to whether or not he is answering the questions honestly. If his interview goes well and the other handlers think he will be a good fit for the program, he becomes a secondary handler, and begins the training program, learning about dogs and the different breeds, how to care for them, how to perform first aid on the dogs, learning the proper way of training dogs, and most importantly, accepting the program’s rules and expectations. Once he proves that he is able to successfully train, has completed all of the necessary tasks, and there is room in the dorm, he is promoted to a primary handler, and will train and hold complete responsibility for his own dog.

**Discipline**

*It started out with inmates [having] the dogs in various dorms; they weren’t all in one place. And they found that wasn’t very conducive to actually evaluating the inmates as far as how they were handling the dogs and what they were learning. The program changed hands and then came to me and was actually moved into 1-Lower, which was the merit dorm. Basically what happened is they lost the day room and the inmates were moved back there and it was a lot easier to evaluate what the inmates were doing [with] more supervisors in the dorms themselves. The sergeants, case managers, and officers had more contact so they could see what was going on and we could monitor that training was actually happening and things of that nature.* (Program Coordinator)

The role of discipline and the idea of individuality are central to the transformation of bodies in *Discipline and Punish*. Discipline involves the institution’s knowledge of the individual receiving punishment, and the knowledge it gathers is used to create a standard to measure others against, as well as the individual. The institution then uses this standard to control the inmates, punishing those who fail to meet the standard- writing them up or
placing them in segregation—while rewarding those who do, with possibilities of
placement in the honor dorm or a better job within the institution.

One of the most important aspects of the dog program is discipline. Foucault
(1977:167) writes:

Discipline creates out of the bodies it controls four types of individuality,
or rather an individuality that is endowed with four characteristics: it is
cellular (by the play of spatial distribution), it is organic (by the coding of
activities), it is genetic (by the accumulation of time), it is combinatory
(by the composition of forces). And, in doing so, it operates four great
techniques: it draws up tables; it prescribes movements; it imposes
exercises; lastly, in order to obtain the combination of forces, it arranges
‘tactics’.

These four characteristics are present within the dog program and when applied, offer an
in-depth look at discipline’s operation within the program, specifically the ways in which
it controls the inmate and allows for the process of normalization to occur.

Cellular

The first type of individuality discussed by Foucault is that of cellular
individuality, which works through the spatial distribution of inmates. Placing inmates in
assigned spaces throughout the institution—the cell, the dorm, the dayroom, etc.—allows
the institution to work with the inmates individually.

Inmates are not placed in locations randomly. Dreyfus and Rabinow (1983:155)
explain:

For the most effective and productive operation, it is necessary to define
beforehand the nature of elements to be used; to find individuals who fit
the definition proposed; to place them in ordered space; to parallel the
distribution of functions in the structure of space in which they will
operate.
Within the institution, inmates are placed with respect to their race, their crime, and the programs in which they participate, as in the case of the dog program.

As previously mentioned, the primary handlers live together in what used to be a day room of one of the units within the prison. There they are single bunked and each have their own space with their beds, personal belongings, and crates for the dogs. Some handlers consider this a benefit to participating in the program, as the rest of the inmates are forced to double-bunk.

This organization of space allows for control and surveillance of the inmates. With them all living in the same place, it is easier for the prison staff to monitor the handlers individually and the program as a whole. However, the inmates do not seem to mind this arrangement. In fact, they view their living space as a luxury over how the other inmates live.

*The living situation, to me, bein’ in a prison with 2,300 guys, maybe more, and everyone has a bunkie, either on the top or the bottom. There’s eight of us back there and [none] of us have a bunkie. So it’s one man plus our dog, and to me that’s very comfortable because I don’t have to worry about another human being bein’ over me or beneath me and my dog.* (Handler)

Organic

The second type of individuality, organic, emphasizes the use of timetables in structuring the time of inmates. Within *Discipline and Punish*, Foucault discusses organic individuality where discipline over the inmate is exercised through the control of activity, particularly through the use of timetables. Foucault (1977:149) states that the timetable is useful for its “three great methods- establish rhythms, impose particular occupations, [and] regulate the cycles of repetition.”
Within the program the handlers have a daily schedule that they follow with their dogs, which makes use of all three methods mentioned above. Within the institution, the dogs are considered the handlers’ jobs. They follow a daily and weekly schedule, and they know what training needs to be done at particular points in the seven-week program.

One handler describes his daily routine:

*Okay, well we wake up in the morning and we have to take the dog out at 7:00, at least 7:00 and that’s a pattern that we have to get all the dogs on one track and also to keep the guys from bein’ lazy cuz some guys they would try to sleep in if you don’t give ‘em some kind of structure. After we take the dogs out at 7:00, we usually bring ‘em back in and feed ‘em and give ‘em water and around 8:30 they’ll take the dog out for a walk. Maybe do a little bit of training before class. What we like to do is, we like to let the dogs play. Burn some of that energy because when the play they are a lot more, uh, they listen to you a lot better. So, we have class at 9:30, from about 9:30 -10:15. When we come back from chow it’s about 12:00 and we take the dogs out to use, go to the bathroom. Uh, after that, there’s nothin’ really goin’ on, depends on what day it is, we take the dogs out and let them play in the field, all of them play together, or if we have a pass, or somewhere we need to be we’ll take the dogs and we’ll go there. And so later on that evening, is really just about playin’ time and trainin’ on your own.*

This organization of time is what drew some of the handlers into the program. Within the program, they have very little down time, as the dogs occupy much of their attention. One handler states:

*I became interested in the dog program because it looked like it gave you something to do all day. Uh, I’m not big into working out, shoot I’m 50, I’ll be 51 in October. I wasn’t big into the education program here but I needed something to keep my time filled and I really enjoy animals.*

When asked if they were ever bored, the handlers laughed and all said that the dogs take up the majority of their time. They contrasted this with their experiences in other programs and occupations in the institution, where they found themselves...
frequently bored with excessive free time. The same handler expresses the benefits of participating in the dog program as compared to his previous job within the institution.

[The program] has gotten me into a routine of getting up in the morning and it’s made me a lot less lethargic. It gives me something to get up and want to do. The music was doin’ that, but you only get to play like twice a week and that leaves a lot of down time. The job I had here was as a recreational groundskeeper, and I don’t think I did anything for like three months in it. I mean, go out, “Grounds are still there, okay.” I never did find out what the job was. [The program] gives me something to do, it really keeps my time occupied. Beforehand I was watched a lot of TV and just laid around and really didn’t do much. In fact, I’ve lost 35 pounds since I got in the program. I put my mind to it too, a lot of it’s the walking and things like that, it just isn’t the program. But rather [than] walk by myself, I walk and talk with the dog.

Genetic

Genetic time, which is the third type of individuality, focuses on the capitalization of time, in which time is divided and individuals work towards a goal. Through this, they are made aware of the level of progress at which they should be. The seven-week schedule and its weekly goals are the operation of genetic time within the program.

Operating on a seven-week training cycle, the use of a training schedule optimizes the time the dogs spend in the program. This schedule allows the inmates and prison staff to gauge the level at which their dog should be performing. Lessons are planned for each week, and the complexity of the training increases as the time goes on. While genetic time is on-going throughout the program, it re-sets itself every seven weeks as the trained dogs leave and new ones enter. As soon as a new dog enters, the handlers return to week one in the training schedule, starting fresh with each new dog.
Combinatory

The final characteristic of individuality is combinatory, in which the individual is created and is now able to be arranged. When cellular, organic, and genetic forces meet, their combination produces an individual who has been created through discipline and is now able to be arranged. It is through this process and the use of power-knowledge tactics over the individual that normalization takes place.

Normalization

The process of normalization is at the very core of Discipline and Punish, and of dog programming as well. This section will explore the process of normalization, as Foucault defines it, that the handlers go through during their participation in the program, detailing how this normalization occurs and the ways it affects handlers’ behavior. When defining normalization, Foucault (1977:183) writes:

In short, the art of punishing, in the regime of disciplinary power, is aimed neither at expiation, nor even precisely at repression. It brings five quite distinct operations into play: it refers individual actions to a whole that is at once a field of comparison, a space of differentiation and the principle of a rule to be followed. It differentiates individuals from one another, in terms of the following overall rule: that the rule be made to function as a minimal threshold, as an average to be respected or as an optimum towards which one must move. It measures quantitative terms and hierarchizes in terms of value the abilities, the level, the ‘nature’ of individuals. It introduces, through this ‘value-giving’ measure, the constraint of a conformity that must be achieved. Lastly, it traces the limit that will define difference in relation to all other differences, the external frontier of the abnormal… The perpetual penalty that traverses all points and supervises every instant in the disciplinary institutions compares, differentiates, hierarchizes, homogenizes, excludes. In short, it normalizes.
These five steps of normalization—comparison, homogenization, differentiation, hierarchization, and exclusion—form an important component of the dog program. Tracing the program through each of the steps will illustrate the normalizing operations that occur within the program.

Comparison

Comparison plays an integral part in the transformation of participants from inmates to handlers. It occurs throughout all levels of the prison and program, specifically in the form of micropenalty. Dreyfus and Rabinow (1983:158) explain that “through the specification of the most detailed aspects of everyday behavior, almost anything could be potentially punishable.” The handlers within the program understand this. Speaking of behavior within the institution, one handler describes:

*If you do the right thing, you ain’t get no trouble. If you do the wrong thing, they’re gonna put you in the hole or you’re gonna get written up or suffer things like that.*

This statement is also indicative of the uses of negative and positive reinforcement in the program. According to Garland (1990:145), the process of normalization is “essentially corrective rather than punitive in orientation, concerned to induce conformity rather than to exact retribution or expiation.” Further, sanctions involve exercises and training which serve to make the individual more self-controlled.

As an example of this within the program, handlers are expected to conduct themselves in a certain way and comply with program rules, regulations, and schedules. If a handler falls behind, he is not immediately removed from the program. Instead, he is given a warning and time to correct the situation. However, if he would fail to correct it
in the allotted time, he would be forced to leave the program. Additionally, if there are problems with the dogs, specifically when they are not performing at the level at which the program coordinator feels they should be, the handlers are talked to as a group and given a specific length of time to amend the problem.

At one point, around the fifth week of the training, the program coordinator felt that the dogs were not performing at the level they should have been at, particularly when it came to the dogs obeying commands from people other than their handler. This occurred on a Friday and the handlers were given the weekend to work with their dogs and fix the problem, or else she would come in and take over more control within the program. When asked if the handlers would correct this by Monday, the program coordinator responded that they always do whenever they are given something to work on, and that they see it as a chance to rise up to a challenge.

Though non-conformity is punished, Smart (1985:86) states that “discipline not only operates through punishment but in addition through gratification, with rewards and privileges for good conduct and practices.” As stated earlier, the ability to participate in the program is selective, as a good behavior record is one of the prerequisites for joining. Thus, the handlers regard their inclusion in the program as a privilege in itself. Other rewards within the program take the form of positive reinforcement from staff, outside trainers, and public recognition. Through this use of rewards, discipline is still controlling the handlers’ behavior, in that they will not do anything that may jeopardize their place in the program.
Knowing the individual, as discussed at the beginning of this chapter, is important at this stage of comparison. The program aide described how he motivates some of the guys in the program through praise, encouraging conformity to program expectations.

*So I’ve learned what these guys can and can’t do. This guy might need to be praised a lot, just like the dog. “Man, you did a good job, man, a really good job.” And that’ll motivate him and spark him to continue to do [a good job]. Or one guy, he don’t want to be praised, he don’t want to be told that he’s done good. So, we have to learn the different people and what they can and can’t do.*

**Homogenization**

It is through comparison that the homogenization of handlers occurs. Because of its organization, it is important that all of the handlers know what is expected of them within the program and that all of the handlers share and are committed to meeting these expectations. Therefore, once accepted, the participants’ attitudes and preconceived notions of the program must be removed and replaced with the rules and goals of the dog program. This is done during the stage when the participants are secondaries within the program, and those who are committed stay with the program, while those who cannot or will not commit or conform are asked to leave the program.

Interestingly, when discussing the reinforcement they use to modify the dogs’ behavior, the handlers are quick to point out that while they use negative reinforcement, they do so in a way that does not break the dogs’ spirit. It is in this same way the program molds the behaviors of its participants. This process continues throughout the handlers’ time spent in the program. The program coordinator recalled the change she
saw in one handler, who has worked his way up in the program to the position of 
program aide. She describes how he has changed from when he first entered the program 
to today:

[The program aide] was kinda cocky, and thought he knew everything. To 
look at him today, he was a kid when I seen him, an immature kid. And 
this has made him grow into a man. He was a man when he started it, he 
just didn’t act like it.

Another element of homogenization within the program is the training of the 
dogs. From the very beginning, all handlers learn to train their dogs in the same way, 
using the same methods. While they may come from different backgrounds and have 
different thoughts about how to train dogs, they must come together and train their dogs 
the same, so that each dog will be able to follow commands given by any human. This 
element of homogenization serves to make a strong, tightly knit group of handlers. 
However, it also allows for differences among the handlers to be observed.

**Differentiation**

For Foucault, individuality can be used as a tool for social control, particularly 
through the establishment of norms. It then follows that after homogenization, or once the 
handlers are following the same rules and training the same way, they can be 
differentiated from one another. Their actions within the program can be gauged and 
compared with the notion of the ideal handler- one who meets expectations, follows 
rules, and produces well-trained dogs. Thus the concept of differentiation allows for rank 
within the program.
The most often used form of differentiation within the program is through the identification of the weakest dog at random points in time. The program aide elaborates on how this identification serves to differentiate the handlers:

*The trainin’ we do in the morning time is regimented training, so we try to figure out what dog is least amount trained and we feel that our program is only as strong as the weakest dog or the weakest trainer. So, we try to find out who is the weakest trainer and who is the weakest dog and then we’ll work our classes, our sessions around that. And after that, I will instruct that person this is what he needs to work on and if he need any help, I’ll be there to help him or he can do it on his own to try to show some progress.*

Incorporating the previous two stages of comparison and homogenization, this differentiation ultimately encourages the handlers to work hard and keep up with their dog’s training, as no one in the program wants to be singled out for having the weakest dog. The differentiation of handlers leads to the next stage of normalization, hierarchization, which involves the ranking of the handlers in the program.

*Hierarchization*

When discussing Foucault’s concept of normalization, Dreyfus and Rabinow (1983:158) write:

*The effect of normalizing judgment is complex. It proceeds from an initial premise of formal equality among individuals. This leads to an initial homogeneity from which the norm of conformity is drawn. But once the apparatus is put in motion, there is a finer and finer differentiation and individualization, which objectively separates and ranks individuals.*

The ranking of individuals and development of a hierarchy occurs to a small degree within the program. The most prominent example is that of the program aide, who, while still a handler, also acts as a liaison between the other handlers and the prison staff.
Though at first he had concerns about being labeled a snitch, he has come to appreciate this role.

_I was kind of put in the position I didn’t really want to be in, because in the prison life when [an] inmate has to interact with the staff as much as I do, they will give you label as bein’ a snitch or whatever. And me bein’ locked up as long as I have, I have seen people before me, where people was given that label and they wasn’t doin’ that. So, anytime you work at, in the position I’m in, you will get labeled and I have been called that, but me bein’ secure in what I am and know that I’m doin’ what I’m s’pose to do and not doin’ that, it doesn’t matter what anybody else think. I know that I have a job to do and when I have a job I want to do it the best that I can. So, I block that out and I do everything I can do to make the dog program go as smoothly as possible._

Having served as the aide for five years now, he has come to embrace the responsibilities that come with the position of program aide.

_After the supervisor there’s the program aide, which is myself. And what I am, I am the liaison between supervisor and the inmates. And what I do is, when somethin’ is wrong, I bring it to her if I can’t handle it and she will handle it however way that she feel it should be handled. And, my job as the program aide, is to teach guys how to train the dogs in the five basic commands._

Hierarchization also occurs in the dog selection that takes place every seven weeks when new dogs enter the program. While they rotate the selection order, the handler must be able to control the dog he chooses. Again, knowledge of the handlers is important, as the program coordinator and the program aide have to be sure that the handler can control the dog he chooses.

_What we do is, we allow a guy to pick a dog by seniority and once he get that dog he has to be able to handle that dog because some dogs are kinda mean and some guys are not, how you put it, experienced enough to handle a dog who could be kinda mean towards another dog or people._

(Program aide)
Handlers also discussed the concept of hierarchization in relation to the dogs as well, in their socializing the dogs and teaching them to be submissive to humans. One handler states:

*Most of the time, they understand that we are dominant over them, [and the dog thinks] “I’ll do what you say dude, but I am still dominant over them and they will do what I say dude.” So the peckin’ order is not just with the dogs but it’s with the humans as well. And what we try to do is make the dogs understand that not just me that trains you is dominant over you, but every human being that put this leash in their hand is gonna be dominant over you. And you need to listen to what they say.*

This quote highlights the unique position of the program and the handlers within the institution. It’s a form of discipline within discipline. While the institution uses various means to control inmates’ behavior, the handlers struggle to control the dogs’ behavior, using the same ideas of positive and negative reinforcement with the dogs that are used upon them.

While there is not a great deal of hierarchy among the handlers, it is present with the handlers and the rest of the institution, leading to the final stage of normalization—exclusion.

*Exclusion*

According to Foucault (1977:146), “discipline is an art of rank, a technique for the transformation of arrangements. It individualizes bodies by a location that does not give them a fixed position, but distributes them and circulates them in a network of relations.” This, then, allows for elements of exclusion, particularly among the handlers within the program and the inmates outside of the program.
The language of exclusion was often used by the handlers when discussing their situation within the institution. They recognized that they get more privileges through their participation, including a single bunk and increased yard time. However, there was also the idea that only certain people belonged in the program. Much like Foucault’s discussion of lepers, this idea led to a binary opposition, an ‘us’ versus ‘them’ mentality within the program. Handlers talk of the ‘right type’ of people participating in the program and the ‘weeding out’ of inmates who get into the program but eventually drop out because they cannot handle the responsibility and commitment the program requires.

One handler, when asked if he would like to see the program expanded, gave the following response:

\[
I \text{ would be for it, you know, providing they get the right guys to do it. Because a lot of guys, they don’t know how to work with a dog. Some of them will lose their patience and start to abuse the dog. And [the dogs have] already been through that and they make it worse. As long as they had the right type of people workin’ with them, the more the better.}
\]

Another handler expressed that not everyone can succeed in the program:

\[
I \text{ think that it is a privilege to be in the dog program. It’s not like anybody can just get in there. It’s only a certain few that get in here and lot of guys get in there but a lot of them get weeded out.}
\]

Continuing this concept of exclusion, one handler indicated the idea that some inmates are simply incapable of being rehabilitated, stating, “I have yet to find a dog that I would call intractable or untrainable. And some people, no matter how much negative or positive reinforcement you use, it just doesn’t work.”
Examination

In summary, Foucault’s process of normalization is an essential component of the dog program. However, normalization does not operate by itself. In order to be truly effective, it needs to operate in conjunction with the examination. Dreyfus and Rabinow (1983:156) explain:

Discipline, then, operates differentially and precisely on bodies. ‘Discipline ‘makes’ individuals; it is the specific technique of power that regards individuals both as objects and as instruments its exercise’ (DP 170). It does this not by crushing them or lecturing them, but by ‘humble’ procedures of training and distribution. It operates through a combination of hierarchical observation and normalizing judgment. These combine into a central technique of disciplinary power: the examination.

When exploring the importance of the examination, Foucault (1977:184) writes:

The examination combines the techniques of an observing hierarchy and those of a normalizing judgement. It is a normalizing gaze, a surveillance that makes it possible to qualify, to classify and to punish. It establishes over individuals a visibility through which one differentiates them and judges them.

Within the dog program, the concept of the examination is an important element of the handlers’ success.

As stated earlier, all of the handlers live together in the former day room of a dormitory. With the handlers all living in the same room, examination and surveillance by the staff happens much more easily than if the handlers lived in different dorms. Living together, the same staff members are able to get to know them, becoming familiar with their behavior and their interactions with the dogs, and would therefore be able to more quickly recognize a suspicious behavior or incident.
While this informal examination is occurring whenever staff is watching the handlers, formal examination takes place every week during the training sessions with the outside trainers. When conducting these sessions, the trainers follow a training plan that allows them to observe each handler and dog, so they can see that all of the dogs are progressing in their training at the appropriate rate.

Examination happens within the groups of handlers as well. The program aide watches the other handlers, keeping them on track while utilizing specific skills that particular inmates may have. He explains:

So, what we do is, we watch the person. What I do is, I learn each individual back there. I learn what they can do, what they can’t do. I learn their characteristics and what I can expect from them... So, we have to learn the different people and what they can and can’t do. That’s what my job is. And then I’ll let the supervisor know that “This guy excels in this and this guy doesn’t excel in this.” So, and then after that, what we do is work, work the dogs and we try to advance in it.

Examination is crucial within the program, as it keeps the handlers in line and on track with their training.

**Disciplinary Power**

Also key in Foucault’s work is the function of disciplinary power. As discussed earlier, before the prison came to represent punishment, traditional power relied on its visibility and deterrent effect to keep citizens from breaking the law. Unlike traditional power, which makes itself publicly visible,

Disciplinary power, on the other hand, is exercised through its invisibility; at the same time it imposes on those whom it subjects a principle of compulsory visibility. In discipline, it is the subjects who have to be seen. Their visibility assures the hold of power that is exercised over them. It is the fact of being constantly seen, of being able always to be seen, that
maintains the disciplined individual in his subjection” (Foucault 1977:187).

In the interviews conducted with the handlers, they were asked if they saw any similarities between how they train the dogs and how the institution treats them as inmates. One manifestation of the invisibility of disciplinary power was the inability of all but one handler to recognize the meaning of the question.

The handler that recognized the meaning of the question stated that he does see similarities. In fact, it is his answer to this question that is used as the opening quote of this study. He states:

The dog handlers recognize the fact that just because you have a sense of superiority over somethin’ doesn’t mean you have to necessarily misuse it or mistreat it. And I think that’s where a lot of officers go wrong. They feel their superiority, just in the sense of them having a job, makes them better, more educated.

The other handlers tended to be confused as to what the question was asking, sometimes wanting further elaboration. They seemed to understand it in terms of the uses of positive and negative reinforcement on themselves and the dogs, but they largely did not see, or did not want to see, the overarching disciplinary power that is at work within the program and within the institution.

**Critique**

While I have used Foucault’s framework to outline the disciplinary aspects of the program, there are other elements of the program that are in conflict with Foucault’s writing. Through an examination of critiques of Foucault, some of these differences are highlighted below.
One major problem with Foucault in the context of dog programming is that Foucault approaches the function of the prison solely through the framework of power, to the exclusion of everything else. However, “rather than approaching punishment from the point of view of power alone, our framework of study should also be geared towards the interpretation of conflicting social forces, values, and sentiments which find expression in penal practice” (Garland 1990:167). This is a valuable suggestion when studying the dog program. While the framework of power forms an integral part of the program, it is certainly not the only relevant framework. The rehabilitative framework is also a crucial part of the program and will be discussed, along with its relationship to power, in chapter five.

Another area of divergence is Foucault’s insistence of the prison’s failure. Garland (1990) argues that a different way of evaluating failure might produce different conclusions. He states:

In the same way, the prison might be evaluated in terms of its ability to deprive offenders of their liberty in accordance with a court order, to exclude them from society from a period of time, or to inflict mental suffering in ways which satisfy a punitive public—in which case its only failures would be occasional escapes and unwonted leniencies” (166).

Again, Foucault’s writing excludes the possibility of anything but failure, whereas the possibility for small successes must be left open.

Furthermore, Foucault ignores the positive social values that might be taught in prisons. Garland (1990:170) writes, “Had it focused upon some of the other norms which social and even penal agencies try to inculcate—such as literacy, cleanliness, health, responsibility, independence, stability, etc.—its critique would not have been so easily
made.” In the following chapter, through an examination of the rehabilitative ideal, I hope to illustrate the possibilities for positive occurrences in prisons.

In conclusion, while disciplinary power is a useful tool in controlling the inmate, other areas of value must be explored as well. Garland (1990:170) explains:

The essential point of political analysis must be to distinguish and evaluate separately the various objectives which our institutions seek and the means which they use to achieve them. Foucault’s work refuses to make discerning judgments about the different purposes to which ‘power’ can be put, and, in so doing, implies that one is no better than any other.

By taking this approach, Foucault fails to consider any positive functions of disciplinary power. He also fails to recognize the inmates as having any agency to affect their situation. Although I have been critical of these forces operating within the prison and the dog program, these concepts are not necessarily negative in context. While the forces of power within the program control the handlers, it also gives the handlers pride and teaches them crucial social skills and valuable job skills. The next chapter will examine the positive effects of dog programming within a rehabilitative framework in detail.
Chapter 5: Findings- Rehabilitation and Rehumanization

In the state of Ohio, our agencies in the Department of Rehabilitation and Correction strive to change our offenders so that they can re-enter society and not re-offend. To do that, we have to give them a marketable skill, we have to deal with some of the victim awareness issues, and a lot of times we are forced to be maybe that inmate’s real first learning experience of socialization and the skills that go along with it. How to shake someone’s hand, how to look them in the eyes, and [we] try to teach them not to go along with the crowd. All the programs have their benefit and to contrast one to another would be difficult because they’re designed to enhance certain skill sets. So to compare the dog program to an educational program or vocation like auto body-- I don’t think that’s fair. I mean, auto body teaches you how to repair damaged bodies on cars. The dog program does something different. It begins the rehabilitation process of the character. (Warden of the institution)

While the previous chapter examined the process of discipline within the dog program, absent in the discussion were the potentially positive outcomes and the rehabilitative effects of dog programming. Also missing was a discussion of any agency the handlers possess and to what extent they exercise this agency within the program. This chapter will explore both of these elements in relation to their role in the dog program and the beneficial effects on the handlers.

As Garland (1990:174) states, it is a “mistake to think that penality is nothing but power.” In fact, there is much more to penality, and to the dog program specifically, that is worth exploring. Rhodes (2004:7) writes:

Current theoretical debates… make heavy use of the historical prison to draw connections between power- particularly the power of the state- and the conditions in which the modern sense of self or personhood is formed. The usefulness of these debates has been little explored, not has the social world inside the prison been approached for what it might have to say to them… Those who live within the actual practices of confinement- staff and prisoners- offer an embedded commentary that can illuminate theoretical difficulties being excavated elsewhere.
One such theoretical difficulty is illustrated by Cullen (1982:243) in his discussion of rehabilitation, when he writes:

Such proponents of the justice model assert that the grand design of past liberals to save society’s outcasts and unfortunates from a life of crime must be abandoned, the impossibility of doing good in the coercive environment of custodial institutions admitted.

The previous chapter, in its application of Foucault, illustrated the coercive forces at work to control the handlers. However, this raises the question of whether something can still be good and beneficial despite its coerciveness. I wish to argue that it, in fact, can.

By watching and listening to the institution staff and inmates, I was able to see the positive effect the program has had on the individuals in the program. One reason for this is, perhaps, the handlers’ participation in the program and in, ultimately, their rehabilitation. Garland (1990:172) states:

As Durkheim suggests, punitive disciplines may be ineffective precisely because the process of punishment robs the offender of the sense of pride and moral self-respect which self-discipline requires. This Durkheimian point leads on to the important question of the individual’s orientation and relationship to disciplinary power. In many disciplinary situations, such as the monastery, the school, or the factory, the individual co-operates in his training because, at least to some extent, he shares the goals of the disciplinary process… The key problem for the prison as a form of discipline is that individual prisoners may have no inclination and no need to take an active part in the process.

Unlike Garland’s account of prison, this dog program is unique in that it does provide its participants with pride and self-respect. One handler explains how the program can help a person:

*I think anything that involves a person who has come in here, whatever he’s done had to be violent a little bit, if he can, take an animal and care for it, maybe it will help him transfer that to havin’ a little more respect for people.*
Additionally, while to Foucault, power was used to control inmates, according to Garland (1990:174):

There is an important sense in which discipline can create freedom as well as control… The ultimate questions which need to be faced, whether in penal policy or in social policy, are not about power or no-power but rather about the ways in which power should be exercised, the values which should inform it, and the objectives which it should pursue.

While Foucault would argue that power is coercive and therefore incapable of any true rehabilitative effects, conceiving power differently can produce different potentials. Touching on this alternate conception of power and its use in rehabilitation, the warden of the institution states:

*It’s a community service process, project. It has a positive impact on my offenders. It’s a part of a concert, so to speak. Inmates go through a whole host of programs and each program is designed to do certain things with that offender. I sort of look at it as a concert. You’ve gotta go through the string section, you’ve gotta go through the brass section, you’ve gotta go through all these sections and then when you’re ready to leave, I hope we’ve made some changes in your character, not just that you did time.*

In this way of thinking, it is through institutional power that rehabilitation and accountability are pursued. While public support of rehabilitation has been suffering for the past few decades, Cullen (1982:246) warns that “rehabilitation is not simply an evil but a source of actual and potential good that can be abandoned only at considerable risk.”

The rest of this chapter will be an examination of the current perceptions of rehabilitation, agency of the handlers, the concepts of rehumanization and reentry, the positive effects of animal therapy and dog programming in prisons, and also the
contradictions that occur between these elements and the disciplinary environment of the prison.

**Rehabilitation**

As briefly mentioned before, popular support for rehabilitation has been suffering ever since Martinson (1974) famously declared that “nothing works.” While refuted by Palmer (1975, 1978), Cullen (1982), and others, the rehabilitative ideal never recovered. Though the handlers are incarcerated and removed from society, American society’s sentiments towards the causes of imprisonment and rehabilitation are echoed throughout the handlers’ statements about the dogs in the program. Speaking about dogs who have been mistreated and abandoned, one handler states:

If they’re so abused to where you really can’t get that out of them, they still don’t trust... that’s one of the worst because you see the potential in the dog... We try to socialize, socialize ‘em as much as we can but sometimes you can’t do enough because somebody’s done destroyed that dog.

Though he was talking about dogs, these circumstances apply to humans as well, and potentially describe some of those currently incarcerated. Another handler discusses dogs using their survival instincts to keep themselves alive, an additional concept that could easily apply to humans as well.

When a dog comes into the program, he may have been a stray dog from a puppy. So they never been in a controlled environment. They more or less have grown into themselves only from their own survival instincts. So when they come in here, this is no doubt a serious transition for ‘em, for someone else to be dominant over them. So a lot of times we have problems with that.
While dogs may at first be resistant to the handlers’ control over them, they eventually come to accept it. Handlers also made statements about the rehabilitative changes that the dogs undergo while in the program that could also apply to the forces changing the handlers as well. One handler states:

*He’s more relaxed now. He’s no doubt more attentive to me as a handler and attentive to other handlers as well. I believe at this point he has more respect. He’ll respect a human when initially he had no respect for ‘em. He would easily try to dominate another human being, but now I believe he recognizes, uh, his order, in a sense, or his placement.*

In a sense, it is through the rehabilitation of dogs that the handlers themselves are rehabilitated. Handlers come to respect not only the animals that they are caring for, but also their fellow handlers and humans in general. Seeing the dogs undergo this process of change is inspiring to the handlers. One states:

*Some of the dogs that have come in here have been abused and kind of aggressive. When they left out of here, they was obedient and I seen I did that and it kind of inspired me.*

Additionally, it is this idea of rehabilitating the dogs that is most important to many of the handlers. To them, they are giving these dogs their last chance at life through training them. Without this program, these dogs probably would not find homes due to behavior problems and would instead be euthanized.

*That’s a beautiful thing, because if it wasn’t for us or the other guys in the program these dogs might have been put down. And that’s somethin’ I hope they never take away because we’re really givin’ somebody a nice pet and givin’ somethin’ back there.*

On another level, one handler discusses how the program takes throwaway dogs and transforms them into family pets. Upon closer reflection, a connection can be seen
between what he calls ‘throwaway dogs’ and inmates - like these dogs, humans also
deserve another chance and can change their behavior for the better.

There are so many dogs and cats that are put down. The biggest thing I think this might encourage people on the outside to do is look at a dog [and think], “This is a shelter dog, this was a throw away.” They see what these dogs can actually be trained to do [and] maybe generate more interest in people, rather than going out and buying a dog from a breeder, going to a shelter and picking out a dog.

Another handler, though speaking about dogs, also describes an underlying philosophy of
dog programs in terms of rehabilitating inmates.

[The program] takes dogs that were never given a chance through their training. Probably a lot of these dogs were brought to the shelter because they have a problem here, a problem there, and there’s nothin’ wrong with the dog. It’s that the people didn’t know how to take care of the dog; they didn’t have the time or whatever. We’re making them into a marketable product that will benefit them in living a long life. I think this is great. Rather than just havin’ a bunch of dogs and then putting ‘em down and making a bunch of other dogs, take the dogs we got and do something good with ‘em.

Along the same line, instead of relying on the warehousing of inmates, of giving up and thinking nothing can be done to change them, this program is taking some of them and teaching them something valuable.

Agency

This rehabilitation, this transformation, cannot happen in a vacuum without agency. The inmate must willingly participate in the program, must dedicate his time, and truly believe the program’s goals. The aspect of agency is missing from Foucault’s account of power within prisons, yet it forms an integral part of rehabilitation programs of any kind. In her discussion of agency, Rhodes (2004:249) writes:
There are three layers to the sense of agency I am talking about here. One is simply the capacity to act; the second is self-awareness of one’s acts—a feeling of being the person in charge of them; and the third is the question of whether and how much one’s felt choices are really submission to the enforced or internalized demands of others.

This third layer that Rhodes defines is important not only to this study, but to all humans. While agency can be thought of as the ability to make free choices, social forces constrain the actual outcome of the person’s decision. Within the prison, inmates face more constraints than those outside, and are perhaps more susceptible for these forces to influence their decisions. Despite this limitation, inmates at least have more of a sense of agency than was attributed to them by Foucault.

Keeping in mind the limits of agency, this conception of agency is nonetheless key to the process of rehabilitation, as if one is forced to participate—his agency is completely removed—he is less likely to be responsive to the program goals. Thus, Cullen (1982:265) writes, “Prison programs will, as a consequence, become more meaningful to those who choose to participate, and their effects on reducing recidivism will be commensurately enhanced.”

Ultimately, this sense of agency, albeit limited and influenced by institutional control, allows for a sense of control, for ownership of the inmates’ choices and their lives. This, then, opens the door for rehumanization and for the reconnecting the man with the social.
Rehumanization

In our society today, support for rehabilitative programming can be seen as turning one’s back against the victims of crime. However, this is not necessarily the case, as Rhodes (2004:6) argues:

…Attention to the effects of prisons on individuals and of large scale imprisonment on the country does not require us to turn away from the effects of crime or to minimize the fact that some people need to be prevented from harming others. In fact, much of the current situation increases the likelihood of future harm.

To change this, offenders need not only to be rehabilitated, they also need to be rehumanized. As a site of exclusion, the prison completely removes the inmate from the outside social world. Rhodes (2004:7) explains:

When these projects of exclusion are framed in entirely individualistic and non-rehabilitative terms, they confront us with disturbing questions about what it means to be a human- a social- being. I believe this is the issue most deeply at stake in the contemporary prison.

With the state of imprisonment as an ever-growing problem within American society and the cultural attitudes towards those incarcerated, rehumanization looks to be a daunting task. For it to actually occur, Rhodes (2004:218) writes:

The only way ‘rehumanizing’ can happen under these conditions, as many staff and inmates see it, is to locate and display the individual’s availability for compassion, connection, and learning- to mark his accessibility to a conversation that proceeds elsewhere, without him.

In what follows, I will illustrate the ways in which the dog program does exactly this, and thus why it is a program that shows promise in both the rehabilitative and rehumanizing aspects of prisons.
**Links to the outside**

The exclusion resulting from incarceration is difficult for the handlers. In the interviews, the desire for links to the outside were expressed in different ways. For one handler, this link is one of the reasons that he participates in the program. He states:

> If I wouldn’t have dealt with the dogs and changed my attitude and they would’ve let me out, I don’t know if I really could’ve survived because I had a chip on my shoulder. I really didn’t care about nothing, and this has given me somethin’ to care about. The person I’ve become through the younger years, the way I had to act when I first got this case, I didn’t like. This has brought me back to a little reality, the person that I was or wanna be, instead of the groucho.

For others, this desire for a connection to the outside came in their wanting to learn additional training methods and to have more interaction with a greater number of volunteers from the outside. One handler elaborates:

> I would like to see different training methods. You know, come in, people from the street come in and teach us different techniques and grooming and all that. I would like to learn that too.

Another handler details the importance of human interaction in the process of learning by saying:

> It’d be nice to get more people to come here. Volunteers from the streets to show us other methods of training and what’s goin’ on out there. The only way we know is by readin’ magazines and things like that. It would be nice if somebody could show us.

As stated before, prisons are sites of social exclusion. That handlers voiced their desire for connection not only illustrates the exclusion taking place, but also the importance of connections to the outside world for those removed from it. It also opens the door for rehumanization, or a reintroduction of the social, to occur.
Responsibility and Accountability

Connection to the outside is only one component of the process of rehumanization. Making the inmate responsible and accountable for his actions is another. Due to its setup, one of the biggest benefits of dog programming is its emphasis on responsibility and accountability. According to Rhodes (2004:81):

The point of prison discipline, in the eyes of many workers, is to get inmates to move from positive small choices to revising their life as a whole. It is not clear to many exactly how to do that- the leap from small to large-scale change is often unexamined or mysterious. But the reason for this emphasis is not just a well-run prison, but the notion that the inmate is- and must come to see himself as- both owner and author of his own deeds.

In the outside world, people are responsible for their actions and are constantly expected to meet the expectations of others. The handlers understand this, and work to live up to the program expectations of both themselves as trainers and of their dogs. The responsibility gained in the program is evident to the staff involved in the program. The program coordinator states:

*I have to say probably the biggest changes that stand out is the inmate that comes in a little cocky, a little angry, doesn’t feel like he belongs here, and thinks everybody was out to get him. It’s just a real apparent attitude that they have, but they don’t appear to be mean...That’s probably the major change that I see with the majority of the inmates. They come in, the ones who stay, you see this, it’s kind of unexplainable changes that you see in ‘em. It’s like they grow up, and I think that’s part of the responsibility they get [when] somethin’ else is dependin’ on them for protection.*

The idea that the handler is held accountable for his dog’s progress and performance is also a large part of the rehumanization process. In a study of admission handbooks given to inmates upon their arrival at various prisons, Mary Bosworth (2007:69) speaks to the concept of accountability, writing:
Whereas booklets from the 1960s and 1970s promise individualized care and attention in preparing inmates for release, the recent manuals are characterized by mission statements that seek less to help prisoners realize their potential, but rather to motivate them into becoming willing actors, working towards the goals of the institution and increasingly, of the wider, globalized, society and marketplace.

As part of the normalization process that was discussed in the last chapter, the handlers all subscribe to the same rules and expectations, and no one wants to be singled out as someone who is not living up to program goals. Through utilization of a training schedule, this notion of accountability is continually enforced. Additionally, one handler describes how the program has taught him the importance of following rules, both within the institution and once released into society as well.

*I have accepted that I have to follow the rules, not just in here, but even in society. And not just follow rules, but I [can] set rules at my house that you have to obey. If I want you to obey my rules, then I have to learn to follow rules.*

**Animal Therapy**

Another component is the process of rehumanization specific to this study is the use of animal therapy. While absent from criminological literature, the use of animals in prisons has been documented in animal therapy literature for over two decades.

The core of the dog program is rooted in animal therapy. “The rehabilitative use of animals is not a new concept in today’s medical and psychological fields… One of the earliest accounts of pets being used for therapeutic reasons occurred at the York Center in Britain in 1792.” (Harkrader et al. 2004:74). Since then, animals have been proven to help the elderly and those recovering from serious ailments. Despite the lack of research on the topic, the use of animals in U.S. prisons dates back to over 25 years ago. There are
three types of dog programs operating within prisons today—guide dog programs, assistance dog programs, and programs that train dogs to be adopted as family pets.

In 1981, Sister Pauline Quinn, a Dominican nun, began the first dog program in United States prisons. The prison dog program is based on the idea of the human animal bond, defined as “that physical, emotional, intellectual, and philosophical relationship that occurs between a person or family unit and an animal” (Cusack 1988:1). According to Quinn (2004:7)

Since the first program in 1981, other Prison Dog programs developed around the United States and other countries, helping forgotten and unwanted people find meaning in their lives, saving unwanted dogs and helping the prison system learn the importance of allowing inmates to give something back to society.

Incorporating the elements of schedules and responsibility from both the last chapter and this one, Cusack (1988:9) states that “caring for pets encourages nurturance, responsibility, and adherence to a daily schedule.” Without any formal knowledge on the subject, the handlers were acutely aware of the benefits of animal therapy. In many interviews, the handlers touched on the ways in which the dogs affect both others in the institution and themselves.

Two of the handlers described the ways in which other inmates react to the dogs’ presence in the institution. One states:

_I wouldn’t say that they treat you differently, but you get a chance to see the other inmates for who they really are. You have a guy who tries to appear aggressive, but they’ll show their true self sometimes when they come to pet the dogs. You really get a chance to see how dogs do play on a persons’ soul._
Another felt that other inmates were more likely to talk to him because of the dog, saying:

*I think I know more people or I have talked to more people in this environment simply because guys will [ask], “Can I pet your dog?” People that I wouldn’t necessarily talk to or associate with without a dog.*

Additionally, the dogs are used to help others within the institution as well. The program aide specifically mentioned using the dogs as a form of therapy when he discussed taking the dogs to visit those inmates with psychological problems.

*We take the dogs around because a lot of staff like dogs. We also take the dogs over to the special services, where they have a case load of guys that [are] maybe on some kinda medication or somethin’ and dogs really soothe them. They play with the dogs, they rub the dogs, they feed ‘em treats and we listen to this, I don’t know what kinda music it is, but it puts me to sleep. Some kind of therapy music. We’ll take the dogs out because it is therapy. The dogs are very good in soothin’ and calmin’ people down. It does for me, so that’s the main reason I’m in the program too.*

Cusack (1988:11) writes of the differences between people’s relationships with other humans and their relationship with pets, saying:

*Our relationships with our fellow humans may be deep and fulfilling, but they are subject to whims, moods, other obligations, and pressures of everyday life. The pet, however, is always there, always loving, and always willing both to give and to accept affection. Unconditional and nonjudgmental love and affection are the most frequently cited benefits of pet association.*

The handlers also described the positive effects that the dogs have had on their lives within the institution. One stated:

*I get more out of it probably than the dog does, because I’m doin’ a little bit of time. And when things ain’t goin’ right with me, I take my dog out and it seems like everything’s better later.*
Yet another handler summed up the therapeutic effects of animals, saying:

*I walk and talk with the dog. The dog never argues with me and never gives me any bad feedback. Shoot, he solves all my problems.*

**Reentry**

These elements of rehumanization taught by the dog program will be a positive resource that the handler can draw upon once released. As this case study occurred at a minimum-security prison, the handlers all have release dates and will one day re-enter society. While the public might be resistant to rehabilitative programs, Cullen (1982:260-61) argues:

If the public is not willing to pay now to facilitate the betterment of those held in captivity, it can be made clear to them that they will be forced to pay in more bothersome, if not tragic, ways at a later date.

Many people are unaware of the realities of prison life and fail to realize that these men will one day rejoin society. The stories of prisons that do reach the public are often overwhelmingly negative in context. Though prisons and the positive stories within them are largely removed from the public view, one handler speaks of the positive benefits of dog programming:

*The public* might not see what’s goin’ on but a lot of good stuff is goin’ on behind the scenes and it may be in a prison environment but there are good people in prison. They just made wrong choices in life. I’ve met a lot of good dudes in the program. They’ve had a rough past but I don’t look, I don’t judge ’em by their past. I see them as they are now and their character and they’re good handlers. I think they’ll be successful when they get out of here, that they’ll be able to remember this experience and be able to use it. They are not just there for the so-called “Well, I get a dog” and things like that. There’s a purpose for it, you know.
Additionally, Rhodes (2004:219) writes of society’s view of inmates:

Society in the form of legislators and taxpayers may object to the booths as frills, society looks down on these men as the lowest form of life, society is where victims have been harmed and most of the inmates hope someday to return.

Although she is discussing education booths that would be used for programs within the prison she was researching, the same statement applies to dogs as well. The handlers are aware of this perception of inmates and were asked about the concerns they have about re-entering society. All responses given encompassed three general concerns: adjusting to the amount of freedom on the outside, finding suitable employment, and dealing with the public perception of ex-convicts. One handler touches upon both the amount of freedom and the stigma of having been incarcerated, saying:

*I used to be in the military and I know how it was when I first got out of there. It was like, “Oh man, I gotta get a job. Oh man, the food’s not gonna be there, I gotta provide for myself.” So I’m kinda prepared. But at the same time it’s a different aspect because gettin’ out of the military, everybody applauds you. Comin’ out of prison, everybody looks at you as some type of monster, a horrible person. I just have to deal with that aspect and prove to them, “No, I’m not a bad person.” Maybe I’ll go do some volunteer work or somethin’. Prove to them, say “Hey look, prison did me good.” I’m not gonna come back. I’m gonna stay out. This is it. One time’s enough.*

Though the public is generally unsupportive of offenders and rehabilitation, Cullen (1982:277) proposes a campaign to increase support for a rehabilitative ideology, thereby changing the public’s perception of those imprisoned. One suggestion he offers is to “highlight the successes of rehabilitation. This would involve publicizing treatment programs that lower recidivism rates or that supply useful community services.”
Today, although not receiving a significant amount of media attention, dog programming does receive some coverage, and is largely described as a win-win situation for all involved. The handlers take great pride in having one of the best programs in Ohio, and they have appeared in articles in local newspapers, newsletters, and newscasts. They appreciate this recognition for their work and view anything that allows the public to see the positive programs operating within prisons and also anything that will increase adoptions of their dogs as a benefit to the program.

Education

In the dog program, education is a priority to the handlers, and through it, they gain knowledge of both dogs and themselves. Within the institution, a large variety of educational, vocational, and rehabilitative programs are offered to the inmates. When asked about the programs they had completed during their time at RICI, the handlers listed a multitude of programs.

The following are programs offered by the institution that the handlers have participated in or completed during their time at the prison: Cage Your Rage, Victims Awareness, Ashland University coursework, Self Focus, Criminal Thinking, NAACP, Real Estate, Toastmasters, Real World, Financial Literacy, Music Program, and apprenticeship programs in the kitchen as a cook and in the barber school.

While they have all participated in many programs, one of the handlers stressed the educational benefits that are unique to the dog program.

*There’s many programs you can take. They offer alcohol anonymous, narcotics anonymous, anger management, victims awareness, but I think you can get a lot of that from a dog program. You can learn patience.*
And you’re takin’ a dog that has been possibly a victim and realize, “Wow,” you know, “what if, what if I would have done this?” You know, you learn a lot. Anger management’s a big one you can learn and time management, all that. I mean, there’s a whole lot you can learn. You can apply it, not just to train a dog, but to yourself when you leave this place. You can use it. It’s just not for the dogs. You can help yourself at the same time as helpin’ the dogs, so it’s a benefit both ways. Benefit you and the dog.

While education occurs in other programs, it forms a large component of the dog program. One handler states:

The strengths of the program are surely educational. The educational aspects of it- every week we learn about two different dogs. We learn the history, origin of the dog, lifespan of a dog, the markings of the dog; health problems if they are apply to specific dog or breed. And we learn medical terms. Two a week. I think that’s the greatest benefit ‘cuz ultimately what happens is you get to almost thoroughly understand and know about different dogs. Any dogs, especially when you encounter one on the street you can just, you can say, you know that’s a so and so dog and did you know it originated from here and their normal life span is this, and then this is the average color and this is the average height size... So I mean, that’s a luxury, any type of education is a luxury.

Additionally, as part of the program requirements, the handlers do a lot of writing. Their nightly journals that were described earlier are a part of this writing requirement. They also write book reports on articles found in dog magazines or other books related to dogs, something the majority of handlers enjoy doing. One describes:

Everytime I do go to write one, I’ll find out somethin’ different that either I didn’t pay close attention to when I was bein’ taught it, or somethin’ I just didn’t know at all, period- I was blind to. And they get fun. I did one this morning on a health book because... I want the person readin’ it to learn somethin’ as well as me. We both gonna get sent outta here. I enjoy writing mine... I mean, I never did like school work but there’s somethin’ about these book reports, probably because they mention dogs and I’m readin’ about dogs and I’m learnin’ as I go things that I miss that I didn’t even know, so, I just write ‘till I get tired.
As books and magazines are one of their only connections to outside training, reading material is very important to them. They are currently trying to compile a dog-related library in their dorm, collecting books related to dog breeds and various training methods.

**Patience**

Another form of knowledge gained through participation in the program is a knowledge of themselves and their emotions. When asked if they ever experienced frustration while training the dogs, all of the handlers stated that the dogs frequently frustrated them. The most common reason for frustration was when the dog refuses to perform a command that the handlers are sure it knows. However, the handlers are quick to recognize their feelings of frustration, because they have learned that the dogs can sense it too, creating an environment that is not conducive to training.

> If you got [a dog] and you know they know that they got [the command] and then tomorrow it decides, “I don’t want to do it,” that’s when you need to be a good enough trainer to know “Okay, let’s take a break for a while.” Because a dog will feel your frustrations and they react to that. I was always told that and I never realized it until one day I had words with one of the other trainers because he kept stoppin’ me, saying “You’re doin’ this wrong.” I finally told him, “Man, would you shut up?” I got mad at him and when I started to work the dog, the dog was cowering down beside me. And [the other handlers] said, “That’s what we tried to tell you, if you get mad or frustrated the dog thinks you’re mad at it.” If you get frustrated, you need to cut your session and take it up later, you know. But dogs will get you frustrated, but you gotta be man enough to be able to control that.

Another handler describes what happens once the dogs become comfortable in the new setting.

> You have a period [around] the third or fourth week [when] the dogs get rebellious. They [are] comfortable in their surroundings and they start
actin’ up and you’re like, “I know you know this”. You just gotta grin and bear it and smile.

Despite the frustration that handlers experience, it is actually quite valuable. From this frustration, they learn patience. Not only did all handlers state that the program has made them more patient, but they also have learned methods for dealing with the frustration that can be applied in other situations as well. The handlers talk of learning to take a deep breath and of walking away from the situation to calm down. One describes:

*When we have a dog [that] makes us frustrated, what we usually do is we give up the leash. We give it to somebody else and let them train, or hold the dog back, or just walk away. That’s the best way to do it, just walk away. Go out, get some fresh air or come in, sit down for a minute. And when you get your head back together go right back at it.*

Echoing back to the last chapter and the concept of discipline, another handler states how self-discipline comes into effect when working with a resistant dog.

*Really when you know the dog knows a command and he chooses not to do it just for the sake of not doing it. But what happens is you learn to not to take it out on the dog. You learn to discipline yourself. [The program is] no doubt an aid in making you become more patient.*

**Conclusion**

To those unfamiliar with the concept, practice, and results of dog programming, concerns may emerge. People convinced that prisons exist solely to punish those who have broken the law might view allowing dogs into the institution as a luxury that the inmates do not deserve. As Wilson and O’Sullivan (2004:13) explain, “The institution’s goal of punishment leads to regimes which deprive inmates if access to those things regarded as normal by the rest of society such as family relations, access to normal paid employment, and so forth. Attempts to allow prisoners access to those activities which
maintain their connection with society and which might encourage their eventual rehabilitation tend to be seen as working against the notion of prison as a form of punishment.”

While some may argue against dog programming for these reasons, through the applications of the rehabilitative ideology and the concept of rehumanization this chapter argues that dog programs are not simply a luxury that negates punishment, but rather that these programs serve a deeper purpose and can help the participants learn important social and occupational skills. With the knowledge gained about dogs and themselves, the handlers are given the opportunity to give back to the community and to reconnect with outside society in a way that other inmates are missing. As stated earlier, both how we punish and the ways which we treat people being punished are reflective of the culture in which we live and speak to the possibilities for hope, change, and human dignity within the prison institution.
Chapter 6: Conclusion

In chapter one, I outlined the research goals and questions that have been discussed throughout this study, and also introduced a brief description of the program. Additionally, it was in this chapter that the two competing frameworks within punishment today, discipline and rehabilitation, were first mentioned in regards to their significance to this study.

The theoretical framework for this study was laid out in chapter two, beginning with historical perspectives on punishment and the ways in which they continue to affect current debates within the field. This section then moves into the two competing frameworks first mentioned in chapter one, discussing them in greater detail and highlighting their relevance to the concept of dog programming.

Chapter three detailed the methods that I employed in the research and writing of this study.

The disciplinary framework was discussed at length in chapter four, specifically within the disciplinary framework theorized by Foucault. In this chapter, I lay out the techniques of normalization and its genesis within the dog programming, addressing key processes such as discipline, normalization, and the examination.

Chapter five contained the discussion of the rehabilitative framework and the contradictions between it and discipline. Highlighted in this chapter were the ideas of rehabilitation and rehumanization, reentry, and the benefits of the dog program within the rehabilitative ideology.

Though recognized in animal therapy literature, dog programming has been and continues to be virtually ignored in the field of criminology. Through this study, I hope to
raise awareness of dog programming occurring within prisons today. A particular strength of this study is that it is an in-depth case study examining the operation of a prison dog program and the forces—both disciplinary and rehabilitative—at work within it.

While its case study approach is a strength, it is also a limitation, as my data consists only of one program at one institution. Moreover, rehabilitative programming’s success often depends on the recidivism rates of its participants. Due to the relatively short research span and the scope of this study, this was a factor that I was not able to gather data on. Therefore, I am unable to speak to the programs’ rehabilitative effects in terms of recidivism.

Recognizing these strengths and limitations, I hope to pursue this study in my later graduate work, furthering the strengths and addressing the limitations. I would like to continue gathering qualitative data from inmate participants and prison administration and to also be able to observe other programs operating at different institutions. At the same time, I feel the next step is to begin incorporating quantitative data in the form of recidivism rates of both participants and non-participants in an effort to determine whether or not this program significantly affects the lives of its participants once they are released. My ultimate goal in the continuation of this project is to determine how dog programming affects the lives of participants both inside and outside of the prison institution.

Finally, it is in this chapter that I conclude my study, and I wish to do this by placing dog programming within a framework of hope and change. The three theorists whose work has formed an integral part of this study- Francis Cullen, Lorna Rhodes, and
Michel Foucault- each have something to offer to this framework. Cullen speaks most vocally about the possibility for change and increased support for the return of rehabilitative ideology, while Rhodes (2004:223) ends her book with the idea that we must work with our history and “struggle it out,” working for change. Even Foucault (1977:308), whose writings on power and control appear full of both cynicism and hopelessness, concludes *Discipline and Punish* with the image of “the distant roar of battle,” a statement suggesting the possibility that the system can and should change.

In a democracy, to understand how we punish and how we treat those being punished is essential before any change can even begin. Prisons today are largely filled with a sense of hopelessness, a sense that nothing within them will ever change. Dog programming resists these senses, bringing to the institution a new type of programming that benefits all involved. In the press, dog programming has been described as a win-win situation for everyone participating. Within the program, the handlers gain valuable social and vocational skills, the institution gains positive press, the animals are given a second chance at life, and families receive well-trained family pets.

The possibilities for hope are evident throughout dog programming. Though rehabilitative programs are often justified by prison administration due to the positive press that the programs generate, there is undeniably something deeper at work within prison dog programming. Those imprisoned have been removed from society, unwanted and unwelcome. They are judged by their fellow members of society and rarely get a chance to explain themselves, much less a chance to redeem themselves.

The dogs, however, know nothing of the inmate’s background, nor are they capable of passing judgment in any way. Abandoned and unwanted themselves, the dogs
will accept and love the inmates unconditionally and show their affection with no strings attached—something society will never do. It therefore takes the use of animals, rather than fellow human beings, to locate and encourage compassion within those imprisoned. Once it is found, the hope is that the inmates may take this compassion, along with the other ideas of responsibility and understanding fostered in the program, and transfer it to other aspects of their lives.

While this study was conducted at a minimum-security institution where the handlers all have release dates, dog programming is also being used in institutions where the participants are spending life in prison. The foundational beliefs of respect and dignity upon which dog programming rests are relevant to those with and without release dates. They speak to the most basic treatment that all humans—incarcerated or not—deserve, as well as the potential for change within both humans and dogs alike. Within the program, handlers had been incarcerated for various amounts of time, the longest being 27 years. If dogs can be rehabilitated in seven weeks, who’s to say an inmate cannot be rehabilitated in the years that he spends behind bars?

If those on the outside were to be asked if they are the same person they were one, two, 10 or 20 years ago, I suspect the vast majority would say no. Prisons do not exist in a vacuum, nor do the people inside of them. The possibility for change is always there, and it is up to society to recognize this and support those, regardless of their background, who truly want to change their lives.
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## Appendix A: Dog Programs in Ohio Prisons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INSTITUTION</th>
<th>DOG PROGRAM</th>
<th>PROGRAM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allen Correctional</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Angels for Animals (cats only)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belmont Correctional</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Paws with Cause</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chillicothe Correctional</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Belmont County Animal Rescue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrections Medical Center</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Golden Endings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correctional Reception Center</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Pilot Dogs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Purebred Dogs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dayton Correctional</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Rescue Dog Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin Pre-Release</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Buckeye Border Collies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Citizens for Human Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Golden Endings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Team Greyhound</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pilot Dogs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 Paws for Ability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grafton Correctional</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hocking Correctional</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Canine Companions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pound Rescue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Erie Correctional (private)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Pound Puppy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebanon Correctional</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Correctional</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Pilot Dogs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorain Correctional</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Team Greyhound</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madison Correctional</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mansfield Correctional</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Team Greyhound</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tender Loving Care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marion Correctional</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Humane Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montgomery Pre-Release</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Wildlife Center of Ohio (wild animals)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Animal Rescue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noble Correctional</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Humane Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Central Correctional</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Canine Care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Coast Correctional (private)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Pilot Dogs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pound Puppy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Humane Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast Pre-Release</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>APL Pound Pet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakwood Correctional</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Humane Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Animal Rescue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Animal Trainer Apprenticeship)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio Reformatory for Women</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Angels for Animals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio State Penitentiary</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pickaway Correctional</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Pound Puppy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richland Correctional</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Pilot Dogs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ross Correctional</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Hocking County Care for Dogs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeastern Correctional</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Assistance Dogs of America</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Ohio Correctional</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Caring Companions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toledo Correctional</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Angels for Animals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trumbull Correctional</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4 Paws for Ability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warren Correctional</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B: Daily Journal Form

**Basic Daily Journal**

**Date: _____ / _____ / _____**

**Dog’s Name:** __________________________

**Stool Times:** ____________________________________________________________

**Stool Sample:** Hard:_____  Soft:_____  Runny:_____  Worms:_____  Blood:_____

**Urine Color:** Normal:_____  Other/Explain:____________________________________

**Appearance Issues:**  Good:_____  
(Coat, Eyes, Weight, etc.)  Other/Explain:____________________________________

**Feeding Times:** ________________________________________________________

**Training Times:**  How long:__________

What was done-  Heel_____  Sit_____  Down_____  
Stay_____  Recall_____  
Auto sit_____  / Other____________________________

**Socialized:**  Yes_____  No_____  

**Water intake:**  Normal______  Other/Explain____________________________________

**Play time with other dogs:**  Yes_____  No_____  

**Separate play time:**  Yes_____  No_____  

**Notes:** ________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________
Appendix C: Initial IRB Application

OHIO UNIVERSITY
INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD (IRB)
PROJECT OUTLINE FORM

Title of Research Proposal  Rethinking Rehabilitation: Examining Staff and Inmate Participation in Prison-Sponsored Dog Programs

Investigator(s) Information
Primary Investigator
Name Ashley Demyan Department Sociology

Address
(If off-campus, include city, state and zip code)

Email Phone

Training Module Completed? X Yes □ No (Attach Certificate as Appendix H)
(www.vp-res.ohiou.edu/cbt)

Advisor Information (if applicable)
Name Michelle Brown Department Sociology

Address Phone

Email

Training Module Completed? X Yes □ No (Attach Certificate as Appendix H)

Anticipated Starting Date June 2006 Duration 6 mos 0 yrs
(Work, including recruitment, cannot begin prior to IRB approval. This date should never precede the submission date)

Funding Status
Is the researcher receiving or applying for external funding? □ Yes X No
(Note - This refers to funding from entities outside of Ohio University)

If yes, list source
(Note - If an application for funding has been submitted, a FULL copy of the funding application must accompany this form as APPENDIX G)

If yes, describe any consulting or other financial relationships with this sponsor.
Is there a payment of any kind connected with enrollment of participants on this study that will be paid to persons other than the research participants?  ☒ Yes  ☐ No  
(If yes, describe.)

Review Level
Based on the definition in the guidelines, do you believe your research qualifies for:

____ Exempt Review  Category ____________________
____ Expedited Review  Category ____________________
☒ Full Committee Review

Final determination of review level will be determined by Office of Research Compliance in accordance with the categories defined in the Code of Federal Regulations

Prior Approval
If this or a similar protocol been approved by OU IRB or any other, please attach copy of approval and label as Appendix E.

Recruitment/Selection of Subjects
Estimated Number of Human Participants  25 (2 administrators, 1 coordinator, 22 inmates)

Characteristics of subjects (check as many boxes as appropriate).

___ Minors
___ Physically or Mentally Disabled  ___ Elementary School Students
 ___ Adults
 ___ Legal Incompetency  ___ Secondary School Students
 ☒ Prisoners
 ___ Pregnant Females  ___ University Students
 ___ Others (Specify) ______________________

Briefly describe the criteria for selection of subjects (inclusion/exclusion). Include such information as age range, health status, etc. Attach additional pages if necessary.

For this project, I plan to interview prison administrators, dog program coordinators, and inmate participants at ____________, a medium security level men’s facility. If, for some reason, I cannot accommodate this study, I plan to establish a backup site at ____________. 
How will you identify and recruit prospective participants? If subjects are chosen from records, indicate who gave approval for the use of the records. If records are "private" medical or student records, provide the protocol, consent forms, letters, etc., for securing consent of the subjects for the records. Written documentation for cooperation/permission from the holder or custodian of the records should be attached. (Initial contact of subjects identified through a records search must be made by the official holder of the record, i.e. primary physician, therapist, public school official.)

Recruitment will depend upon the discretion and advice of prison administration and dog program coordinators. I hope to interview administrators, program coordinators, and inmate participants in the dog program(s) at [insert location]. Inmates who are participating in the dog program will be informed of the study and invited to participate. Those who give their consent will then be interviewed as part of the project. Upon authorization through the Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Corrections human subjects committee and the warden at [insert location], I will then be informed in writing of when recruitment may begin.

Please describe your relationship to the potential participants, i.e. instructor of class, co-worker, etc. If no relationship, state no relationship.

I will have no relationship to potential participants.

Attach copies of all recruitment tools (advertisements, posters, etc.) and label as APPENDIX B

Performance Sites

List all collaborating and performance sites, and provide copy of IRB approval from that site and/or letters of cooperation or support.

There are no other collaborating and performance sites.
Project Description

Please provide a brief summary of this project, using non-technical terms that would be understood by a non-scientific reader. Attach an additional page, if needed, but please limit this description to no more than one typewritten page.

Dog programs are rapidly increasing in popularity in prison systems throughout the United States. In fact, there are at least 38 dog programs across facilities which make up the Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Corrections. However, there is little research on dog programming components, objectives, curriculum, or effects. This study seeks to provide a preliminary contribution to this research through a case study of the dog program at Chillicothe Correctional Institution. This project will also constitute my master's thesis in the Department of Sociology and Anthropology at Ohio University, where I specialize in criminology. Through the use of interviews and observations I hope to provide an in-depth account of one specific program. My goals are to explore 1) what constitutes dog programming; 2) how dog programming originated at CCI; 3) what core elements make up this kind of programming; 4) and to examine perceptions and justifications for these programs by staff and inmate participants.

For this project, the definition of ‘case study’ will be as follows: an empirical enquiry “that investigates a contemporary phenomenon within its real-life context; when the boundaries between phenomenon and context are not clearly evident; and in which multiple sources of evidence are used.” While some may disregard the use of case studies in the attempt to gather scientific knowledge, I feel the use of a case study for this particular project has its benefits: 1) As this is a single program at a single facility, I will be able to use observations and interviews to construct a clear picture of the elements that make up this dog program; 2) Findings may then be carefully generalized to dog programs at other institutions, and may assist in future decision-making regarding such programs; 3) Data from this case will prove useful for generating hypotheses and theoretical frameworks to be tested and applied in other and future research; 4) Ethnographic and qualitative research has a longstanding emphasis upon the case study as an essential method when seeking depth rather than breadth in strategic research contexts. This makes the case study a particularly beneficial research approach in the collection of preliminary data.

Please describe the specific scientific objectives (aims) of this research and any previous relevant research.

For this study, I have developed the following research questions:

Descriptive Questions
1. What constitutes dog programming?
2. What are the key components of that programming?
3. What are its formal objectives and goals?

Theoretical Questions
1. In the context of dog programming, why do inmates participate in the program? Do they relate participation to rehabilitation?
2. In the context of dog programming, do the coordinators see the program as directed at rehabilitation?

As stated above, dog programs are rapidly increasing in popularity. However, little has been written on this topic. My aims for this project are to increase understandings about what dog programs are designed to do and to explore the perceptions and justifications behind them. Ultimately, I hope to provide a complete case study to further the knowledge that currently exists on the subject. This kind of research is new and emergent. For example, Strimple has written on animal programs in prisons in an article titled, “A History of Prison Inmate-Animal Interaction Programs” (2003). This article provides a brief history of animal programs and the benefits that these programs provide but gives no in-depth qualitative context for these programs.

Another important aspect to this project is the idea of rehumanization, put forth by Lorna Rhodes in her book *Total Confinement*. Rhodes (2004) conducted research in maximum-security facilities in Washington State and states that “the only way rehumanizing can happen under these conditions... is to locate and display the individual’s availability for compassion, connection, and learning- to mark his accessibility to a conversation that proceeds elsewhere, without him” (218). Dog programs mark a possible contribution to this pursuit of rehumanization.

Methodology: please describe the procedures (sequentially) that will be performed/followed with human participants.

My methodology constitutes a case study approach with interview and ethnographic components. What follows is my methodological sequence.

1. Upon approval from the Ohio University Institutional Review Board, the Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Corrections and consent of the warden and prison administration, I will meet with the dog program coordinator and arrange a research program that can accommodate institutional schedules.

2. I will then sit in on a dog program meeting. At this meeting, I will make an announcement describing my research and inviting inmates to participate. Inmates may indicate voluntary participation through signing a sign-up sheet that will be in the coordinator’s possession.
3. At the actual interview, which will be semi-structured in nature and tape recorded for the purposes of transcription, program staff, coordinators, and inmate participants will be presented with the consent form and asked to sign it with the reminder that their participation in the study is voluntary and that they may exit at any time. After they have signed, they will be interviewed about their experiences with prison, the nature of their participation in the dog program, and their perceptions of the objectives and effectiveness of the program.

4. Furthermore, I will be observing a series of dog program sessions (dependent upon the cycle and schedule of the program across the summer of 2006). I will also be observing those inmates who have voluntarily consented with their dogs, noting their interactions with the dog, other inmates, and prison staff. For the participant observation, I will be jotting extensive notes while observing the programs. Immediately after each day of observation, I will go back through the jottings and add to them while collecting my thoughts and observations into complete, typed field notes. Once the observation phase is complete, I will be coding them by using themes that are relevant to my research questions.

5. After the research has been completed, I will transcribe the audio tapes of the interviews. Once transcription is complete, I will then move on to coding and analyzing the collected data. I will then use the interview transcripts as supplemental data to support the observational field notes. I will be coding them according to my research questions. Key concepts will include any discussion about 1) what constitutes dog programming; 2) how dog programming originated at [ ]; 3) what core elements make up this kind of programming; and 4) perceptions and justifications for these programs by staff and inmate participants.

Describe any potential risks or discomforts of participation and the steps that will be taken to minimize them.

Although it is impossible to guarantee that neither staff nor inmates are experiencing institutional pressure to participate in the study, I am taking steps to ensure that participation is as voluntary as possible. I will represent, to the best of my ability, that their cooperation is entirely voluntary and will do my best to minimize any risk. While they may be hesitant to discuss past behavior or to share any information that may be used against them, I will assure them that everything they say will be confidential, data will be maintained under lock and key, and that the tapes will be destroyed as soon as transcription is complete. In addition, a master key which establishes a number code and pseudonym will be kept under lock.

Describe the anticipated benefits to the individual participants. If none, state that. (Note that compensation is not a benefit, but should be listed in the compensation section on the next page.)
There are no anticipated material benefits to the individual participants.

**Describe the anticipated benefits to society and/or the scientific community. There must be some benefit to justify the use of human subjects.**

Over two million U.S. citizens are currently imprisoned. The majority of those incarcerated have release dates. It is not only beneficial to examine the effects of prison programs on inmates, it is essential. Due to its setup and nature, this study will give inmates and staff voice to express their thoughts about dog programming. It will contribute to the existing knowledge of prison programs and provide potential information and insights into the programs. It will also make a potentially useful contribution to coordinators and administrators of dog programs in terms of program evaluation.

**Describe procedures in place to protect confidentiality. Who will have access to raw data? Will raw data be made available to anyone other than the Principal Investigator and immediate study personnel (e.g., school officials, medical personnel)? If yes, who, how, and why? Describe the procedure for sharing data. Describe how the subject will be informed that the data may be shared.**

As stated previously, only the primary investigator will have access to the raw data. Participants will be assigned a code number and pseudonym through a master key to which only the primary investigator has access and once the interviews are transcribed, the tapes will be destroyed.

**Will participants be: Audiotaped?**

- X Yes
- No

**Videotaped?**

- Yes
- X No

If so, describe how/where the tapes will be stored (i.e. locked file cabinet in investigator office), who will have access to them, and at what point they will be destroyed.

Only the primary investigator will have access to the tapes, which will be stored in a locked file cabinet in the investigator’s office. They will be destroyed immediately after transcription is completed.

**Provide details of any compensation (money, course credit, gifts) being offered to participants, including how the compensation will be prorated for participants who discontinue participation prior to completion.**
There will be no compensation offered.

**Instruments**
List all questionnaires, instruments, standardized tests below, with a brief description, and provide copies of each, labeled as APPENDIX C.

I will be using a primary interview instrument with slight modifications made based on the interview subject (i.e. administrators, coordinators, or inmates).

**How will the data be analyzed?** State the hypothesis and describe how the analysis of the data will test that hypothesis.

After the research has been completed, transcription will involve a significant amount of time. Once transcription is complete, I will then move on to coding and analyzing the collected data. I will then use the interview transcripts as supplemental data to support the field notes. I will be coding them according to my research questions. For the participant observation, I will be jotting extensive notes while observing the programs. Immediately after each day of observation, I will go back through the jottings and add to them while collecting my thoughts and observations into complete, typed field notes. Once the observation phase is complete, I will be coding them by using themes that are relevant to my research questions. Key concepts will include any discussion about 1) what constitutes dog programming; 2) how dog programming originated at [ ]; 3) what core elements make up this kind of programming; and 4) perceptions and justifications for these programs by staff and inmate participants.

**Informed Consent Process** Attach copies of all consent documents or text and label as APPENDIX A.

Informed consent is a process, not just a form. Potential participants/representatives must be given the information they need to make an informed decision to participate in this research. How will you provide information/obtain permission?

Proper permission will be obtained through the appropriate chain of command-the Ohio University IRB, the Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Corrections, and the appropriate correctional facility. Once permission is granted, I will contact administrators and coordinators and provide them with the necessary information regarding the project, and ask for their cooperation in conducting this study. With permission, I will meet with the program coordinator and sit in on a dog program meeting. At this meeting, I will make an announcement describing my research and inviting inmates to participate. Inmates may indicate voluntary participation through signing a sign-up sheet that will be in the coordinator’s possession.
How and where will the consent process occur? How will it be structured to enhance independent and thoughtful decision-making? What steps will be taken to avoid coercion or undue influence?

When participants voluntarily sign up for the study, I will schedule individual interviews. The signing of the consent form will take place at this first interview. Each participant will be reminded at this time that participation is voluntary and that they are free to refuse participation or to stop the interview at any time during the process.

Will the investigator(s) be obtaining all of the informed consents? X Yes
☐ No

If not, identify by name and training who will be describing the research to subjects/representatives and inviting their participation?

Will all adult participants have the capacity to give informed consent? If not, explain procedures to be followed.

Yes, all adult participants will have the capacity to give informed consent.

If any participants will be minors, include procedures/form for parental consent and for the assent from the minor.

N/A

Are you requesting a waiver or alteration of Informed Consent? ☐ Yes
X ☐ No

An IRB may approve a consent that does not include, or alters, some or all of the elements of informed consent. Provide justifications below for the waiver.

a. Describe how the proposed research presents no more than minimal risk to participants.

N/A

b. Why will a waiver of informed consent not adversely affect the rights and welfare of participants?

N/A
c. Why is it impracticable to carry out the research without a waiver or alteration of informed consent?

N/A

d. How will pertinent information be provided to participants, if appropriate, at a later date?

N/A

Even if waiver of written informed consent is granted, you will likely be required to obtain verbal permission that reflects the elements of informed consent (if appropriate). Please specify below information to be read/given to participants.

N/A

Will participants be deceived or incompletely informed regarding any aspect of the study?  

☐ Yes  ☒ No

If so, provide rationale for use of deception.

Attach copies of post-study debriefing information and label as APPENDIX D.
Investigator Assurance

I certify that the information provided in this outline form is complete and correct.

I understand that as Principal Investigator, I have ultimate responsibility for the protection of the rights and welfare of human subjects, conduct of the study and the ethical performance of the project.

I agree to comply with Ohio University policies on research and investigation involving human subjects (O.U. Policy #19.052), as well as with all applicable federal, state and local laws regarding the protection of human subjects in research, including, but not limited to the following:

- The project will be performed by qualified personnel, according to the OU approved protocol.
- No changes will be made in the protocol or consent form until approved by the OU IRB.
- Legally effective informed consent will be obtained from human subjects if applicable, and documentation of informed consent will be retained, in a secure environment, for three years after termination of the project.
- Adverse events will be reported to the OU IRB promptly, and no later than within 5 working days of the occurrence.
- All protocols are approved for a maximum period of one year. Research must stop at the end of that approval period unless the protocol is re-approved for another term.

I further certify that the proposed research is not currently underway and will not begin until approval has been obtained. A signed approval form, on Office of Research Compliance letterhead, communicates IRB approval.

Principal Investigator Signature ________________________________ Date ______
Co-Investigator Signature ________________________________ Date ______
Faculty Advisor/ Sponsor Assurance

By my signature as sponsor on this research application, I certify that the student(s) or guest investigator is knowledgeable about the regulations and policies governing research with human subjects and has sufficient training and experience to conduct this particular study in accord with the approved protocol. In addition:

- I agree to meet with the investigator(s) on a regular basis to monitor study progress.
- Should problems arise during the course of the study, I agree to be available, personally, to supervise the investigator in solving them.
- I assure that the investigator will report significant or untoward adverse events to the IRB in writing promptly, and within 5 working days of the occurrence.
- If I will be unavailable, as when on sabbatical or vacation, I will arrange for an alternate faculty sponsor to assume responsibility during my absence.

I further certify that the proposed research is not currently underway and will not begin until approval has been obtained. A signed approval form, on Office of Research Compliance letterhead, communicates IRB approval.

Advisor/ Faculty Sponsor Signature ______________________________ Date ______

*The faculty advisor/sponsor must be a member of the OU faculty. The faculty member is considered the responsible party for legal and ethical performance of the project.
Title of Research: Rethinking Rehabilitation: Examining Staff and Inmate Participation in Prison-Sponsored Dog Programs

Principal Investigator: Ashley Demyan
Co-Investigator: 
Department: Sociology/Anthropology

Federal and university regulations require signed consent for participation in research involving human subjects. After reading the statements below, please indicate your consent by signing this form.

Explanation of Study
You are invited to participate in a project studying dog programs in the prison setting. The purpose of this study is to increase the current knowledge of such dog programs that are growing in popularity throughout prisons across the nation. The project will consist of observations of inmates and their dogs and interviews with those inmates, as well as with prison administrators and dog program coordinators. Interviews will last approximately 1-2 hours. Participation will take place across the summer of 2006.

Risks and Discomforts
Participation in this project is completely voluntary. If you feel uncomfortable in any way, you are free to leave the study/end the interview at any time. While all precautions will be employed to protect confidentiality, due to the nature of this study strict confidentiality can not be ensured. However, only the investigator will have access to raw data, and the names of all participants will be changed.

Benefits
While there will be no benefit to you, the participant, this project will give you a voice to express your thoughts and feelings regarding the dog program. In addition, it will contribute to the existing knowledge of prison programs and provide potential information and insights into the programs. It will also make a potentially useful contribution to coordinators and administrators of dog programs in terms of program evaluation.
Confidentiality and Records
All material collected during this project will be kept confidential, to the best of the investigator’s ability. Only the primary investigator will have access to the tapes, which will be stored in a locked office file cabinet. Interviews will be coded, removing the participant’s name and the tapes will be destroyed once transcription is complete.

Compensation
Unfortunately, no compensation is being offered for participation in this study.

Contact Information
If you have any questions regarding this study, please contact Ashley Demyan at ad279501@ohio.edu/(419) 571-7584 or Dr. Michelle Brown at brownm3@ohio.edu/(740) 593-1372, Department of Sociology and Anthropology, 162 Bentley Annex, Ohio University, Athens, OH 45701.

If you have any questions regarding your rights as a research participant, please contact ________________________

____________________
I certify that I have read and understand this consent form and agree to participate as a subject in the research described. I agree that known risks to me have been explained to my satisfaction and I understand that no compensation is available from Ohio University and its employees for any injury resulting from my participation in this research. I certify that I am 18 years of age or older. My participation in this research is given voluntarily. I understand that I may discontinue participation at any time without penalty or loss of any benefits to which I may otherwise be entitled. I certify that I have been given a copy of this consent form to take with me.

Signature___________________________ Date________
Printed Name_________________________
Ohio University Consent Form
(Staff Participants)

Title of Research: Rethinking Rehabilitation: Examining Staff and Inmate Participation in Prison-Sponsored Dog Programs

Principal Investigator: Ashley Demyan
Co-Investigator:
Department: Sociology/Anthropology

Federal and university regulations require signed consent for participation in research involving human subjects. After reading the statements below, please indicate your consent by signing this form.

Explanation of Study
You are invited to participate in a project studying dog programs in the prison setting. The purpose of this study is to increase the current knowledge of such dog programs that are growing in popularity throughout prisons across the nation. The project will consist of observations of inmates and their dogs and interviews with those inmates, as well as with prison administrators and dog program coordinators. Interviews will last approximately 1-2 hours. Participation will take place across the summer of 2006.

Risks and Discomforts
Participation in this project is completely voluntary. If you feel uncomfortable in any way, you are free to leave the study/end the interview at any time. Because the number of staff participants is small, it is possible that your participation will be able to be identified. However, only the investigator will have access to raw data, and the names of all participants will be changed.

Benefits
While there will be no benefit to you, the participant, this project will give you a voice to express your thoughts and feelings regarding the dog program. In addition, it will contribute to the existing knowledge of prison programs and provide potential information and insights into the programs. It will also make a potentially useful contribution to coordinators and administrators of dog programs in terms of program evaluation.
Confidentiality and Records
All material collected during this project will be kept confidential, to the best of the investigator’s ability. Only the primary investigator will have access to the tapes, which will be stored in a locked office file cabinet. Interviews will be coded, removing the participant’s name and the tapes will be destroyed once transcription is complete.

Compensation
Unfortunately, no compensation is being offered for participation in this study.

Contact Information
If you have any questions regarding this study, please contact Ashley Demyan at ad279501@ohio.edu/(419) 571-7584 or Dr. Michelle Brown at brownm3@ohio.edu/(740) 593-1372, Department of Sociology and Anthropology, 162 Bentley Annex, Ohio University, Athens, OH 45701.

If you have any questions regarding your rights as a research participant, please contact Dr. Sherow.

I certify that I have read and understand this consent form and agree to participate as a subject in the research described. I agree that known risks to me have been explained to my satisfaction and I understand that no compensation is available from Ohio University and its employees for any injury resulting from my participation in this research. I certify that I am 18 years of age or older. My participation in this research is given voluntarily. I understand that I may discontinue participation at any time without penalty or loss of any benefits to which I may otherwise be entitled. I certify that I have been given a copy of this consent form to take with me.

Signature ___________________________ Date __________
Printed Name __________________________

Recruitment Tool
I am here today to invite you to participate in a study examining dog programs in prison settings. I’m hoping to learn more about dog programs, including how they are implemented and how they affect program participants. Consequently, I will be here observing and conducting interviews across this summer. If you choose to participate in this study, your participation in this project will be completely voluntary and all information provided by you will be kept confidential to the best of the investigator’s ability. While no compensation is being offered for participation, please recognize that this study may be potentially useful in the start and continuation of dog programs in this state and others, and your participation would be highly valuable. If you would like to participate, please see the program coordinator, who will have the sign up sheet available. Once you sign up, you will be contacted for an interview. Thank you for your time and consideration.
Appendix D: Interview Instruments

**Handler Instrument**
Walk me through your typical day.

Do you have a lot of down time? How often do you find yourself bored? How do you occupy your time?
What programs or activities do you participate in?
What are the strengths of this program? And its weaknesses?
Do you feel this program has changed you in any ways?

How did you become involved in the dog program?
What made you want to participate in it?
What was the process that you went through in order to be able to participate?
Is this your first dog? If no, how many others have you had? Describe them.
What kind of dog is he/she?
How did he/she end up in the program?
How long have you had your dog?
Describe the first few days after you received your dog.
What are days like now that you have your dog?
How much time do you spend with your dog? Training your dog?
How has your dog changed since you’ve had him or her?
How do you expect to feel when it is time for your dog to be adopted by an outside family?
What do you think you will do after your dog is adopted?
Will you participate in this program again?
Did you have pets before you were incarcerated?
What are the strengths and weaknesses of the dog program?
Do other inmates treat you differently because of your participation in the dog program?
How, if at all, has this program changed you?

What are your concerns about life after imprisonment and process of re-entry? (How do you feel about your life after prison, once you’re released?)
What sorts of programs would assist you with re-entry?

**Staff Instrument**
How did your institution become involved in the dog programs?
When did the program begin?
What goes into planning this program?
What are the key components of dog programming?
What are its key objectives?
Was there any specific procedure that you followed in order to implement the program?
What resources are necessary in order for it to be run well?
What obstacles have you faced in implementing and running the program?
How many dogs have passed through the program/s?
How many inmates?
How are the inmates selected for participation?
Do the inmates undergo any changes during the process of caring for the animal?
Do the dogs change?
Are there dogs that did not work out in this program?
What are grounds for dismissing inmates from participation in this program?
How do inmates respond after their dog has been adopted?
Has this program changed how you perceive inmates?
Do you support such programs? Why?
Would you encourage other institutions to adopt this program?
What sorts of programs do you think might best assist inmates with re-entry?
Do you have a pet?