

The Prison Journal

<http://tpj.sagepub.com>

Prison-Based Animal Programs: A National Survey

Gennifer Furst

The Prison Journal 2006; 86; 407

DOI: 10.1177/0032885506293242

The online version of this article can be found at:

<http://tpj.sagepub.com/cgi/content/abstract/86/4/407>

Published by:



<http://www.sagepublications.com>

On behalf of:

[Pennsylvania Prison Society](#)

Additional services and information for *The Prison Journal* can be found at:

Email Alerts: <http://tpj.sagepub.com/cgi/alerts>

Subscriptions: <http://tpj.sagepub.com/subscriptions>

Reprints: <http://www.sagepub.com/journalsReprints.nav>

Permissions: <http://www.sagepub.com/journalsPermissions.nav>

Citations <http://tpj.sagepub.com/cgi/content/refs/86/4/407>

Prison-Based Animal Programs

A National Survey

Gennifer Furst

William Paterson University, Wayne, NJ

The Prison Journal

Volume 86 Number 4

December 2006 407-430

© 2006 Sage Publications

10.1177/0032885506293242

<http://tpj.sagepub.com>

hosted at

<http://online.sagepub.com>

Although animals appear to be increasingly incorporated into correctional programming, the field has failed to systematically study the phenomenon. The present research is an initial attempt to capture the extent to which these types of programs are being administered in U.S. prisons through a national survey of state correctional systems. The research regarding the potential therapeutic effects of animals and what we know about prison-based animal programs (PAPs) are reviewed. Among the results: The programs are in most states, are most commonly of a community service design that uses dogs, are more likely to involve male than female participants, and most were established after 2000. Livestock care/prison farms emerge as a unique type of PAP.

Keywords: *correctional treatment programs; animals in prison*

A cursory examination of cable television programs and local newspapers indicates that domesticated animals can increasingly be found inside prisons across the country. Although the incorporation of animals into correctional programming appears to be on the rise, the field has yet to systematically study the phenomenon. The present research represents an initial attempt to capture the extent to which these types of programs are being administered in U.S. prisons through a national survey of state correctional systems. The programs have become more common but with seemingly little guidance by what is known regarding effective offender rehabilitation. Although the programs make sense intuitively and are successful according to a substantial amount of anecdotal evidence, empirical research on the topic is scarce. The survey described here collected descriptive information about the size and nature of the country's prison-based animal programs (PAPs).

The logic of PAPs is rooted in a developed literature that has established human-animal interactions as potentially therapeutic. Physicians and

psychologists have recommended companion animals for a variety of illnesses, including blindness, deafness, recuperation from surgery, high blood pressure, chemical addiction, and a range of disorders associated with aging (Arkow, 1998; Beck & Katcher, 1996). Animal-assisted therapy (AAT) has been used as an effective intervention with the elderly, those who have been physically or sexually abused, and people with chronic mental illness (Arkow, 1998; Beck & Katcher, 1996). The relaxing effect of animals has long been recognized by dentists and doctors with fish tanks in their offices. Companion animals offer a unique bonding experience for humans. In fact, more people in the United States have pets than children (Arkow, 1998).

The prison programs the present research examined differ in several aspects from AAT with other populations. Most important, the animal is not present primarily for the therapeutic benefit of the inmate. The animals are not used in conjunction with clinical methods, such as psychoanalysis, to more effectively communicate with patients (inmates). In prison, the programs do not have a clinical or psychological counseling component. Participants often undergo screening procedures that consider personal characteristics, such as the nature of the individual's crime and prison behavior record, but there is no regular program contact with a clinician. The programs implemented in prisons use AAT techniques differently; participants not only interact with animals, but they often work with or train the animals as well. Because of the unique nature of these facility-based programs in which offenders work with or train animals, these programs will be referred to as PAPs.

Although PAPs incorporate animals as part of an officially sanctioned program, animals are not new to prisons. As Ted Conover (2000) found during his year as a correction officer at Sing Sing, "even more than people on the outside, inmates appreciate pets" (p. 270). Johnson and Chernoff's (2002) analysis of poetry written by inmates suggests that "perhaps the scarcity of opportunities to develop relationships with non-inmates and the difficulties inherent in connecting with fellow prisoners are responsible for the striking number of poems about the importance of animals" (p. 161). The most well-known example of inmates having animals inside prison is probably that of Robert Stroud, the "Birdman of Alcatraz." He cared for and learned about the birds that flew onto the prison island. Early in his ethnography of life inside prison, Pennsylvania inmate James Paluch (2004) makes reference to the birds that wait for him, greeting him each morning (p. 23). He defends breaking the facility rule against taking food from the dining hall because "I take it for my babies . . . my bird friends" (p. 27). He

mentions these birds again in a section of the text devoted to family; he describes how “normally, they just swipe up the bread and fly away, but today they stay on the ground and look up at me as if to say ‘Thanks’” (p. 200). Johnson and Chernoff accurately observe that “animals as diverse as pigeons and lizards may respond to the prisoners’ ministrations and seem to reward their care” (p. 161). The nature of relationships that develop between prison inmates and animals has not been explicitly and thoroughly examined, but given how common it is for an assortment of animals to be present both inside and around prisons, their pairing should not be dismissed as simple convenience.

Physiological and Psychosocial Effects of Animals

The vast majority of the existing research regarding AAT has been conducted with populations other than prison inmates (Lai, 1998; Moneymaker & Strimple, 1991). Perhaps most developed is the literature regarding the beneficial effects of animals on the elderly (e.g., Baun & McCabe, 2000; Perelle & Granville, 1993; Siegel, 1990); the treatment has also been used with people suffering from a variety of chronic and terminal illnesses (e.g., Batson, McCabe, Baun, & Wilson, 1998; Becker, 2002) and AIDS patients (e.g., Gorczyca, Fine, & Spain, 2000). In addition to using animals to encourage recovery from physical illness, pets have successfully been introduced to psychiatric populations for whom “there is so much loneliness and rejection in an institution that pets can have a real impact” (Lee, 1987, p. 232).

The first documented use of AAT is recognized as occurring at the York Retreat in England, established in 1792 by a Quaker group (Beck & Katcher, 1996; Graham, 2000; Lai, 1998). Farm animals were used to teach the psychiatric patients self-control through positive reinforcement with the weaker and needy animals. The approach was vastly different from the general manner in which the mentally ill were treated at the time. In 1867, epileptics institutionalized at Bethel, in Germany, were treated with animal therapy. The center still uses pet therapy treatments for the physically and psychologically disabled people housed there today (Beck & Katcher, 1996). The first recorded use of animals in a therapeutic capacity in the United States was in the early 1940s at the Army Air Corps Convalescent Hospital in Pawling, New York (Arkow, 1998; Beck & Katcher, 1996). Men recovering from service-related injuries worked with farm animals as part of a regimen of nonstressful activities.

Physiological Effects

Despite being used in programs, little formal research that specifically examined how people and animals interact was conducted before the 1960s. Clinical research that scientifically studied the effects of animals on people began, by accident, during a series of studies from 1977 to 1979 of patients with severe coronary heart disease (Beck & Katcher, 1996). At the University of Maryland, Beck and Katcher (1996) found that divorced, single, and widowed men and women died from heart disease at higher rates than those who were married. The scientists designed an exhaustive study to examine what other social factors could have produced such results. They examined variables such as type of neighborhood, number of social encounters, birth place of parents, life changes, and measures of mood. As expected, some of the social variables examined differed between the living and the dead, but it was pet ownership that best predicted who lived or died.

After documenting the effects on heart disease, Beck and Katcher (1996) conducted an experiment designed to compare pet owners talking to a stranger with those interacting with their pets. They found that participants' blood pressure was highest when talking to the researcher and lower when at rest but lowest when the participants were talking to and petting their animals. And "since that first conclusion, that unlike talking to people, talking to animals reduces stress and blood pressure, the validity of the observation has been confirmed by many other investigators" (p. 81).

The calming effect of animals is mediated by how people talk to their pets. By recording the interactions, the researchers were able to watch people's facial expressions while talking with their animals. Pet owners generally talk to their animals "with softer, higher-pitched voices than normal, their conversation punctuated with simple questions . . . and with their attention fully on the animal to the exclusion of all else" (Beck & Katcher, 1996, p. 82). And although in most social interactions, American men are viewed as engaging in touch less often than women, the same cannot be said about how the sexes relate to their pets. The researchers found "men and women touched their dogs as frequently and for just as long. . . . There were no significant differences between the sexes" (Beck & Katcher, 1996, p. 89).

Even the mere sight of an animal can reduce tension. In a series of experiments, Katcher and a research partner had children come into a room with either a lone researcher or the researcher accompanied by a friendly dog. The children's blood pressure was lowest when the dog was present. Fish (present today in medical offices everywhere) were also found to have similar calming effects. The researchers explained their results with a seemingly

simple fact: "We relax whenever any neutral visual event draws our attention outward and interrupts our ongoing train of thought" (Beck & Katcher, 1996, p. 110).

Psychosocial Effects

While Beck and Katcher (1996) were conducting their first experiments, other researchers were investigating the effects of companion animals in psychiatric treatment. The AAT program at Lima State Hospital for the Criminally Insane (today Oakwood Forensic Center), in Ohio, established in 1975, remains one of the most oft-cited animal-assisted programs and was the first formal program to use a maximum-security population (Graham, 2000; Lai, 1998; Lee, 1987; Moneymaker & Strimple, 1991). The program was started after the unit director was struck by how the usually solitary and unresponsive patients coordinated their efforts to hide and feed an injured wild bird one of them had come across (Lee, 1987). After a number of years, the program was evaluated by comparing patients on a unit with animals to those on one without animals. Both wards had comparable patients and were of equal levels of security. The patients with pets required "half as much medication, had drastically reduced incidents of violence and had no suicide attempts during the year-long comparison. The ward without pets had eight documented suicide attempts during the same year" (Lee, 1987, p. 232).

Changes in psychology often accompany changes in behavior. Improvements in both conduct and attendance were noticed after a dog made regular visits to a school for children with severe behavioral handicaps (Woods, 1991). Arkow (1998) discusses several behavioral studies that further demonstrate the range of potential treatment effects in psychiatric populations. In one experiment, offenders with chronic mental illness were videotaped answering questions both with and without a dog present. Patients spoke more words and answered more quickly when a dog was in the room. In another study, physically ill depressed outpatients laughed more readily and maintained a sense of humor after becoming pet owners.

The unconditional positive regard received from an animal can be of particular significance to prison inmates who have been identified as a population vulnerable to "social isolation that leaves people without the social or family support they need during a . . . crisis" (Hart, 2000, p. 60). The companionship that develops is also a source of security in an adversarial environment (Arkow, 1998; Lee, 1987). With animals, inmates are given the opportunity to interact with a living being with no interest in their past

actions or mistakes. Especially for males, who, it has been noted, “have few socially-acceptable outlets for touching and caressing,” the mutual affection that a relationship with an animal provides can be therapeutic (Arkow, 1998, p. 2). For inmates who live lives absent of touch and acceptance, animals are able to “stimulate a kind of love and caring that is not poisoned or inhibited by the prisoners’ experiences with people” (Beck & Katcher, 1996, p. 153).

The fact that animals have relaxing and reassuring effects on people is reflected in the ways in which animals are increasingly being used in everyday work. As airports have become increasingly tension-filled places, the presence of explosive detecting canines can actually produce a calming effect, in addition to being more accurate than machines monitored by people. At Los Angeles International Airport, the dogs have been described as cheering people up and providing passengers with a sense of security: “Strolling through a terminal here with Jackson was like being with Julia Roberts on a crowded street. Nearly everyone who noticed her responded with a smile or an outstretched hand, followed by kissing sounds” (Sterngold, 2002, p. A24). The security officers who are partnered with the dogs also report feeling more relaxed when on the job.

PAPs Literature

Given the beneficial physiological and psychosocial effects discussed above, it should be no surprise that animals have been incorporated into prison life. Despite their increased development, there are “abundant anecdotal and qualitative assessments but few controlled, empirically based studies” of the programs (Lai, 1998, p. 4). In a review of the (mostly American) literature published by Correctional Services of Canada, PAPs were found in the United States, Canada, England, Scotland, Australia, and South Africa. In addition to using a wide variety of animals, these programs also encompass a range of program designs as well (Lai, 1998). Although dogs are most common, this recent review reports animals used in PAPs include wild animals, farm animals, and other domestic animals such as cats. A typology of PAPs based on that proposed by Hines (n.d.) appears in Table 1.

There are a number of reasons prisons are increasingly implementing PAPs. Primarily, the programs may be established to benefit a facility’s inmates by providing a treatment and/or vocational program (Lai, 1998). They can also serve as a source of revenue for the prison. An additional benefit of PAPs comes from the positive community relations fostered by

Table 1
PAP Designs

Program Type	Description
Visitation programs	Companion animals brought to facility by humane society or nonprofit organization at specified times
Wildlife rehabilitation programs	Participants care for injured wildlife, which are then released
Livestock care programs	Farm animal care including milking and calf raising; fish breeding
Pet adoption programs	Animals are adopted and cared for by individual inmates
Service animal socialization programs	Assistance/work puppies or dogs are raised and taught basic commands; dog goes on to specialized training
Vocational programs	Participants are trained/certified in animal grooming/handling/care
Community service programs	Participants train and care for animals (including dogs and wild horses), which are then adopted out to the community
Multimodal programs	Usually vocational program component and community service program component

Note: PAP = prison-based animal program.

these types of programs (Harkrader, Burke, & Owen, 2004). Inmates are viewed as engaging in positive work and as serving the community. Beyond the correctional benefits for both individual offenders and the overall facility, PAPs also make a contribution to a larger social issue when, for example, the program rescues unwanted pets that would otherwise be destroyed (Lai, 1998). The great demand for working dogs has created a market where the large blocks of time had by prison inmates makes them ideal candidates to conduct the intensive and time-consuming training required for animals to go on to specialized service work.

Treatment Effects

One of the forerunners of PAPs was the Purdy Treatment Center for Women, a maximum-security prison in Washington. It was here that a now common program design was originated—teaching inmates to train dogs—with the help of a former inmate (Arkow, 1998; Graham, 2000; Moneymaker & Strimple, 1991). Although classified as a vocational program, prison administrators were also attracted to the program by the potential therapeutic benefits for the participants. In 1981, under the auspices of the

People Pet Partnership program, inmates signed up for 11-week classes through Tacoma Community College. They received classroom and hands-on lessons with local shelter dogs in training, grooming, and job-seeking skills (Hines, n.d.). As a result of the inmates' training, many homeless dogs were made more adoptable and several were sent to schools for more advanced training to work with people with disabilities. Administrators noted that some inmates were more cooperative, whereas others said the women learned self-control. Rather than any incidences of animal abuse being reported, as was initially feared, the inmates quickly became concerned for the animals' welfare (Hines, n.d.).

At the same time, in Virginia, a veterinarian helped establish a program built around a prison chapter of the national People-Animals-Love group (Arkow, 1998; Beck & Katcher, 1996; Graham, 2000; Hines, n.d.). Shelter animals were paired with inmates at Lorton Prison who were allowed to keep the animal if transferred or released, in what would be considered a pet adoption program. According to the program's director, the inmates, "through sharing, are learning to trust one another. Animals bring humanity—they bring out the very best in all of us" (Arkow, 1998, p. 13).

In an evaluation conducted several years after its inception, Moneymaker and Strimple (1991) sought to quantify the treatment effects of the program by examining disciplinary records. First, they found that 12% of participants were discharged from the program because of rule violations. They also found that approximately 11% of the participants (after an unspecified length of time) recidivated, whereas the remaining members of the sample did not return to prison (p. 146). Participants reported significant reductions in feelings of isolation and frustration. The researchers also found that inmates who participated in the program showed "considerable change in their outlook toward others and their sense of self-worth, as well as their sense of achieving a better goal in life. This seems particularly true by the fewer altercations and problem behavior" displayed by program participants (p. 148). They reported that although inmates with pets had slightly fewer disciplinary offenses, the severity of the infractions was not affected.

The literature's most rigorous research has been conducted on the Wild Mustang Program (WMP), which operated from 1988 to 1992 at a New Mexico prison in partnership with the state Bureau of Land Management. The program not only sought to save and tame wild mustangs, but it also served as a vocational program in the prison and generated a profit for the facility when the horses were sold to members of the community (Cushing & Williams, 1995). Several themes emerged from the interviews conducted

by the researchers. Program participants took on “a very different kind of role than is usually available to inmates” (p. 101). They were caregivers that expressed affection in the name of taming and rehabilitating the mustangs, the goal of their job. The tasks entrusted to them allowed the participants to serve as “their ‘own boss’ [which] added to the inmate’s sense of challenge, accomplishment, and pride in a job well-done. Autonomy is a characteristic that was valuable to the inmates” (p. 101). Program participants reported seeing changes in their fellow participants

who appeared to have developed an increased ability to handle stressful situations. The local administration said that the inmates who were in the program developed an increase in self-esteem and self-confidence as a result of working with the large animals. (p. 103)

The researchers examined a number of psychosocial and behavioral treatment effects. Staff members were asked to indicate whether they felt the program influenced participants’ self-esteem, self-confidence, stress, violent behavior, and disruptive behavior. Most reported that the program improved participants’ self-esteem (76%) and increased self-confidence (74%). The researchers point out “a notable minority (40 percent) of staff cited ‘no change’ in violent behavior being observed” (Cushing & Williams, 1995, p. 104). The researchers conclude the program appears to be “wildly successful. However, a somewhat more cautious view is warranted upon realization that most of the basis for the subjective assessment is in the realm of psychological outcomes and these determinations are hardly being made by dispassionate neutral scientists” (p. 104). Based on a quantitative assessment, the program participants’ official disciplinary records, the researchers concluded that “participation in the WMP is clearly associated with a reduction in the overall number of disciplinary reports and the severity of reports swung away from major to minor” (p. 106).

In a review of another New Mexico PAP, incarcerated older teenagers were paired with unwanted dogs from a nearby shelter and trained in obedience for 3 weeks (Harbolt & Ward, 1991). Participants cleaned their dog’s kennel, exercised, socialized, and groomed their dogs and learned about canine health and medicine. The researchers analyzed letters written by the participants to their dogs’ future owners and found the youth demonstrated compassion, were dedicated to their tasks, and gained experience giving and receiving positive regard. For some, it was the first time they had ever known a dog as a pet; their previous experience was with dog fighting or dogs serving as protection (Harbolt & Ward, 1991).

More recent evaluations of PAPs have continued to find support for a variety of treatment effects. Inmates at Colorado's Canon City prison reported reduced illegal drug use and increased self-confidence, patience, and respect for both people and animals and said that time seemed to pass faster when working with the horses in the program (Lai, 1998). Juvenile offenders who participate in Project Pooch at the Maclaren School of the Oregon Youth Authority adopt a dog from a local animal shelter and train it for adoption by a community member. Administrators report that "all the students who have participated have decreased their number of office referrals, and show improved self-esteem, patience, responsibility, and vocational skills" (Lai, 1998, p. 27).

The limited international research reports findings equivalent to those found in the United States. In several English and Welsh prisons, cockatiels are bred and cared for by inmates, and aquariums are installed in common areas (Graham, 2000). A review of programs in Scottish prisons found "an increase in the level of communications between prisoners and again between inmates and staff. Visitors seemed more relaxed and stayed longer. They also found that the presence of animals resulted in a reduction of staff stress levels" (Graham, 2000, p. 250). An evaluation of a pilot program in a women's prison in Australia contains one of the only true experiments in the literature (Walsh & Mertin, 1994). Researchers found significant improvements in participants' self-esteem and levels of depression, based on standardized self-report measures, after participating in the program for 6 months (Graham, 2000).

Vocational Features

In addition to the benefits to both the larger community and psychological well-being of the individuals involved, PAPs have also been shown to influence the overall employability of participants (Harkrader et al., 2004). Lai (1998) reports that "one universal aspect of the program is that inmates tend to set and achieve their goals" (p. 14). Perhaps PAPs teach participants the basic skills necessary for obtaining and keeping a job, including responsibility, dedication, and respect.

An additional vocational aspect of PAPs stems from the training participants receive in a variety of animal-related tasks. Participants receive lessons in how to care for and handle the animals, how to train and groom the animals, and about animal health and diet. Some programs offer certification in one or more areas of animal care that can lead to job opportunities (Lai, 1998). From the contacts made while participating in the program,

with the shelter or volunteer agency that provides the animals, or the veterinarians who work with the program, participants may be hired on release or be referred to job openings by those contacts. The literature lacks specific information regarding the number of ex-offenders employed in the field after participating in a PAP.

Data Sources

To assess the current nature of PAPs being administered in the United States, each of the 50 states' department of corrections central office was mailed a survey (see appendix) with a cover letter explaining the purpose of the research. Each state's top corrections administrator was asked to forward the survey to the appropriate staff member(s). After 4 weeks, a follow-up letter was mailed to the departments. Program characteristics such as the year of establishment, number of participants, eligibility criteria used, types of animals used, amount of resource expenditure, and the nature and extent of the participant-animal interactions were collected. In addition, the survey requests the program's retention rate and inquires whether the program offers participants links to possible jobs in the community on release.

Findings

A survey was sent to the top administrator of each state's department of correction.¹ Forty-six states (92%) returned surveys; 4 states did not respond: Illinois, Iowa, Louisiana, and Texas. Of the 46 states that participated in the survey, 10 states reported having no PAPs: Arizona, Arkansas, Delaware, Hawaii, Maine, Minnesota, Mississippi, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, and Utah. Thirty-six states reported on 71 designs, or models, of PAPs at 159 sites throughout the country (see Table 2). The following results provide an initial description, both qualitative and quantitative, of PAPs on the national level.

Typology

The PAPs were analyzed according to the typology based on Hines's (n.d.) presented above. The most common program design is the community service model ($n = 24$; 33.8%), which is being implemented at 59 sites (see Table 3). In this model, animals (usually dogs, $n = 19$; 79.2% of community service models) are rehabilitated and then adopted out to the community. The model is also used with horses in Kansas, Kentucky, Nevada,

Table 2
Number of PAP Designs and Sites by State

State	Number of PAP Designs	Number of PAP Sites
Alabama	1	5
Alaska	1	1
Arizona	0	—
Arkansas	0	—
California	2	2
Colorado	3	6
Connecticut	1	1
Delaware	0	—
Florida	1	1
Georgia	1	1
Hawaii	0	—
Idaho	1	1
Illinois	Missing	Missing
Indiana	2	3
Iowa	Missing	Missing
Kansas	4	4
Kentucky	5	6
Louisiana	Missing	Missing
Maine	0	—
Maryland	1	1
Massachusetts	1	3
Michigan	2	2
Minnesota	0	—
Mississippi	0	—
Missouri	1	1
Montana	2	2
Nebraska	2	2
Nevada	2	5
New Hampshire	0	—
New Jersey	3	3
New Mexico	1	1
New York	3	18
North Carolina	2	3
North Dakota	1	1
Ohio	10	61
Oklahoma	3	3
Oregon	1	1
Pennsylvania	1	3
Rhode Island	0	—
South Carolina	3	3
South Dakota	1	1

Table 2

State	Number of PAP Designs	Number of PAP Sites
Tennessee	1	1
Texas	Missing	Missing
Utah	0	—
Vermont	1	1
Virginia	2	5
Washington	1	1
West Virginia	1	1
Wisconsin	2	4
Wyoming	1	1
Total	71	159

Note: PAP = prison-based animal program.

Table 3
Frequency of Designs

Design	Frequency	Cumulative Frequency	Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Community service	24	24	33.8	33.8
Service animal socialization	15	39	21.1	54.9
Multimodal	14	53	19.7	74.6
Livestock care	10	63	14.1	88.7
Visitation	3	66	4.2	92.9
Wildlife rehabilitation	2	68	2.8	95.7
Other	2	70	2.8	98.5
Vocational	1	71	1.4	99.9
Total	<i>N</i> = 71		99.9%	

Note: Percentage total does not add to 100 because of rounding.

and Oklahoma ($n = 4$; 16.7%). One program model in Kansas uses cats (4.2%). The community service design is being administered at 59 sites.

Service animal socialization programs are the second most frequent type of PAP model being administered ($n = 15$; 21.1%). In each of the models, participants socialize and begin the training of puppies, which are then sent on to more advanced service animal training (e.g., seeing eye dog school, explosives or drug detection school). The design is being administered at 34 sites.

Several patterns emerged regarding the other models as well. The multi-modal programs are most commonly a combination of vocational and service animal socialization components. The model is being administered at 19 sites. Livestock care programs are also referred to as prison farms or institutional agricultural programs. Each of the farms included in this survey raises cattle/cows ($n = 10$); four of the programs also raise pigs/hogs and one program reported also raising sheep. Livestock care programs are being administered at 39 sites. Two of the three visitation program models included in this survey, one at a site in Kentucky and the other at a site in Montana, use dogs and cats; a visitation model at one site in Ohio includes llamas and domesticated deer. The wildlife rehabilitation models, at one site in Kansas and one site in Ohio, involve local wildlife that have been found injured or abandoned. Animals that have been rehabilitated in these programs include rabbits, raccoons, and birds.

And finally, the two programs identified as “other” do not appear to be typical PAPs. In both programs, participants raise pheasants for release into the wild. One program is located at one site in Michigan, where the animals are released onto state property, and the other is at one site in North Dakota, where the animals are released onto the prison grounds for handicapped hunters who are brought in and driven around on tractors. In the one vocational program included in this survey, participants groom and train privately owned domestic horses. Participants are able to earn a state technician certificate in equine management.

Program Profiles

According to the surveys of the 67 program models in which the gender of participants was specified, males ($n = 38$; 56.7%) are more likely than females ($n = 15$; 22.4%) to be participants in PAPs. Both males and females participate in 14 (20.9%) of the program models.

The earliest program included in this survey was identified as being established in 1885: a livestock care or farm model in Wisconsin. The next four oldest programs (1900, 1920, 1930, and 1981) are livestock care or farm models also. Six programs were established in the 1980s, 14 in the 1990s, and 34 since 2000.

The primary animal used in PAPs is dogs ($n = 47$; 66.2%). The community service design ($n = 19$; 40.4%) is the most common model of PAP that incorporates dogs. The next most common animals used in PAPs are cattle/cows ($n = 9$; 12.7%) and horses ($n = 9$; 12.7%). Two PAPs use pheasants (2.8%) and two programs involve wildlife (2.8%). Llamas (1.4%) and cats (1.4%) are the primary animals used in one program model each. Llamas are the primary animal used at a visitation model being administered

at one site, whereas feral cats are the primary animal in a community service model being administered at one site.

The size of PAPs varies. The smallest program reported having only two inmates participating (a pheasant-raising program), and the largest program reported having approximately 300 participants (a livestock care/farm program). When the five smallest and five largest programs are removed from the analysis, the size ranges from 5 participants to 70 participants. According to this restricted mean, the average-sized program has 21.2 participants.

The number of animals currently participating in each program also varies. Although the livestock care programs/farms have the largest numbers of animals, the participating inmates generally do not work one on one with the animals, which eventually go on to be slaughtered. Of the nonlivestock care programs/farms, community service models followed by multimodal programs report having the greatest number of animals currently participating.

Most PAP models ($n = 43$; 60.6%) include an association with a nonprofit organization that administers the program and provides the animals, supplies, and training. The organizations include animal shelters, rescue groups (e.g., Greyhound Pets of America), county humane societies, and service animal agencies (e.g., Guiding Eyes for the Blind). The four programs that involve wild horses work with the Bureau of Land Management. The livestock care/farm models are the least likely to work with an outside agency. They generally breed their own animals or purchase them from private companies.

Participants most commonly ($n = 30$; 42.3%) are paired with animals 24 hours a day. Nearly half of the community service models ($n = 11$ of 23; 47.8%) and service animal socialization models ($n = 12$ of 15; 80.0%) pair participants all day. The livestock care programs/farms, not surprisingly, report that participants work with the animals for a 6- to 8-hr workday. Among the 45 programs (63.4%) that reported pairing participants with specific animals, the average time they work together is 7.6 months. The length of time a participant works with a specific animal ranges from 1 to 24 months. The average time participants remain in the PAPs included in the present survey is 10.8 months. The length of participation ranges from 3 months to 36 months.

Preparticipation

The vast majority of PAPs interview potential participants prior to their acceptance into the program ($n = 51$; 71.8%). Most frequently, program staff ($n = 36$) are involved in the interview process, followed by other prison staff or administrators ($n = 28$) and representatives of the affiliated nonprofit agencies ($n = 18$). Five program models reported including security staff such as correction officers in interviewing potential participants.

(Surveys generally listed more than one person as being involved with the interview process.)

Two programs (a multimodal program and a community service model) reported administering a psychological survey instrument to potential participants. One reported using a specific instrument: Institutional Basis Psychological Examination. Three other programs (two community service models and one service animal socialization program) report reviewing psychological evaluations conducted on inmates' arrival in the corrections system.

Sixteen programs (22.5%) report that there are no crimes that make inmates ineligible to participate; 42 program models (59.2%) make inmates ineligible based on the nature of their convictions, and 13 (18.3%) did not respond to the question. Neither visitation program, neither "other" program, nor the one vocational program included in the survey makes inmates ineligible based on their crime. The most common types of crime that make applicants ineligible are crimes against animals ($n = 25$; 59.5%), sexual offenses ($n = 19$; 45.2%), and crimes against children ($n = 11$; 26.2%). (Some programs listed more than one type of crime.)

Fifty-three (74.7%) programs report having additional eligibility requirements. The most common criteria are behavioral (i.e., remaining free from disciplinary infractions; $n = 29$; 54.7%). Eighteen (34.0%) programs consider a potential participant's work or program history. Fourteen (26.4%) programs have requirements pertaining to custody level. Twelve (22.6%) programs report having educational requirements (i.e., participants have demonstrated a specified level of education). Nine (17.0%) programs specified that the level of interest or enthusiasm of a potential participant is considered. (Again, some programs listed more than one additional eligibility criteria.)

Postparticipation

The vast majority of programs ($n = 49$; 70.0%) do not include a certificate-yielding component. Of the 10 programs (14.3%) that do offer state-recognized credit, the most common type is a state vocational certificate ($n = 3$), followed by a pet care technician certificate ($n = 2$), and veterinarian assistant ($n = 2$). Two programs (a multimodal program with dogs and a community service program with wild horses) provide community college credit for participation. One program offers a certificate in dog behavior modification, and one offers a certificate in dog handling. A livestock care/farm program offers several certificates including groomer and barn boss.

Twenty-four (33.8%) survey respondents reported knowing of former inmates working with animals in the community since being released.² Respondents reported knowing of former inmates working in a variety of

capacities, including horse trainers on farms and for private individuals, dairy and farm workers, farm managers, and in various capacities at veterinarian's offices, including kennel and vet assistants. Seventeen survey respondents (23.9%) indicated that the program includes a job referral or a link to a possible job in the community on release.

Funding

Thirty-seven PAPs (52.1%) report receiving donations. Programs reported receiving donations from staff and inmate fundraisers, the general public, private veterinarians, and privately owned supply stores, including Walmart, PetCo, and PetSmart, and from corporations such as Iams® and Purina®. Donations of animals, food, supplies, and medical services are also received through the humane society, shelter, or nonprofit organization that administers the program.

In addition, PAPs may collect fees related to the animals; 20 programs (28.2%) report collecting fees. Money is usually from adoption fees or training or service fees. Several ($n = 7$) livestock care/farm programs report selling agricultural products such as crops, animal products such as eggs and milk, and surplus stock. Even if the PAP does not generate money for the facility, the animal trained in the program may earn the administering humane society, shelter, or nonprofit organization funds.

Positives and Negatives

When asked if the respondent would recommend this type of program to other prison administrators, 60 out of 61 respondents (98.4%) reported they would. Follow-up with the facility warden who responded in the negative revealed that he does, in fact, "like the program, but it provides no revenue, so it depends on what you're looking for the program to accomplish" (personal communication, April 8, 2005).

An open-ended question asked respondents to identify how the program benefits the inmates who participate in it. Overwhelmingly, the most commonly cited benefit is the sense of responsibility instilled from caring for a dependent animal ($f = 40$; see Table 4).

An open-ended question asked respondents to identify negative aspects associated with the program—for the inmates, staff, or facility. Most ($f = 42$; 60.0%) reported no negative aspects associated with the PAP. The most common negative aspect of the program identified was staff resistance to the PAP ($f = 8$; 10.1%). Challenges related to the animals ($f = 7$; 8.9%), such as people's fear of them and the mess and noise they can create, and a lack

Table 4
Reported Program Benefits

Benefit	Frequency	Cumulative Frequency	Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Sense of responsibility	40	40	21.5	21.5
Job skills	17	57	9.1	30.6
Meaningful work	16	73	8.6	39.2
Patience/anger management	14	87	7.5	46.7
Self-esteem	14	101	7.5	54.2
Empathy	12	113	6.5	60.7
Parenting skills	12	125	6.5	67.2
Communication skills	12	137	6.5	73.7
Sense of pride/accomplishment	11	148	5.9	79.6
Work ethic	10	158	5.4	85.0
Humanizes/calms facility	8	166	4.3	89.3
Self-control	7	173	3.8	93.1
Relationship skills/trust	7	180	3.8	96.9
Reduces stress	6	186	3.2	100.1
Total	<i>N</i> = 186		100.1%	

Note: Percentage total does not add to 100 because of rounding.

of resources ($f = 7$; 8.9%), including space and staff, were the next most frequently cited negative aspects of the programs. Constraints or struggles that result from administering a program inside a secure institution ($f = 5$; 6.3%) were also indicated by respondents.

Conclusion

The major contribution of the results of the national survey of PAPs described here is the description of the range of programs currently being administered. Among the results: The programs are in most states, are most commonly of a community service design that uses dogs, are more likely to involve male than female participants, and most were established after 2000. Survey respondents overwhelmingly regard these programs as positive. The most commonly identified negative aspect was not an actual characteristic of the program but rather the resistance of some facility staff to the implementation of the program.

Despite the proliferation of PAPs, there has been little attention paid by researchers in the field. There is a critical need for empirical investigation of

these programs as well as long-term follow-up with the inmates who participate in them. Researchers and practitioners need to assess the quality of PAPs according to what the field recognizes as the principles of effective treatment programs. We should also consider how PAPs fit into our ideas of justice. Although PAPs may be an example of what Johnson (2002) conceptualizes as "mature coping" and are clearly an example of what Toch (2000) calls "altruistic activity as correctional treatment," there has been no consideration of the theory of justice driving these programs. It may be that PAPs can also serve as part of the foundation necessary for the field's contemporary ideas of desistance and transformation (see Maruna, 2001; Sampson & Laub, 1993). Additional research is needed to explore the theoretical implications of PAPs.

It will also be important to consider how prison farms or livestock care programs are different from other types of PAPs. Prison farms date back to start of the 20th century and have been criticized for incorporating the spirit of slavery, similar to Jim Crow laws and the convict lease system (see Oshinsky, 1996). Not only do prison farms have implications in terms of the prison industrial complex, but it is unlikely that they foster the same type of empathetic relationships with animals as more conventional PAPs that use domesticated animals. It may be that livestock care/farm programs should be studied as a separate phenomenon.

Given all that is wrong with our prisons, the possibility of PAPs being identified as reliable and effective treatment is alluring. Not only could some of the more than 2 million incarcerated people benefit, but programs that pair inmates with homeless animals make it possible to help an inordinate number of animals as well. Homeless animals and prison inmates are both "throw-away populations," discarded by a society that cares not what happens to them (and prefers they be kept out of sight). Having inmates and animals help each other in a symbiotic relationship results in a win-win-win situation, with not only the inmate and animal benefiting but the larger community as well.

Appendix

Please describe EACH of your state's prison-based animal programs (PAPs). List one program per survey. Multiple copies of this survey have been included.

1. Name of this program _____
2. Facility where this program is located _____
3. Year this program was established _____
4. Type of animal(s) used _____
5. Source(s) of animals _____

6. Number of inmates currently participating _____ Male or Female (circle one)
7. Number of animals currently participating _____
8. Total number of inmates who have participated since this program's start _____
9. Total number of animals who have participated since this program's start _____
10. Number of participants discharged/removed from the program because of rule violations since this program's start _____
11. Identify any nonprofit organization or other non-DOC agency affiliated with this program _____
12. Indicate which of the following designs most accurately describes this program by marking the box to the right

Program Type	Description	Describes This Program (X)
Visitation program	Animals brought to facility by humane society or nonprofit organization at specified times	
Wildlife rehabilitation program	Participants care for injured wildlife, which are then released	
Livestock care program	Farm animal care such as milking and calf raising; fish breeding	
Pet adoption program	Animals are adopted and cared for by individual inmates	
Service animal socialization program	Assistance/work puppies or dogs are raised and taught basic commands; dog goes on to specialized training	
Vocational program	Participants are trained/certified in animal grooming/handling/care	
Community service program	Participants train and care for animals (including dogs and wild horses), which are then adopted out to the community	
Multimodal program	Check off each of the above types that describes a component of this current program	
Other	Please describe:	

13. Number of hours per day the participant is with animal(s) _____
14. How long (in weeks or months) will a participant work with a specific animal? _____
15. How long (in weeks or months) does the average participant remain in this program? _____

16. Is there a maximum length of time an inmate may remain in this program? Yes [] No []
 a. If yes, how long? _____
17. Does this program have a waiting list? Yes [] No []
 a. If yes, what is the average length of time an inmate will remain on the waiting list? _____
18. Are potential participants interviewed prior to acceptance into this program? Yes [] No []
 a. If yes, by whom (list all)? _____
19. Are potential participants administered a psychological survey instrument prior to acceptance into this program? Yes [] No []
 a. If yes, name the instrument(s) _____
20. Are there crimes that make inmates ineligible for this program? Yes [] No []
 a. If yes, which one(s)? _____
21. Is there a minimum length of time potential participants must have remaining on their sentence in order to participate? Yes [] No []
 a. If yes, how long? _____
22. Identify any other eligibility requirements _____
23. Describe the training inmates receive prior to participating in this program _____
24. Does this program include ongoing lessons/classes related to the animals? Yes [] No []
 a. If yes, describe, including the number of hours per week participants receive lessons _____
25. Does this program include a certificate-yielding vocational component? Yes [] No []
 a. If yes, what type of certificate is issued? _____
26. Do you know of any former inmates working with animals since being released? Yes [] No []
 a. If yes, how many; and in what capacity do they work? _____

27. Does this program include a referral or link to a possible job in the community on release? Yes ☐ No ☐
 - a. If yes, how many former inmates work with animals in the community as a result of the referral? _____
28. Does the program receive any donations? Yes ☐ No ☐
 - a. If yes, from whom (list all)? _____
29. Does the program collect any fees related to the animals? Yes ☐ No ☐
 - a. If yes, describe (including dollar amounts) _____
30. Describe any additional funding sources _____
31. Would you recommend this type of program to other prison administrators? Yes ☐ No ☐
 1. How do you think this program benefits the inmates who participate in it? _____
 2. Can you identify any negative aspects associated with this program—for the inmates, staff, or the facility? _____
 3. Please include your contact information. _____

Thank you very much for your time and effort!

Notes

1. The Federal Bureau of Prisons responded to a request to participate by indicating that the office “does not have the resources to respond to the numerous requests for data” received.
2. It is worth noting that many departments of correction have policies in place that forbid employees from contact with former inmates in the community.

References

- Arkow, P. (1998). *Pet therapy: A study and resource guide for the use of companion animals in selected therapies* (8th ed.). Stratford, NJ: Author.
- Batson, K., McCabe, B., Baun, M., & Wilson, C. (1998). The effect of a therapy dog on socialization and physiological indicators of stress in persons diagnosed with Alzheimer's disease.

- In C. Wilson & D. Turner (Eds.), *Companion animals in human health* (pp. 203-215). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Baun, M., & McCabe, B. (2000). The role animals play in enhancing quality of life for the elderly. In A. Fine (Ed.), *Handbook on animal-assisted therapy: Theoretical foundations and guidelines for practice* (pp. 237-251). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Beck, A., & Katcher, A. (1996). *Between pets and people: The importance of animal companionship*. West Lafayette, IN: Purdue University Press.
- Becker, M. (2002). *The healing power of pets*. New York: Hyperion.
- Conover, T. (2000). *Newjack: Guarding sing-sing*. New York: Random House.
- Cushing, J., & Williams, J. (1995). The wild mustang program: A case study in facilitated inmate therapy. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*, 22, 95-112.
- Gorczyca, K., Fine, A., & Spain, C. (2000). History, theory, and development of human-animal support services for people with AIDS and other chronic/terminal illnesses. In A. Fine (Ed.), *Handbook on animal-assisted therapy: Theoretical foundations and guidelines for practice* (pp. 253-302). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Graham, B. (2000). *Creature comfort: Animals that heal*. Amherst, NY: Prometheus Books.
- Harbolt, T., & Ward, T. (1991). Teaming incarcerated youth with shelter dogs for a second chance. *Society & Animals*, 9(2), 177-182.
- Harkrader, T., Burke, T., & Owen, S. (2004). Pound puppies: The rehabilitative uses of dogs in correctional facilities. *Corrections Today*, 66(2), 74-60.
- Hart, L. (2000). Psychosocial benefits of animal companionship. In A. Fine (Ed.), *Handbook on animal-assisted therapy: Theoretical foundations and guidelines for practice* (pp. 59-78). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Hines, L. (n.d.). Overview of animals in correctional facilities. In Delta Society (Ed.), *Animals in institutions* (pp. 111-112). Renton, WA: Delta Society.
- Johnson, R. (2002). *Hard time: Understanding and reforming the prison* (3rd ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Johnson, R., & Chernoff, N. (2002). "Opening a vein": Inmate poetry and the prison experience. *The Prison Journal*, 82, 141-167.
- Lai, J. (1998, April). *Pet facilitated therapy in correctional institutions*. Paper prepared for Correctional Services of Canada by Office of the Deputy Commissioner for Women. Available at <http://www.csc-scc.gc.ca>
- Lee, D. (1987). Companion animals in institutions. In P. Arkow (Ed.), *The loving bond: Companion animals in the helping professions* (pp. 223-246). Saratoga, CA: R & E.
- Maruna, S. (2001). *Making good: How ex-convicts reform and rebuild their lives*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Moneymaker, J., & Strimple, E. (1991). Animals and inmates: A sharing companionship behind bars. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*, 16, 133-152.
- Oshinsky, D. (1996). *Worse than slavery: Parchman Farm and the ordeal of Jim Crow justice*. New York: Free Press.
- Paluch, J., Jr. (2004). *A life for a life: Life imprisonment: America's other death penalty*. Los Angeles: Roxbury.
- Perelle, I., & Granville, D. (1993). Assessment of the effectiveness of a pet facilitated therapy program in a nursing home setting. *Society and Animals*, 1, 7-21.
- Sampson, R., & Laub, J. (1993). *Crime in the making: Pathways and turning points through life*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Siegel, J. (1990). Stressful life events and use of physician services among the elderly: The modifying role of pet ownership. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 58, 1081-1086.

- Sterngold, J. (2002, March 21). In Los Angeles, a traveler's best friend. *The New York Times*, p. A24.
- Toch, H. (2000). Altruistic activity as correctional treatment. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 44, 270-278.
- Walsh, P., & Mertin, P. (1994). The training of pets as therapy dogs in a women's prison: A pilot study. *Anthrozoos*, 7(2), 124-128.
- Woods, B. (1991, Winter). The effects of canine therapy sessions with SBH. *WARDS: Science and Animal Care*, 3-4.

Gennifer Furst is an assistant professor in the Sociology Department of William Paterson University, in Wayne, New Jersey. Her research interests include punishment, drugs and crime, race and criminal case processing, and the death penalty.