

r  
*by* W Z

---

**Submission date:** 04-Mar-2021 05:21PM (UTC+0300)

**Submission ID:** 1524062324

**File name:** Correctional\_Employees.edited.docx (16.63K)

**Word count:** 658

**Character count:** 3979

**Corrections and Probation**

Name

Institution

Course

Instructor

Date

### **Corrections and Probation**

Corruption is a common phenomenon in most workplaces. There is an increased risk of corruption within the correction centers as most officers engage in unethical and illegal acts. The increased risk of corruption among the correction officers might be due to; environmental factors, responsibility denial and injury denial, rejection of victim and condemners being condemned as well as appealing to higher loyalties (Souryal, 2009). Environmental factors are likely to influence the behaviors of correctional employees. For instance, under unappreciative administrators, constant threats and physical harm and irritated staff members are likely to trigger corruption and unethical urge.

Denial of responsibility implies that correctional employees might have been forced into situations they could not control thus, emulating personal accountability. Sometimes, correctional employees openly deny their actions causing any damage despite the evidence of such deeds. Repetition of such acts influences reoccurring of corruption among correctional employees as it is perceived as a norm of the workplace. With the denial of the victim, correctional employees always argue that the victims deserved such treatment despite the harm caused to them. For example, the prisoner subjected to cruel torture is abuse to the human race and should be highly condemned. Another reason for the increase in corruption among correctional employees is the notion that those who condemn unethical misconduct are genuine and often shift the blames unfairly away from themselves (Souryal, 2009). Therefore, the increase of corruption among correctional employees is due to individual believes and experiences they obtain from the workplace.

Correctional employees, particularly prison administrators, face some temptations that could lead to corruption—for instance, being more familiar with certain prisoners, living beyond

their means and abrupt change in the officers' appearance. Some workplace guidelines do not guarantee having a close relationship with clients. Some correctional employees might prefer dealing with specific inmates, which might later raise the alarm. Therefore, forming such kind of relationship with inmates might lead to advocating for them regarding disciplinary matters. The officer will automatically favor a close inmate while punishing the rest. Hence, an officer who shows more interest in a particular inmate might be in trouble for practicing corruption.

Additionally, leaving beyond ones' means might trigger corruption acts. The officer will automatically begin acting illegally, such as taking bribes to meet their daily expectations. Further, the officer might be tempted to transfer the corporate funds into their accounts, landing them in trouble. On the other hand, other inmates might be wealthy hence;, correctional officers might fall victims by trying to rescue them to get some funds in return. Some correctional employees fall victims to the inmates, particularly the opposite gender. Again, the officers might be sexually attracted to them, leading to their dramatic change. A dramatic change in an officer is often dangerous as it might result in corruption while favoring the inmates they are sexually attracted to.

Workplace corruption is a threat to both the inmates and other correctional employees; thus, it should be mitigated. Zero-tolerance approach, engaging all correctional employees' levels and conducting inspection within the correctional facilities increase the employees' accountability (Souryal, 2009). The zero-tolerance approach is the most effective way to curb corruption within correctional facilities. The strategy should begin with the administration staff who engage all the employees to deviate from any form of corruption as it is prohibited. Further, the agencies should implement quality training programs covering organizational ethics (Souryal, 2009). The training should cover topics such as the dangers of possessing contrabands,

ways to avoid manipulating inmates and the repercussions of inmates' relationships. Lawmakers should also be responsible for eliminating corruption within the correctional centers. Inspecting and touring around the correctional centers by the lawmakers enhances accountability. Also, the administrators will uphold the required ethical standards by not condoning staff members who report any form of misconduct.

**Reference**

Souryal, S. S. (2009). Deterring corruption by prison personnel: A principle-based perspective.

The Prison Journal, 89(1), 21-45.

r

---

ORIGINALITY REPORT

---

0%

SIMILARITY INDEX

0%

INTERNET SOURCES

0%

PUBLICATIONS

0%

STUDENT PAPERS

---

PRIMARY SOURCES

---

Exclude quotes Off

Exclude matches Off

Exclude bibliography On