

Perceived Correctional Officers' Power Sources and Compliance among Correctional Facility Inmates in Osun State, Nigeria

EKONG AKPAN ESSIEN, ABIODUN ADEKUNLE OGUNOLA, DAVID A. OLADIYAN
Olabisi Onabanjo University, Ago-Iwoye, Ogun State, Nigeria

ADEBOLAJI EKONG ESSIEN
Gateway Polytechnic, Saapade, Ogun State, Nigeria

Abstract. The continued crisis in correctional facilities which has led to jail breaks and avoidable deaths has been a serious problem for correctional officers and governments. Understanding the application of power sources which could have been used in gaining compliance in these facilities have been ignored by researchers in Nigeria and Africa in general. Therefore, the present study was out to investigate the influence of perceived power sources and compliance among correctional facilities inmates. 150 inmates selected from two correctional facilities in Ilesa and Ile-Ife, Osun State were used in the study. A questionnaire measuring their demographic data and perceived power sources and compliance was used for data collection. The results of the study indicated that correctional officers' power sources (expert, rewards, legitimate, coercive, and referent) significantly jointly influenced inmates compliance to rules and assigned duties ($F(5, 149) = 12.026, P < .05$). Also no significant difference existed between male and female inmates' compliance based on perceived correctional officers power sources ($t(148) = -.483, P > .05$). While years of incarceration of inmates significantly influenced inmates level of compliance based on perceived correctional officer's power sources ($F(4, 149) = 1.183, P < .05$). The study recommended that, the managements of correctional facilities should train their officers to acquire skills that would enable them handle inmates, promote and assigned officers legally to positions of authority and also make available certain rewards into the officers in order to provide same to inmates who comply to rules, assigned duties and responsibilities.

Keywords: Power Sources, Compliance, Perception, Correctional, Duties, Responsibilities, Inmates

1. Introduction

In Nigeria and other parts of the world, there exist correctional facilities previously known as prisons. These facilities are located in different states of the Nigeria federation, in forms of local, state and federal correctional facilities. The correctional officers serve as the voice of authority within these facilities ensuring safety and welfare of the inmates. These courageous enforcement professional disrupt violence confrontations, ensures order, and also work to help rehabilitate the inmates. Correctional officers have multidimensional roles in facility operations, regardless of their assignments, be it to oversee general population inmates or to supervise inmates on death row. A correctional officer is required to perform some task and at the same time ensure peace and order in the facility and provide dignified and safe living conditions. Failure on the part of the correctional officers to undertake the above could result in irreversible consequences that impact an entire community and endanger innocent lives and property.

The roles of correctional officers in the correctional facilities are crucial and so, for them to continually achieve their goals, the understanding and application of power is needed here. Aslanargun (2011) noted that behaviour of people in any society reflects some kinds of powers shaped by power relations. Power is an intangible force in organizations, yet the concept of power is so complex that each person conceives it differently. According to Bass & Bass, (2008), power

is seen as a force while Rahim (1989) posited that power is a capacity. However, both definitions are concerned about the exercise of influence to fulfill or achieve a goal. In this research, the term power is defined as the capacity of an individual agent to influence the behaviour or attitude of one or more designated target person(s) (Rahim, 1988). This definition explains the fact that, this study is limited to the influence of one individual (correctional officer) over other individuals (correctional facilities inmate)

Power is an individual's capacity to move others, to entice others, to persuade and encourage others to attain specific goals or to engage in specific behaviour, it is the capacity to influence and motivate others (Cangemi, 1992). Power is the ability of someone to influence someone else (Nelson & Quick, 2012). The study of power has been classified according to the style of people, their communicative competence, organization climate, interpersonal relations in the society such as teacher-student, Principal-teacher, doctor-patient, commander-soldier, employer-employee which reflects some degree of power based relations. When considered in this direction, power is a process of removing the obstacles that would have hindered organizations from achieving their goal.

Power is defined contextually and in meaning with control, ability, influence and authority. Power can be seen as authority or a means of getting work done (Nesley Quigley, Aguinis, Lieve & Tedeshi, 1999). Etzioni (1961) noted that, power is the actual process of an agent to influence others, for anyone having power in a society is only possible to influence and activates others for their wishes. Within organizations, power, authority, and influence could be substituted each for another. Power is sometimes seen as source of capacity but most times confused with influence. Influence often is defined as power. Power is noted to be a process of activating sources while authority is identified as formally constructed power or legitimacy (Hales, 1997). Therefore, power is merely seen as an informal authority while authority is seen as legitimate power (Luthans, 1992).

Within organizations, influence or influence strategies are generally used as transformative form of power to make subordinate to do assign duties and responsibilities. Influence here is interchangeable used according to object, influential act and alterations over the subject and are derived from concepts such as control, power and authority (Somech & Drach-Zahavy, 2002). Power is also an exchange relationship that affects the organizational

culture in correctional facility, thereby allowing maintenance of order to be achieved even in the absence or physical presence of correctional staff (Gordon & Stichman, 2015).

In this study, emphasis is not on power itself, but on the sources of power as resources to be harnessed by the correctional officers to influence inmate and gain cooperation or compliance to request and or assigned duties and responsibilities. Previous researchers like Cloward (1968); Hepburn (1985); Stojkovic (1986); Sykes & Messinger (1960) found that, in order for correctional officers to succeed in their tasks, they must enforce authority by using power. Our study adopted French and Raven sources of social power in order to discover those types of power that inmates in correctional facilities may perceive as influencing them more to comply and or cooperate with correctional officers on assigned duties and request.

The study of Hepburn (1985) found that expert, coercive, referent, legitimate and reward power are the power sources that correctional officers may adopt in getting inmate to comply and that each of these sources of power depends on the perception of the person who has influence applied against him or her. In other words, when a correctional officer has one of these power sources, the inmates perceive him or her as having that power. Social power refers to the repertoire of power available to an individual to an individual whereas influence tactics refers to the actual usage of specific behavior in situation (Podsakoff & Schriesheim, 1985; Stahelski & Payntton, 1995). Thus an inmate in a correctional facility may comply with the correctional officer's request because of the imagined or perceived social power repertoire available to the correctional officers or due to an actual tactics like the use of specific coercion, such as giving undesirable work assignment.

Firstly, rewards power source is based on the established fact that a power holder has the ability either to reward a target or subordinate compliance with something positive or to remove something negative. This type of power is based on the power holder's authority in the position. This source of power is an important instrument in rewarding effective performers. Reward power acts as reinforcement for subordinates presented by power holder. Reward power depends on the target's belief that the agent can provide them some desired rewards. When this type of power source is perceived, it may indicate a temporary change in the behaviour of the target. This therefore, produces compliance temporarily and the continued

compliance using this power source is based on successful surveillance of the target by the agent. The correctional officer has reward power when inmates perceive them to have authority to issue rewards. However, correctional officers are limited in formal rewards but can give informal rewards in form of overlooking inmates' minor rule breaking or violation in exchange for compliance with major rule or assisting to control other inmates (Lombardo, 1989).

Secondly, coercive power source is based on a subordinates' perception that a supervisor has the ability to punish him or her for failure to conform to the superiors influence attempt. The correctional officer has coercive power when the correctional facility inmates perceive them to have the right to punish them or give them undesirable assignments. Also, like reward power source, coercive power source is disadvantages because it depends on observability by others (French & Raven, 1959). In other words, the inmates' reacts only in certain ways when the correctional officer is available to hand out the punishment

Thirdly, referent power is a source of power that subordinates attributes or desires to identify with a superior because of their admiration or personal liking of the superior. This power leads to private acceptance of targets by enabling him or her to maintain satisfactory relationship with agent and see himself or herself as similar to the agent on certain relevant dimensions (Gibson, Veegerleri, 2003). Referent power represents attraction that correctional officer has with his or her characteristics as perceived by the inmates. Most times the power holders are not aware of these characteristics or charisma of theirs but the subordinate compliance to request made by the power holder.

Fourthly, expert power refers to a perception by the subordinate of his or her superior having job experience and special knowledge or expertise in a given field or area of discipline. This is a common form of power and the bases of a very large proportion of human collaboration including most institutions, company or organizations where the principle of specialization allows large and complex organizations to be undertaken. Leaders or supervisors expertise can contribute to the level of power in organizations and it can provide equal, entreating and motivating relationship with subordinate. Expert power is dependent on an individual having expertise or knowledge in specific domain. If an inmate perceives a correctional officer as an expert in his or her service delivery, it therefore result in that correctional officer's acceptance by the

inmate. This power may be more evident among correctional officers in handling conflicts among inmates and human relations issues that may require the correctional officer's attention.

Finally, legitimate power is based on the belief of the subordinate's that a superior has the right to prescribe and control their behavior. Legitimate power is that which is invested in a role. Legitimacy can come from a higher power which usually results in acceptance behaviour. In this study, a correctional officer has a legitimate right to make request of the inmates and an obligation to comply. This source results in the correctional officer's acceptance that comes from within the inmate as it is socially dependent on the correctional officer, but however does not require any surveillance of inmates in order to be successful. Legitimate power source is different from tyrannical use of power source since it depends on legitimacy and hierarchy (Elias & Loomis, 2004). Today's organizational theory attributes high importance on legitimate authority that flows down through the organizational hierarchy and formal rules established and enforced by those in authority to ensure that organizational behavior is directed at the attainment of goals. (Shafit & Ott, 1987). Legitimate power however, can be influenced by other factors such as experience and age. For example, correctional officers with more experience tended to see legitimate power as less important (Hepburn, 1985). Bachman, Bowers & Marcus (1968) reviewed these power sources to determine why people comply with the request of superiors in their workplace and how each power source linked to organizational effectiveness.

Compliance therefore, means the inmates is willing to carry out the correctional officers wishes as long as doing so will not require extra effort. That is, the inmates will respond to reasonable and or normal request that are perceived to clearly be within the normal boundaries of their job.

The justice system for more than four decades now, have experienced serious issues in correctional facilities and researchers have studied some of these issues, such as violence in prisons, jail breaks, adjustment and coping with prison life. However, Smith, Applegate, Sitren, & Springer (2009) remarked that, researchers have conducted studies using social power base in varieties of academic discipline, probation and other organizational context. While Steiner, Hester, Makarios & Travis (2012) studied inmates on parole. But Symkovych (2019) concluded that, only Gordon & Stichman (2014); Gordon & Stichman (2015); Hepburn (1985);

Stojkovic (1986); Stichman (2003); & Stojkovic (1984) have conducted studies using correctional officers and inmates in correctional facilities.

Wooldredge & Steiner (2016) study found that, Correctional officers' claims to legitimate authority can only be valid when the organizational rules and the enforcers of those rules are proper and just—not just in particular instances, but consistently and over time. The continuity of interactions between officers and inmates that involve respectful treatment and preserve the dignity of inmates is necessary for establishing correctional officials as individuals who deserve the right to govern.

This then leads to the question of what constitutes the legitimate and illegitimate use of correctional officers' power sources and it is, in line with this that such differences in the power sources requires this distinction. For instance, when officers rely more on coercion to gain compliance from inmates, they weaken their legitimate authority because inmates are not willing to follow their directives. On the other hand, if they rely more on their expertise, they may gain the respect of inmates from doing so. However, if the officers are not skilled to use their power sources appropriately, they stand the risk of the inmates not recognizing their right to rule or control them.

Limited studies however exist in Africa in general and in Nigeria in particular on how correctional officers' powers sources can influence compliance of inmates to their assigned duties and responsibilities. For example, Benjamin (2018) examined criminal justice administration and panic of prison correction in Nigeria while Akoeni (2016) examined conditions on which prison officers are seen as power base holders based on legitimacy claims in Ghana respectively. It is against this background that this study tends to examine the influence of perceived correctional officers' power sources on compliance among correctional facility inmates in South-Western Nigeria with emphasis on the following specific objectives: to examine whether inmates who perceive their correctional officers to have either expert, referent, reward, coercive or legitimate power source will comply with rules and assigned duties, whether perceived correctional officers power sources by inmates will significantly independently and jointly influence their compliance, whether there is a significant difference between male and female inmates' compliance based on their perceived power sources of the correctional officers, and whether the inmates' years of incarceration will significantly influence their compliance to rules and assigned duties.

In order to achieve the goal of this study, answers are sought for the following research questions:

- Will inmates who perceive their correctional officer to have expert, reward referent, coercive and legitimate power sources influence their compliance with rules and assigned duties?
- Will perceived correctional officers' power sources significantly independent and jointly influence inmates' compliance?
- Will there be a significant difference in the compliance of male and female inmates?
- Will the years of incarceration of the inmates significantly influence their level of compliance to rules and assigned duties?

2. Literature Review

2.1 Power Sources and Inmate Compliance

It was stated earlier that there is paucity of research in Nigeria and Africa in general in this area of study, but studies in other parts of the world, for example; Stichman (2003) study reported that, inmates of correctional facility accept the fact that officers have the right to be obeyed. He went further to explain that, the inmate's acceptance of both the institutionalization of authority and the officers' right to occupy the office they do, indicates support for legitimate and referent power. Hepburn (1985) study also found that, legitimate and expert power source of officers was the reasons for inmates' compliance. The officers' exercise of powers over inmates can influence inmate's perception regarding the legitimacy of their authority, not to mention regarding the legitimacy of prison rules (Bottons 1999; Lambardo, 1989; Wooddriege & Steiner, 2016). Therefore, because of officers legal authority they are more seen as the representatives of formal rules of conduct and determinant on how rules are enforced (Liebling, Price & Shefer, 2011) The study of Gordon *et al.* (2015) which examined correctional orientation and compliance in respect to three dimensions of power (expert, referent and legitimate) which relied on informal control and relationship indicated in their results, officers believing in rehabilitation ideals that was consistently related to the dimensions of legitimate, referent and expert power source control. Gordon *et al.* (2014) in their earlier study of a preliminary investigation of the effect of correctional officers bases of power and their fear and risk of victimization showed that expert and legitimate power were negatively related to fear and expert and referent power were negatively related to victimization. The study however concluded that,

officers who relied more on internal power base are less fearful and believed in themselves to be at a lower risk of victimization when compared to officers who relied more on external power bases.

But in another study by Gordon *et al.* (2015), their results indicated that inmates' compliance to rules was as a result of the fact that, they perceived officers as using expert, referent and legitimate power. Their study further indicated that, the rehabilitative philosophies of correctional officers on legitimate, expert and referent power sources were the means used by the officers to gain compliance from inmates. According to Ferdik & Smith (2016) study which investigated maximum security correctional officers' social bases of power relied upon in influencing inmates as well as their antecedents in decision making. This study showed that, referent and legitimate power source were ranked the highest in use for controlling inmates, while measures of officers risk perception and work-related attitude significantly predicted the reliance of power sources. These researchers noticed an interesting dichotomy in the findings for perception of inmates' compliance. They discovered that, officers who perceived greater compliance by inmates were significantly influenced by expert, referent and positional power and the reliance on coercive power. Their study further showed that coercive power of correctional officers could reflect inmates' reaction to the use of force that enhanced their compliance to order and rules. The study revealed further that, correctional officers depended on coercive power the same way they depended on referent and expert power. These researchers were however surprised that, coercive power source was perceived in relation to referent and expert source given the less desirable information about it. According to Stojkovic (1986), prison guards rejected the idea that inmates are controlled by them through coercion and reward. They however noted that, inmates ranked legitimate and expert power as most important reason why they comply with orders and directives by officers. In the same vein, Stichman (2003) & Gordon (2015) sum up that, coercive and reward power were the weakest source of power used in correctional facilities by officers. But Steiner, Makorios, Hester & Travis (2012) were of the view that the ratings of legitimate and expert powers of the officers were negatively related to officers interest in pursuing parole revocation, which suggested that, the type of power parole officers adopted must have in one way or another made the inmates to comply to directives.

Steiner & Wooldredge (2018) in their study found that, inmates' perception of officer's legitimacy had an inverse relationship with both violent and non-violent rule violation while non-violation rule

infraction was statistically significant when the inmates perceived officers to be fair and just, thus, making the inmates to be less involved in non-violent rule infractions. They also found that, perceived positional power of officers on each type of misconduct had an inverse predictive direction which was statistically significant. Expert power in their study predicted a non-violent infraction to rules, while perceived referent power of officers was also a significant predictor of non-violent infraction to rules. This study however indicated that, the greater use of each reward power and coercive power had significant higher rates of violent infractions. In contrast to Steiner *et al.* (2018) submission, Sparks, Settons & Hay (1996) study indicated that, when officers rely less on coercive power and treat inmates with respect and fairness, they tend to experience less violence in correctional facilities that are concerned with the use of coercive power.

However, Hepburn (1985) study reported that, in a custody oriented facility also known as correctional facility, the officers therein may see their ability to resolve dispute among the inmate as expert power. But Stichman (2003) negated this view noting that inmates might be reluctant to accept correctional officer's expertise in controlling them. But Hepburn (1985), sum up with the fact that, conformity can be achieved through officers power over inmates as a result of their reputation for competence and good judgment. A fundamental question must be asked and given an answer to in this current study. That is, within a correctional facility, which gender (male or female) among the inmates comply more with rules and regulations? According to Toman (2017) study on female incarceration and prison order with emphasis on gender differences in prison misconduct and in-prison punishments indicated that, male inmates receive more formal rule infraction than female with about 42 percent for males and 32 percent for females. Also, Jang & Fisher-Giolando (2005); Clone & Dehart (2014) studies showed that female inmates display less misconduct than male inmates and cope in correctional facilities conveniently. But Toman (2017) concluded that misconduct patterns of inmates whether male or female results from or are influenced by common predictors of behaviour such as prior incarceration and age of inmates. This submission is to the fact that in criminal justice system when an accused person has been sentenced, he or she is sent into a correctional facility to serve the term of the sentence. During this period, all rules and regulations must be obeyed by the inmates. Wooldredge (1994) opined that, deviation from the formal rules by inmates in the prison is considered as crimes.

3. Method

The design for the study is a cross sectional survey design. The researchers adopted this design because the study does not involve the manipulation of variables, it allowed us to assess certain characteristics of the inmates at a given point in time, and the analysis of prevailing characteristics of the inmates. The study was conducted at two (2) correctional facilities at Ile-Ife and Ilesa in Osun State, South-West, Nigeria. The targeted population of the inmates in the two (2) correctional facilities was seven hundred and seventy- five (775) inmates. The sample size for this study was one hundred and fifty (150) respondents from the inmate’s population in Ile-Ife and Ilesa Correctional facilities. There were more male inmates participants (129) than female inmates (21). However, the study strictly focused on inmates who were sentenced, awaiting trials and those who had spent more than six (6) months in the facility.

A non-probability sampling technique was used, specifically convenience sampling was employed. The study used a set of questionnaire for data gathering. The questionnaire was divided into two different sections. Section A, measured basic demographic information of the inmates, and self-reported criminal history (sentence length, conviction offence(s), and previous prison confinement). Section

B, measured inmates perceived power sources of correctional officers and their compliance to rules and assigned responsibilities using Stichman (2003) perceived power bases scale of fifteen (15) items, tapping each of the original power sources of Raven (1959). In order to determine the psychometric property of the scale and suitability for use in Nigeria, the instrument was subjected to initial standardization process conducted among facility inmates in Ijebu-ode, Ogun State in the same geo-political zone with Ilesa and Ile-Ife in Osun State correctional facilities. The fifteen (15) items scale with five (5) Likert response style of Strongly Agree to Strongly Disagree after standardization indicated a Cronbach Alpha value of 0.832.

Before the commencement of the study, the researchers sought and obtained permission to conduct the study using the inmates from these facilities, from the management of these facilities as participants. The copies of questionnaires were administered during the day and within forty-five (45) minutes with the assistance of the social workers (correctional officers within each facility) to the sampled inmates who were gathered at their vocational units and were expected back into their cells after the stipulated time. The inmates were however, assured of the confidentiality of their responses.

4. Results

Table 1: Socio-Demographic Characteristics and self-reported Criminal History of Respondents

Variables	Group	Frequency	Percentage
Gender	Male	129	86.0%
	Female	21	14.0%
	Total	150	100.0%
Age Group	20-29 years	54	36.0%
	30-39 years	58	38.7%
	40-49 years	19	12.7%
	50-59 years	10	6.7%
	60 years above	9	6.0%
	Total	150	100.0%
Marital Status	Single	76	50.7%
	Married	47	31.3%
	Separated/ Divorce	17	11.3%
	Widowed	10	6.7%
	Total	150	100.0%
Sentence Length	1-5 years	59	39.3%
	6-10 years	57	38.0%
	11-15 years	21	14.0%
	16-20 years	5	3.3%
	21 years above	8	5.3%
	Total	150	100.0%
Conviction Offence	Homicide	19	12.7%
	Robbery	33	22.0%
	Burglary	17	11.3%
	Rape	14	9.3%
	Aggravated Assault	16	10.7%
	Drug Offenses	12	8.0%
	Probation/Parole Violation	3	2.0%

	Theft	16	10.7%
	Others	20	13.3%
	Total	150	100.0%
Previous Prison Confinement	None	111	74.0%
	One other time	24	16.0%
	Two other times	9	6.0%
	Three or more times	6	4.0%
	Total	150	100.0%

Source: Authors' Computation

The above (Table 1) showed the socio-demographic characteristics and self-reported criminal history of respondent and the percentage distributions. A total of two Hundred (200) inmates were given the questionnaires but only one hundred and fifty (150) were appropriately filled out (a 75 percent response rate). From this completed number, it was indicated that 129 (86.0%) were male, while 21 (14.0%) were female. The table showed that their ages ranged from 20-29 (36.0%), 30-39 (38.7%), 40-49 (12.7%), 50-59 (6.7%) and 60-and above (9.0%) The table also indicated that 76 (50.7 %) were single, 47 (31.3 %) were married, while 17 (11.3 %) were either separated or divorced, and 10 (6.7) were widowed. The sentence length of the inmates were 59 (39.0%), for a sentenced between 1 and 5 years, 57 (38.0%), for those sentenced for between 6-10 years, 21 (14.0%), were sentenced within the sentenced length of 11-15 years, 5(2.3%) were sentenced for between 16 and 20 years, while 8(5.3%0 were sentenced for more than 21 years. The table also depicted the conviction offense of the respondents as 19 (12.7%), 33 (22.0%), 17 (11.3%), 14 (9.3%), 16 (10.7%), 12 (8.0%), 3 (2.0%), (16) 10.7% and 20 (13.3%) for homicide, robbery, burglary, rape, aggravated assault, drug offence, probation/ parole violation, theft, and other categories of offences respectively.

Research Hypotheses

- Perceived correctional officers’ expert, referent, reward, coercive, or legitimate power sources by inmates will significantly influence their compliance with rules and assigned duties.
- Perceived correctional officers’ power sources will significantly independently and jointly influence inmates’ compliance to rules and assigned duties.
- There is a significant difference in male and female inmates’ compliance based on perceived correctional officers’ power sources.
- Years of incarceration of inmate will significantly influence their level of compliance based on perceived correctional officers’ power sources.

Hypothesis One: Regression analysis was used to test the hypothesis which states that perceived correctional officers’ expert, reward, legitimate, coercive, and referent power sources will significantly influence inmates’ compliance to rules and assigned duties. This is shown in Table 2 below.

Table 2: Summary of Hypothesis 1 Result

Variable	N	Mean	Sd	Df	Beta(β)	T	Sig	P
<i>expert</i>	150	3.99	1.28	149	.207	2.434	.016	<.05
<i>reward</i>	150	1022	3.51	149	.330	4.294	.001	<.05
<i>legitimate</i>	150	7.71	1.78	149	.249	2.741	.007	<.05
<i>coercive</i>	150	6.39	2.14	149	.001	-.066	.995	>.05
<i>Referent</i>	150	8.01	1.95	149	-.133	-1.343	.181	>.05

Source: Authors' Computation

The result of the analysis presented in the table above revealed that perceived correctional officer’s expert, reward, legitimate, coercive, and referent power sources significantly influenced inmate compliance to rules and assigned duties, with expert (t (149) = 2.434, P<.05), rewards (t (149) = 4.294, P<.05), and legitimate (t (149) = 2.741, P<.05), showing positive influence on inmate compliance to rules and assigned duties. While coercive (t (149) = -.066, P>.05) and referent power sources (t (149) = -1.343, P>.05) showed negative influence on inmate compliance to rules and assigned duties. Therefore, the result was partially confirmed and accepted.

Hypothesis Two: Regression analysis was used to test the hypothesis which states that perceived correctional officer’s power sources (expert, rewards, legitimate, coercive, and referent) will significantly independent and jointly influence inmates’ compliance to rules and assigned duties. This is shown in Table 3.

Table 3: Summary of Hypothesis 2 Result

Variables	Beta (β)	T	P	R	R ²	Adjusted R ²	F	Sig	P
<i>expert</i>	.207	2.434	<.05						
<i>reward</i>	.330	4.294	<.05	.543	.295	.270	12.026	.001	<.05
<i>legitimate</i>	.249	2.741	<.05						
<i>coercive</i>	.001	-.066	>.05						
<i>Referent</i>	-.133	-1.343	>.05						

Source: Authors' Computation

The result of the analysis presented on the table above revealed that expert ($\beta = .207, t = 2.434, P < .05$), rewards ($\beta = .330, t = 4.294, P < .05$), and legitimate power sources expert ($\beta = -.249, t = 2.741, P < .05$), significantly and independently influence inmate compliance to rules and assigned duties. The table also revealed that coercive ($\beta = .001, t = -.066, P > .05$) and referent power sources ($\beta = -.133, t = -1.343, P > .05$) did not significantly and independently influence the inmates compliance to rules and assigned duties.

Furthermore, it revealed that the correctional officers' power sources (expert, rewards, legitimate, coercive, and referent) significantly jointly influenced inmate compliance to rules and assigned duties ($F(5, 149) = 12.026, P < .05$) and this accounted for 29% variance in the dependent variable of inmates compliance ($R^2 = .295$). Therefore, the hypothesis was accepted.

Hypothesis Three: The T-test of independent measures was used to test the hypothesis which states that there will be a significant difference between male and female inmates' compliance based on perceived correctional officers' power sources. This is shown in Table 4.

Table 4: Summary of Hypothesis 3 Result

Variable	N	Mean	Sd	Df	Sig	T	P
Male	129	18.24	3.86	148	.200	-.483	> .05
Female	21	18.67	2.92				

Source: Authors' Computation

The result presented revealed that there is no significant difference between male ($X = 18.24, SD = 3.86$) and female ($X = 18.67, SD = 2.92$) on perceived correctional officers power sources ($t(148) = -.483, P > .05$). Therefore, the hypothesis was rejected.

Hypothesis Four: One way ANOVA was used to test the hypothesis which states that years of incarceration of inmates will significantly influence their level of compliance based on perceived correctional officers' power sources. This is shown in Table 5 and 6.

Table 5: Summary table of descriptive analysis showing the mean and standard deviation of the years of incarcerations

Variables	N	Mean	Standard Deviation
1-5 years	57	19.05	3.45
6-10 years	21	17.48	4.20
11-15 years	5	17.40	4.03
21 years and Above	8	17.00	4.24
Others	59	18.12	3.74

Source: Authors' Computation

Table 6: Summary of Hypothesis 4 Result

Variables	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Squares	F	Sig	P
Between group	66.050	4	16.513			
Within groups	2023.450	145	13.955	1.183	.032	<.05
Total	2089.500	149				

Source: Authors' Computation

The result presented revealed that years of incarceration of inmates significantly influenced inmates level of compliance based on perceived correctional officer's power sources ($F(4, 149) = 1.183, P < .05$). Therefore, the hypothesis was accepted.

5. Discussion of Findings

Power is the ability of someone to influence someone else (Nelson *et al.*, 2012). Researchers in the area of power source in correctional facilities over the years have submitted evidences that suggested how these authorities (correctional officers) exercise their power over inmates and their subsequent compliance (Hepburn, 1985; Stichman, 2003; Steiner *et al.*, 2015 & Steiner *et al.*, 2016). We assessed these information in a correctional facility by examining the influence of correctional officers' power sources and inmates' compliance to duties and responsibilities in Ile-Ife and Ilesha correctional facilities in Osun State, Nigeria.

From the results of the study, hypothesis one which stated that perceived correctional officers' expert, reward, legitimate, coercive and referent power sources will significantly influence inmates compliance to rules and assigned duties was supported partially, in the sense that only expert, reward and legitimate power sources significantly influenced compliance of inmates to rules and assigned duties. From our result, it showed that when inmates in these correctional facilities perceived their correctional officers to have either reward, legitimate or expert power sources they are motivated to comply with rules and assigned duties. This findings collaborates to a large extent the results of Gordon & Stichman (2015) whose results indicated that inmates' compliance to rules was as a result of the fact that, they perceived officers as using expert, referent and legitimate power. Their study further indicated that, the rehabilitative philosophies of correctional officers on legitimate, expert and referent power sources were the means used by the officers to gain compliance from inmates. The slight difference observed in our study, is the fact that reward power of correctional officers was found to significantly influence inmates compliance which is at variance with most studies as it is noted to be a weak source. This result thereby provides motivational interest for future researchers to examine the constituent of rewards that officers grant to inmates in Nigerian correctional facilities.

Hypothesis two which stated that perceived correctional officer's power source (expert, reward, coercive, legitimate and referent power sources) will significantly and jointly influence inmate compliance to rules and assigned duties was supported. This means that when the inmates perceive correctional officers to have a positive combination of expert, reward, legitimate, coercive and referent powers sources, they systematically comply with rules and assigned duties. This study could not be corroborated

since there are no literature in power sources study examining both the independent and joint influence of power sources and compliance in a single hypothesis. But Hepburn (1985) study which reported that legitimate and expert power source of officers was the reasons for inmates' compliance could be regarded as a study that lay credence to this study to a great extent. Hepburn study implied that inmates complied with rules and regulations when the officers are seen to control them based on their combined position and reputation for competence and good judgment which to us is regarded as joint influence.

The study of Rahim (1989) supported the result of our analysis. His study revealed that out of the five power sources, legitimate, expert and referent power sources were significantly related to compliance. The study of Bachman, Bower & Marcus (1968) examining why people comply with the request of their organization superior indicated that legitimate and expert power were the most important reasons for complying also supported this study.

Hypothesis three stated that, there will be a significant difference between male and female inmate compliance based on perceived correctional officers power sources. The result of the study was not confirmed. This means that being a male or female inmate in a correctional facility does not relate to compliance to rule or duties when perceiving correctional sources of power. The result of our study is at variance with the result of Toman (2017) study on gender differences in prison misconduct indicating that male inmates receive more formal rule infraction than female inmate indicating 42 percent for males and 32 percent for females. Also, Jang & Fisher-Giolando (2005) & Clone Dehart (2014) studies did not support the result of our study, noting that female inmates display less misconducts than male inmate and that the female inmates cope conveniently in correctional facilities. The results of these studies by these researchers by implication is that, their observed lower level of misconducts recorded by female inmates indicates that, they complied more to rules and assigned duties and responsibilities than their male counterpart. This result should also be further researched into to uncover why there was no significant difference in gender compliance among inmates in correctional facilities in Nigeria as found in other countries of the world.

Hypothesis four which stated that, age of incarceration of inmates will significant influence their level of compliance based on perceived correctional officer's power sources was supported. This means that the length of years of incarceration of inmates afforded them the opportunity to understand the workings of correctional facilities in

the areas of rules obedience, respect for officers and inmates and even their reason(s) for incarceration. The study of Stichman (2003) collaborate the findings of this present study. In his study on the sources and impact of inmates' perception of correctional officers bases of power, he reported that length of sentence was positively and significantly related to personal offenses and those inmates who committed personal offenses perceived correctional officers to have legitimate and expert power sources as the highest.

Aslanargun (2011) study on the power sources that principal handle in school administration also lay credence to the present study. He reported a significant positive relationship between teachers teaching years and perceived power sources (expert, reward, coercive, legitimate and referent) of their principal.

6. Conclusion

The study conducted shows clearly that inmates perception of their correctional officers experts, reward and legitimate power has direct influence on their compliance to assigned duties, responsibilities and rules while coercive and referent power sources of correctional officers perceived by inmates does not. Inmates' perception of their correctional officers' experts, reward, referent, legitimate and coercive power sources has direct and joint influence on inmates' compliance to assigned duties and responsibilities. The study in addition indicated no difference in compliance to assigned duties and responsibilities by inmates whether male or females and also a difference in compliance to rule and assigned duties by inmates based on age of incarceration.

7. Recommendations

The following recommendations are hereby made as a result of the finding from the study:

The major findings of this study is the fact that only three (3) out of five (5) of the power sources, that is, experts, reward and legitimate power sources were found to have significant influence on inmates compliance to assigned duties and responsibilities. This result indicates that the management of correctional facilities should train their officers to acquire skills that can handle inmates, promote and assigned officers legally to positions of authority and also make available certain rewards into the officers in order for them to provide same to inmates who comply to rules assigned duties and responsibilities.

Secondly, power sources of experts, legitimate, reward referent and coercive were seen to jointly influence inmates compliance. Based on these results, the correctional officers should be educated on using a combination of these sources when making a request or seeking compliance from inmates in correctional facility. Thirdly, the result of the study also indicated no difference in compliance between male and female inmates. Organizations, management of correctional facilities should focus on training, motivating and or providing equal treatment to both male and females' inmates since sentence served by them are not given differently but based on crimes committed.

Primarily, the study showed a difference in compliance to rules and assigned duties by inmates. Following this inference, the management of the correctional facilities should provide to inmates from the first day of entrant into the facility orientation on rules based on age of incarceration and regulations within the facility.

References

- Akoensi, T. (2016). Perception of self-legitimacy and audience legitimacy among prison officers in Ghana. *International Journal of Comparative Applied Criminal Justice*. 245-261. doi.org/10.1080/019240.36.2015//65712
- Aslanargun, E. (2011). The Power that Principals handle in School Administration. *Journal of Education and Humanities: Theory and practice*. Cilt 2 (3), 3-28.
- Bachman, I.G., Bowers, D. G. & Marcus, P. M. (1968). Bases of Supervisory Power: A Comparative study in five Organizational setting. A. S. Tannenbaum (Ed.). Control in organization, 229-238. New York: McGraw Hill
- Bass, B. M., & Bass, K. (2008). *The Basic Handbook of Leadership Theory Research and Management Application*. 4th ed: New York; Free Press.
- Benjamin, O. (2018). Criminal Justice Administration and Panic of Correction in Nigeria. *Journal of Law and Judicial System*.1 (2), 1-8
- Bottoms, Anthony E. (1999). Interpersonal violence and social order in prisons. In crime and justice, (Eds.) Michael Tonry and Joan Petersilia. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Cangemi, J. (1992). Some observations of successful leaders and their use of power and authority, *Education*, 112,499-505

- Clone, S. & Dehart, D. (2014). Social Support Network of Incarcerated Women: Types of support, source of support and implication for reentry. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation* 53 (7), 503-521.
- Cloward, R. A. (1960). *Social Control in the Prison*. In D. Cressey (Ed.), *Theoretical Studies in Social Organization of the Prison*. New York, NY: Social science research council.
- Elias, S. M. ve Loomis, R. J. (2004). The effect of instructor gender and race/ethnicity on gaining compliance in class. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 34(5), 937 -958.
- Etzioni, A. (1961). *A Comparative Analysis of Complex Organization on Power: Involvement and their correlates*. NY: The Free Press.
- Faci, N. (2013). Impact of manager's reward power and coercive power on employee's job satisfaction: A Comparative Study of Public and Private Sector. *International Journal of Management Business Resources*. 3(4), 383 – 392
- Ferdik, V. & Smith, P. (2016). Maximum Security Correctional Officers: An Exploratory Investigation into their Social Bases of Power. *American Journal of Criminal Justice*. Doi: 10:1007/s1203-0159307-5
- French, J., & Raven, B. (1959). The Bases of Social Power: In D. Cartwright (Ed.). *Studies in Social Power*, 150 – 167. Ann Arbors, MI: Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan.
- Fiedler, F. E. (1959). Personality and Situational Determinants of Leadership Effectiveness. In D. Cartwright ve A. Zander (Eds.) *Studies in Social Power*, 362 – 380 Ann Arbor MI: Research Center for Group Dynamics, University of Michigan.
- French, J. R. P. & Raven, B. (1968). *The Bases for Social Power*. In D. Cartwright (Ed). *Studies in Social Power* Ann Arbor , MI: University of Michigan Press.
- Gibson, J. L., Ivancevich, J. M., Donnely, J.H., ve Konopaske, R. (2003). *Organizations, Behaviour Structure, Processes*. (11th Ed.). NY: McGraw Hill.
- Gordon J.E & Stichman, A. (2015). The influence of rehabilitative and punishment ideology on correctional officers' perception of informal bases of power. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*. 1-18. Doi: 10.177/0306624X15586414
- Greiner, L. E., & Schein, V. E. (1988). *Power and Organization Development: Mobilizing power to implement change*. New York: Addison – Wesley Press.
- Ivancevich, J. M., Konopaske, R. & Matterson, M. T. (2011). *Organizational Behaviour and Management* (9th Ed.) McGraw-Hill International Edition.
- Katz, D. & Kahn, L. K. (1966). *The Social Psychology of Organizations*, NY: John Wiley Press.
- Kelman, H. C. (1958), Compliance Identification and Internalization. Three Processes of Attitude Change. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 2, 51 – 60.
- Liebling, A., David P. & Guy S. (2011). *The Prison Officer*: New York: William Press.
- Lombardo, L. (1989). *Guards imprisoned: correctional officers at work*. Cincinnati, OH: Anderson.
- Luthan, F. (1992). *Organisational Behaviour*, Toronto: Mc Graw Hill
- McClelland, D. C., & Burnham, D. H (2003). Power is the great motivator. *Harvard Business Review*, 8 (1), 117 – 129.
- Munduate L. & Gravenhost, K. M. B. (2003). Power Dynamics and Organizational Change: *An International Review*, 52 (1), 1 – 13.
- Mushtao, A., Hamad, N., Anosh, M. & Iqbal, N. (2014). Leadership Power and Career Contentment. *International Journal of Academic Research in Accounting, Finance, and Management Sciences*, 4 (4) 290 – 296.
- Nelson, D. L. & Quick, J. C. (2012). *Understanding Organizational Behaviour*, 4th ed. Mason, OH: South-Western/Cengage Learning Press, pp. 150 – 167.
- Nesler, M. S., Quigley, B. M., Aguinis, H., Lee, S. J. & Tedeschi, J. T. (1999). The Development and Validation of a Scale Measuring Social Power based on French and Raven's power taxonomy, *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 29 (4), 750 – 771.
- Podsakoff, P.M. & Schrieshem, C. A. (1985). Field Study of French and Raven's bases of power: Critique, reanalysis, and suggestions for future research. *Psychological Bulletin*, 97 (3), 387 – 411.
- Rahim, M. A. (1988). The development of a leader power inventory. *Multivariate Behavioural Research*, 23 (4), 491 – 502.
- Raven, B. (1990). Political application of the psychology of interpersonal influence and social power. *Political Psychology*, 11 (3) 493 – 520.
- Rahim, M. A (1989). Relationship of leader power to compliance and satisfaction with supervision; Evidence from a national

- sample of managers. *Journal of Management*. 15(4), 545 – 556.
- Rahim, M. A. & Afza, M. (1993). Leader power, commitment, compliance and propensity to leave a job among U. S. accountants. *The Journal of Social Psychology*. 13(5), 611 – 625.
- Shafritz, J. M. & Ott, J. S. (1987). Power and Politics in J. M. Shafritz. & Ott, J. S. (Eds.). *Classics of organizational Theory*. California, the Dorsey Press, pp.304-309.
- Somech, A. & Drach-Zahavy, A. (2002). Relative power and influence strategy: The effect of agent and target power on supervisors' choice of influence strategies: *Journal of Organisational Behaviour*, 23, 167-179
- Sparks, R., Bottons, A., & Hay, W. (1996). *Prison and the problem of order*. Oxford U. K Clarrendom.
- Stichman. A. (2003). *The Sources and impact of correctional officers' power*: Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation.
- Stichman, A. & Gordon, J. (2014) A preliminary investigation of the effect of correctional officers' base of power on their fear and risk on victimization. *Journal of Crime and Justice* Advance online publication doi:10.1080/073548V.2014.929975.
- Stojkovic, S. (1986). Social bases of power and control mechanism among correctional administrators in a prison organization. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 14, 15-166.
- Stojkovic, S. (1984). Social Bases of power and control mechanism among prisoners in a prison organization. *Justice Quarterly*, 1, 511-528.
- Stojkovic, S., Kalimich, D., & Klofas, J. (2007). *Criminal Justice Organization Administration and Management* (4th Ed.). Belmont, C. A: Wadsworth.
- Steiner, B., & Wooldredge, J. (2008). Inmate versus environmental effect on prison rules violation. *Criminal Justice and Behaviour*, 35,438-456
- Steiner, B., Makorios, M., Hester, R. & Travis L. (2012). Examining the link between parole officers' base of power and their exercise of power. *The Prison Journal*, 92 (4), 435-459. doi: 10.11770032885512457546.
- Steiner, B. Wooldrege, J (2018). Prison officer legitimacy, their exercise of power and inmate rule breaking. *Criminology*. 56, 750-779.
- Sykes, G. M., & Messinger, M. L. (1960). The inmates' social system. In Cloward (ed.) *Theoretical studies in social organization of the prison*. New York, NY: Social Science Research Council.
- Symkovych, A. (2019). The Legal and Illegal Use of Force by Prison Officers in Ukraine. *The Prison Journal*, 99(1), 89-111. doi: 10:1177/0032885518814728.
- Toman, E. (2017). Female Incarceration and Prison Social Order: An Examination of Gender Differences in Prison Misconduct and in-prison Punishment. An unpublished Doctoral Thesis.
- Wooldredge, J. & Steiner, B. (2016). The exercise of power in prison organizations and implications for legitimacy. *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*. 106(1): 125-166.
- Yi Meng, Jia He, & Changkun L. (2014) Science Research Group Leader's Power and Members' Compliance and Satisfaction with Supervision. *Research Management Review*, 20, 1–15.