

Examining Correctional Administrator Perceptions of The Prison Rape Elimination Act (PREA)

Dr Creag Dunton is based at Western New England University, Springfield, Massachusetts; Dr Hayden Smith is based at the University of South Carolina, Columbia;¹ and Dr Frank Ferdik is based at Austin Peay State University, Clarksville, Tennessee

In this article we highlight the key themes that emerged following training on preventing sexual violence in prison for high-level administrators in the United States. This included reference to the Prison Rape Elimination Act (PREA), which was designed to prevent, detect, and respond to all acts of sexual harassment and sexual assault occurring within the American correctional system. The findings related to institutional safety have relevancy for both American and UK prisons, particularly due to a lack of research that overlaps both systems.

Introduction

For a significant portion of correctional history, the issue of sexual violence within corrections has been ignored or treated with ridicule.² This has been fuelled by mass media and public perceptions that sexual violence is a consequential risk related to incarceration.^{3,4,5} In the United States, the issue of sexual violence occurring in prison received increased and needed attention following the publication of a 2001 Human Rights Watch report. Based upon accounts from 200 incarcerated persons throughout 37 states in the USA that self-reported victimisation, the report detailed systemic flaws inherent within the American correctional system with regards to accurately identifying and

responding to reports of sexual violence, as well as staff indifference and barriers to reporting.^{6,7} Publication of the report generated public outcry over how the issue of sexual victimisation was being handled by corrections officials, leading the United States Congress in 2003 to unanimously pass the *Prison Rape Elimination Act* (PREA). This article will first discuss the context in which PREA was developed, how it has been implemented, and how the context differs from the United Kingdom. Following that there will be results presented of how prison administration in a Southeastern US prison system perceived the establishment of PREA.

A primary approach of PREA involved education and training initiatives for corrections staff and incarcerated persons.⁸ While the focus of PREA was to establish a zero-tolerance policy for prison rape and sexual violence, there was a concurrent effort to standardise data collection, ensure accountability, and develop measurable outcomes. Administrators of the corrections system, including wardens and other high-ranking officials, play pivotal roles in initiating and enforcing prison regulations. The success or failure of this policy fundamentally rests in the hands of these individuals, and for this reason, increased scholarly attention concerning how they interpret this federal policy becomes all the more warranted.

To date, only two studies, one conducted immediately before the passage of PREA⁹ and one

1. Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Hayden Smith, Department of Criminology & Criminal Justice, 1305 Greene St, Columbia, 29205. Email: Smithhp@mailbox.sc.edu
2. Dumond, R. W. (2003). Confronting America's most ignored crime problem: The Prison Rape Elimination Act of 2003. *Journal of the American Academy of Psychiatry and the Law*, 31(3), 354–360.
3. Smith, B. V., Walton, R. B., Kaneb, J. A., Aiken, J. E., Fellner, J., Nolan, P., Puryear IV, G. A., Struckman-Johnson, C., Chiara, M. M., Trovillion, J., & Dempewolf, J. (2009). *National Prison Rape Elimination Commission Report*.
4. Smith, H. P. (2020). Evaluating the Implementation of the Prison Rape Elimination Act (PREA): A 'Lessons Learned' Approach. *Evaluation & Program Planning*, 83, 1-8.
5. Smith, H. P. (2021). Inmate and Correctional Officer Perceptions of the Prison Rape Elimination Act (PREA): A Thematic Analysis. *Journal of Crime & Justice*, 44, 213-225.
6. Mariner, J. (Ed.). (2001). *No escape: Male rape in U.S. prisons*. Human Rights Watch.
7. See footnote 6
8. Smith, B. V., Walton, R. B., Kaneb, J. A., Aiken, J. E., Fellner, J., Nolan, P., Puryear IV, G. A., Struckman-Johnson, C., Chiara, M. M., Trovillion, J., & Dempewolf, J. (2009). *National Prison Rape Elimination Commission Report*.
9. See footnote 8

several years afterwards,¹⁰ have directly assessed the perspectives of correctional administrators regarding both PREA and the extent of sexual violence occurring within carceral settings. Of the two studies discovered that feature warden impressions of PREA, one was authored by Hensley and colleagues immediately preceding the passage of PREA. Here, it was found that wardens perceived their policies around sexual violence as being notably less effective than direct training of correctional officers, with a mere 6.7 per cent of wardens reporting that they believed their policies to be effective.¹¹ In a study published six years after the passage of PREA, Moster and Jeglic found that wardens were successful in identifying incidents of sexual assault involving physical and coercive contact via hypothetical vignettes, but less so when coercion was vague. In this study, only 29.3 per cent of the participants believed that PREA policies for an institution could be completely effective in the prevention of sexual violence. These wardens routinely favoured increased staff supervision as the most effective means of addressing sexual violence.¹²

To the best of the authors' knowledge, this is the first study to capture administrator views of both PREA itself, and the implementation process as it was being introduced across an entire state-run corrections department. Our results may help guide the formation of policies geared towards creating safer and more inclusive institutional climates.

Prevalence and Consequences of Sexual Victimization Within Corrections

Only within the past few years has the issue of sexual violence within corrections come to the forefront

Only within the past few years has the issue of sexual violence within corrections come to the forefront of public attention.

of public attention, yet this problem has plagued the penal system for quite some time. In a 1960s study that examined the extent of sexual victimisation within Philadelphia jails, it was estimated that 2,000 of the 60,000 (3 per cent) individuals studied were the victims of sexual coercion.¹³ More recent estimates, since codification of PREA, indicate there were 27,826 allegations of sexual violence throughout all forms of US correctional institutions in 2018, an increase of 14 per cent from 2017.¹⁴ Rape and other forms of sexual violence are neither unique nor exclusive to the American correctional system. Reports have been published by various scholars documenting a high prevalence of sexual misconduct within jails, prisons and other custodial settings across the world.^{15 16 17} Even the United Kingdom has witnessed a surge in the number of incarcerated individuals disclosing victimisation experiences.¹⁸ After surveying 408 formerly imprisoned persons in England, 1 per cent of them reported being forced to perform sexual favours for another inmate, while another 4 per cent indicated they were subjected to invasive, inappropriate, and overly aggressive drug searches by corrections staff that fit the description of unlawful sexual contact (based upon the researcher's assessment).¹⁹ A recent Ministry of Justice report uncovered how the number of sexual assaults between inmates that came to the attention of

English and Welsh Prison Service officials rose from 14,511 in 2012 to 16,218 in 2017, representing an 11.7 per cent increase.²⁰

In response, and starting in 2013, HM Inspectorate of Prisons (HMIP) issued, for the first time in the history of England and Wales, a survey of corrections officials

10. Moster, A. N., & Jeglic, E. L. (2009). Prison warden attitudes towards prison rape and sexual assault: Findings since the Prison Rape Elimination Act (PREA). *The Prison Journal*, 89, 65-78.
11. Hensley, C., Dumond, R. W., Tewksbury, R., & Dumond, D. A. (2002). Possible solutions for preventing inmate sexual assault: Examining wardens' beliefs. *American Journal of Criminal Justice*, 27(1), 19-33.
12. Moster, A. N., & Jeglic, E. L. (2009). Prison warden attitudes towards prison rape and sexual assault: Findings since the Prison Rape Elimination Act (PREA). *The Prison Journal*, 89, 65-78.
13. Davis, A. J. (1968). Sexual assaults in the Philadelphia prison system and sheriff's vans. *Trans-action*, 6(2), 8-16.
14. Buehler, E. D. (2021). *Sexual Victimization Reported by Adult Correctional Authorities, 2016-2018* (Special Report NCJ 255356). US Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics.
15. Banbury, S. (2004). Coercive sexual behavior in British prisons as reported by adult ex-prisoners. *The Howard Journal of Crime and Justice*, 2, 1-11.
16. Sondhi, J., Hunks, S., & Smith, H. (2018). *Sexual Assaults Reported in Prisons: Exploratory Findings from Analysis of Incident Descriptions*. Ministry of Justice. URL: https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/737991/sexual-assaults-reported-prisons-exploratoryfindings.
17. Charlie, K. (2018, May 22). 'In the UK, the epidemic of male prisoner rape and lack of support services'. Citizen Truth. <https://citizentruth.org/uk-male-prisoner-rape/>
18. Banbury, S. (2004). Coercive sexual behavior in British prisons as reported by adult ex-prisoners. *The Howard Journal of Crime and Justice*, 2, 1-11.
19. See footnote 18
20. Sondhi, J., Hunks, S., & Smith, H. (2018). *Sexual Assaults Reported in Prisons: Exploratory Findings from Analysis of Incident Descriptions*. Ministry of Justice. URL: https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/737991/sexual-assaults-reported-prisons-exploratoryfindings.

and incarcerated individuals to gather more reliable and accurate figures on the prevalence of sexual victimisation within prisons across England and Wales. Further, Andrew Neilson, assistant director of the Howard League, has claimed that estimates of sexual violence within prisons is surely underestimated: 'The issue of rape in prison is one which barely receives any attention in this country, whereas in the United States it is seen as a part of everyday prison life...No one is claiming that we have that kind of problem in the UK, but the official line that prison rape is almost unheard of here seems highly unlikely.'²¹

Following a thorough scan of the Official UK Legislation Website (<http://legislation.gov.uk>), along with multiple published literature databases, it does not appear that either England and Wales, or the entire UK for that matter, possess a national piece of legislation that is similar to the USA's Prison Rape Elimination Act. While it is referenced as part of overall Prison Instructions and Frameworks, as well as reflected in HMPPS' published Safety in Custody statistics, it has not been singled out in a way similar to the PREA in the USA.²² As explicitly stated by Brown and colleagues, '[m]ale rape literature is limited in the United Kingdom, with little public attention and limited research about prison officers' perceptions.'²³

Current Study

The current study addresses a gap in research that examines perceptions of correctional administrators occurring during the actual implementation of PREA. Directors, wardens, and other administrative stakeholders have a key role in the development and implementation of correctional policy. This study is the first to the authors' knowledge to examine the perceptions of the implementation by key administrators in a US state prison system. Results from this research effort not only add to the limited body of literature on administrator views concerning PREA, but may also hold potential policy implications in terms of guiding efforts to create inclusive and safer institutional environments in the USA and other countries.

The issue of rape in prison is one which barely receives any attention in this country, whereas in the United States it is seen as a part of everyday prison life.

The study site was selected because one of the members of the research team served as the principal evaluator for the state prison system under study. As such, the researcher had significant access to and buy in from practitioners. The researcher served as the principal evaluator for an eight-year period, during which time the PREA was implemented.²⁴

This research details the perceptions regarding PREA training and implementation of 95 staff members of a state-level Department of Corrections prison system. The goal of the training was how to use PREA standards to create a safer working environment, with the training specifically tailored toward agency administrators. Data were collected, via survey, at the end of a two-day-long training event in 2014 led by Just Detention International that was mandatory for key administrators and included experts from the state Department of Juvenile Justice, the National Council on Crime and Delinquency, and the state-level Department of Corrections. For the purposes of this study, these various components will be described collectively as the 'PREA training'.

Sample

The sample included all key administrators for an entire state prison system located in the Southeastern US. This included a total of 103 staff members, including 98 in administrative positions and five executive staff

members. Surveys were completed by 95 participants with all surveys being usable. This represents a response rate of 92.3 per cent. To ensure anonymity and confidentiality of participants, only details of their current position and length of employment were asked for. Participants had a mean of 21.6 years of employment with the Department of Corrections, with a maximum of 48 years and a minimum of one year.

Method and Data Analysis

Following the training, the research team distributed a survey that contained both closed- and open-ended questions designed to assess the PREA

21. Doward, J. (2021, May 1). 'My son was raped in jail-nothing was done'. The Guardian. <https://www.theguardian.com/society/2010/may/02/male-rape-prison-jail-howard-league>
22. Ministry of Justice, Her Majesty's Prison and Probation Service (2020). Managing prisoner safety in custody: PSI 64/2011. <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/managing-prisoner-safety-in-custody-psi-642011>
23. Brown, H. L., Tzani, C., Fumagalli, A., Reynolds, A-L., & Williams, T. (Accepted/In press). Prison Officers' Perceptions of Prisoner Male Rape Victims in England and Wales. *Journal of Police and Criminal Psychology*.
24. Smith, H. P. (2020). Evaluating the implementation of the Prison Rape Elimination Act (PREA): a 'Lessons Learned' approach. *Evaluation & Program Planning*, 83, 1-8.

training (i.e., delivery and content), as well as perceptions of prison administrators about the training materials. All surveys contained a cover letter that underscored study protocols, particularly the research being anonymous and confidential. A convergent parallel mixed-methods approach was employed, utilising a survey of quantitative and open-ended qualitative items. A mixed methods approach is suitable for this study as it allows for analysis of qualitative data to further explore themes that emerge from quantitative analyses.^{25 26 27}

The quantitative questions first addressed the delivery of the training and were based on a modified Likert scale, eliminating the 'neutral' or 'no opinion' option. The open-ended questions centred around three topics: strengths (i.e., opportunities for positive change), challenges (i.e., limitations and barriers), and opportunities for the correctional agency (i.e., current strategies already being used) (see Appendix A: Participant Survey Form). Quantitative data was analysed using SPSS, while ATLAS.ti was utilised for the thematic qualitative analysis.

Findings

Participants endorsed the pace of the training, use of training aids, site arrangements (i.e., room/food), group discussions, preparation and professionalism of trainers, and trainer knowledge at very high levels (i.e., 97 per cent 'agree' or 'strongly agree' with each statement). The variable measuring length of training received 87 per cent 'agree' or 'strongly agree' responses, as some participants found the new information to be intense and would have preferred the training to be spread over a longer period. Additional Likert-scaled questions assessed the content of the training, with participants also responding positively. These sessions were ranked 'very useful' or 'somewhat useful' in the following manner: Talking about Culture Change: Where Are We? (94 per cent); PREA as a Tool for Positive Culture Change (95 per cent); Communicating Effectively and Professionally (95 per cent); Promoting a Safe Environment for LGBTQI Inmates (94 per cent); Warning Signs of Inmate-on-

Inmate Sexual Abuse (85 per cent); and What Would You Do? 3 Scenarios (89 per cent).

Analysis of the qualitative data produced three key themes. These findings are described next, with reference to the participant number associated with quotes.

Leadership, Communication, and New Reporting Procedures

Participants commonly expressed a linkage between PREA and the need for leadership. However, most responses featured the use of the term 'leadership' using a third person narrative. For example, one respondent wrote, *'The challenge is simply that leaders of this organization. This agency must lead by example to make an everlasting impression'* (A. 32). A smaller subset of responses expressed leadership in the first-person as such, *'As a leader, I intend to complete the following PREA tasks by example'* (A. 10). Leadership was also linked to a need for clear and definitive communication that extended throughout the prison system. Participants expressed concern that the implementation of PREA could fail due to a lack of consistency in communication, with great variability between individual prisons.

A related subtheme involved estimates of how changes to the reporting of sexual violence would be received, processed, and shared. As one participant stated, *'there is currently no way of ensuring everyone is reporting the same way and receiving the same information afterwards'* (A. 77). Participants perceived the training materials would support changes to reporting policies: *'the training can assist with simple and clear reporting procedures and to increase the sharing of information amongst staff'* (A. 54). Related to reporting procedures were concerns surrounding future audits of facilities following the implementation of PREA. Participants perceived the means of ensuring compliance as being unclear and placing significant demand on the correctional staff. One participant wrote, *'PREA requires staff time to implement and get audit ready. This is a part-time additional duty'* (A. 33).

Participants perceived the means of ensuring compliance as being unclear and placing significant demand on the correctional staff.

25. Greene, J. C., & Caracelli, V. J. (2003). Making paradigmatic sense of mixed methods practice. In *Handbook of Mixed Methods in Social and Behavioral Research* (pp. 91–110). Sage Publications.
26. Hanson, W. E., Creswell, J. W., Clark, V. L. P., Petska, K. S., & Creswell, J. D. (2005). Mixed methods research designs in counseling psychology. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 52*(2), 224–235.
27. Trahan, A., & Stewart, D. M. (2013). Toward a pragmatic framework for mixed-methods research in criminal justice and criminology. *Applied Psychology in Criminal Justice, 9*(1), 59–74.

Additional points of interest related to standards of practice, as a participant described, *'With standards, PREA provides a focal point and specific goal to improve. This has been needed since the agency no longer does ACA accreditation'* (A. 66).

Dynamics of Abuse and Vulnerable Populations

Positively, participant responses indicated an appreciation for training materials that defined sexual assault. This included the dynamics of abuse, reinforced by discussions of aetiology, manifestation, and responses to sexual violence occurring in corrections. Participants valued the educational materials that clearly defined the identification of sexual assault, and consistency with prescribed responses, as seen here, *'the training assisted in helping standardise methods of responding to prison rape, particularly with the tools and resources provided'* (A. 47). This theme also encompassed appropriate methods for addressing survivors of sexual assault, with one participant writing,

'When confronted with an issue of sexual abuse or any instance of a PREA related subject. I have no idea on what to ask the victim. I know what not to ask, but I'm not sure what I need to ask to get information' (A. 3).

This theme further contained references to materials related to vulnerable populations, particularly incarcerated LGBTQI persons. A number of participants found this topic to be intriguing and recommended additional training because *'more emphasis was needed on LGBTQI inmates'* (A. 2). Others expressed concern in the dissemination of this information to frontline staff, stating, *'the training on LGBTQI was an eye opener. A lot of employees are not going to want to hear it'* (A. 5). Only one negative comment was received, though it was considered noteworthy by the researchers, with a participant arguing that the training should, *'not force feed [sic] the gay mantra down our throats and just treat inmates as people'* (A. 59). It is of course hard to discern if this is truly a marginal perspective, or one held by others but not shared due to issues of social desirability.

Culture Change

The most general theme to emerge centred on the need to change organisational culture. This largely involved a need to *'break the code of silence'* (A. 2), *'get buy-in from all staff'* (A. 64) and acknowledge that *'some employees will be resistant to change or still unwilling to comply with standards'* (A. 43). Culture change featured perceptions of existing bias in other staff, though this reflection was also personalised, as evident here:

'We have to get out of the mindset of 'oh, he killed his children or raped young boys, he deserves to be raped once he gets to prison' — I am included in that mindset. No, it will not happen overnight, but this training is a good start' (A. 5).

The theme of culture change encompassed perceptions that PREA provided an opportunity for enacting systematic improvements for safety.

The theme of culture change encompassed perceptions that PREA provided an opportunity for enacting systematic improvements for safety. This is exemplified by this account:

'The training provides further aid in developing a culture that promotes safety from all people and reinforcing personal accountability at all staff levels; blending traditional security practices into all aspects of prison operations. PREA provides renewed opportunity to refocus on staff and inmate safety and in shaping acceptable organizational attitudes and values' (A. 32).

Discussion and Conclusion

Estimates of the extent of sexual victimisation within correctional institutions indicate that this problem is endemic to many corrections systems.^{28, 29} As a response to this issue, the United States Congress in 2003 unanimously passed the Prison Rape Elimination Act to serve as a comprehensive means by which to eradicate entirely from correctional facilities any and all acts of sexual misconduct. Such a manoeuvre would seem to represent the first of its kind across the globe, at least with respect to the United Kingdom. PREA's

28. Banbury, S. (2004). Coercive sexual behavior in British prisons as reported by adult ex-prisoners. *The Howard Journal of Crime and Justice*, 2, 1-11.

29. Charlie, K. (2018, May 22). 'In the UK, the epidemic of male prisoner rape and lack of support services'. Citizen Truth. <https://citizentruth.org/uk-male-prisoner-rape/>

success is fundamentally driven by whether correctional administrators express support for this policy. To date, only a handful of studies have empirically examined the perceptions and viewpoints regarding PREA held by this professional workgroup.³⁰⁻³¹ Given the influence they wield within correctional confines, studying their judgments becomes all the more important because these are the individuals who shape institutional policy. The findings from our research therefore offer insight into a largely understudied topic, and may be of importance to those correctional officials strategizing ways of preventing sexual violence within their facilities.

Before discussing the implications of this research, it is important to initially highlight some of its methodological shortcomings. To begin, participant reactions to a new policy may carry the risk of social desirability bias.³²⁻³³ Participants had the space to complete the survey privately, though they were in a large room together and the impact of this should be considered.³⁴ The mixed methods approach may minimise these concerns as the open-ended qualitative comments prompted elaboration on the quantitative survey responses. The focus solely on upper level administration employees also reflects the need for future studies to compare multiple perspectives simultaneously, particularly middle administrators, frontline staff, medical/mental health staff, and individuals experiencing incarceration, as all play vital roles in the correctional system. Also of note was the lack of demographic data collected, though this was to ensure confidentiality and anonymity protocols. Considering the influence of demographics on perceptions of PREA may yield important additional findings. Limitations aside, our study still offers several relevant discussion points.

In short, they appreciated the opportunity to increase knowledge on the definition, manifestation, and response to sexual violence.

This study offers insight into understanding PREA training and administrator responses. The high response rate of this study is certainly a strength at 92.3 per cent and is unique in that it featured the entire upper administration of a state prison system, constituting a population-based survey. Participants had long-term tenure in prison settings, significant experience as administrators, and were responsible for interpreting, modifying, and applying policy. Also, the delivery and content of the training was perceived as valuable, relevant, and pragmatic.

Administrators were optimistic and responded positively to definitional approaches to sexual assault. In short, they appreciated the opportunity to increase knowledge on the definition, manifestation, and response to sexual violence. This included a focus on vulnerable groups, including LGBTQI persons. This supports previous research findings that suggest PREA serves as a conduit to institutional safety for staff and the incarcerated.³⁵⁻³⁶ This increased institutional safety, reinforced by expanded knowledge regarding sexual violence, may lead to a cultural shift that can positively impact institutions.³⁷⁻³⁸ The role of culture emerged as a broad concept related to the implementation of PREA. In a previous qualitative study in six prisons, correctional staff were found to often view PREA as an administrative, safety, and cultural burden. Male correctional staff in the study believed that PREA produce inequality where female staff would 'get in the way, take their jobs/positions, and/or hurt them occupationally' (p. 255).³⁹ This misalignment of institutional logics suggests that administrators may utilise the term 'cultural change' to reflect concern that

30. Hensley, C., Dumond, R. W., Tewksbury, R., & Dumond, D. A. (2002). Possible solutions for preventing inmate sexual assault: Examining wardens' beliefs. *American Journal of Criminal Justice*, 27(1), 19–33.
31. Moster, A. N., & Jeglic, E. L. (2009). Prison warden attitudes towards prison rape and sexual assault: Findings since the Prison Rape Elimination Act (PREA). *The Prison Journal*, 89, 65–78.
32. Fowler, F. J. (1995). *Improving survey questions: Design and evaluation*. Sage Publications.
33. Krumpal, I. (2013). Determinants of social desirability bias in sensitive surveys: A literature review. *Quality & Quantity*, 47(4), 2025–2047.
34. Stocké, V. (2007). The interdependence of determinants for the strength and direction of social desirability bias in racial attitude surveys. *Journal of Official Statistics*, 23(4), 493–514.
35. Smith, H. P. (2020). Evaluating the Implementation of the Prison Rape Elimination Act (PREA): A 'Lessons Learned' Approach. *Evaluation & Program Planning*, 83, 1–8.
36. Smith, H. P. (2021). Inmate and Correctional Officer Perceptions of the Prison Rape Elimination Act (PREA): A Thematic Analysis. *Journal of Crime & Justice*, 44, 213–225.
37. Hensley, C., Dumond, R. W., Tewksbury, R., & Dumond, D. A. (2002). Possible solutions for preventing inmate sexual assault: Examining wardens' beliefs. *American Journal of Criminal Justice*, 27(1), 19–33.
38. Moster, A. N., & Jeglic, E. L. (2009). Prison warden attitudes towards prison rape and sexual assault: Findings since the Prison Rape Elimination Act (PREA). *The Prison Journal*, 89, 65–78.
39. Rudes, D. S., Magnuson, S., Portillo, S., & Hattery, A. (2020). Sex logics: Negotiating the prison rape elimination act (PREA) against its' administrative, safety, and cultural burdens. *Punishment & Society*, 23(2), 241–259.

the implementation of PREA could impact the daily activities and function of frontline staff. As such, PREA training would benefit from group interactions where more specific concerns are shared between different staff groups.

One unexpected finding was the consistent use of the term 'leadership' using third-person terminology. The paradox of leaders distancing themselves from the role of leadership requires further research, and it appears the term was used as a code word to describe a multitude of concepts such as specific to role expectations or job descriptions that may not accurately reflect how they approach their roles. For practical purposes, future PREA-based training may benefit from sessions that explicate the role, function, and duties of prison administrators. The potential for PREA-reporting procedures to be changed also raised questions from administrators, with these participants seeking

reassurances of standardisation, consistency, and fairness in policy.

While more work is needed, the current study demonstrates that the perceptions of prison administrators are a valued, though under researched, component of the implementation of policy. The current study is the first to assess administrator perceptions during PREA implementation with findings providing theoretical and practical insights. Future work would benefit from collaborative research partnerships between the USA and prison services in other countries (including England and Wales) to identify overlapping themes. While there are certainly differences in the demographics of staff and incarcerated persons by geographical location (as well as staff structures, types of prison facilities, available resources, etc.), there is enormous potential in finding generalisable themes that can fuel effective policies to reduce sexual violence occurring in prison worldwide.

Appendix A: Participant Feedback Form
Using the PREA Standards to Create a Safer [Redacted]: A Workshop for Agency Administrators
 Please take a few minutes to complete this participant feedback form.

Section I of IV. This section asks about your current job.

What is your current job title(s) (e.g., Warden, PREA coordinator, etc.)?

How long have you been employed by SCDC?

Section II of IV. This section asks about the delivery of the training.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Length of the training was just right	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Pace of the training was just right	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Training aids (Powerpoint) were valuable	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Site arrangements (room/food) were satisfactory	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Group discussion segments were valuable	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Trainers were open to feedback/questions	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Trainers were professional and prepared	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Trainers were knowledgeable	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Section III of IV. This section asks about the content of the training. Please rate the following sections in terms of usefulness for your job.

	Very Useful	Somewhat Useful	Not Very Useful	Not at All Useful
Talking About Culture Change: Where Are We?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
PREA as a Tool for Positive Culture Change	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Communicating Effectively and Professionally	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Promoting a Safe Environment for LGBTI Inmates	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Exercise: Yellow Light, Red Light	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
What Would You Do? 3 Scenarios	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Section IV of IV. This section asks about your perceptions of today's training and the future of PREA-related efforts at [redacted].

- a). Strengths: After receiving this training, how do you think SCDC can use the PREA standards to strengthen the agency? What opportunities for positive change do you see with PREA?**

Explain:

- b). Challenges: After receiving this training, what do you think are some of the limitations or challenges facing the implementation of the PREA standards? How could the training be improved upon?**

Explain:

- c). Opportunities: Can you briefly describe any PREA related activities that have worked well at your facility?**

Explain:

**If you have any questions about this participant feedback form, please contact:
[Redacted]**