

# UNIVERSITY OF CINCINNATI

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

I, \_\_\_\_\_,  
hereby submit this work as part of the requirements for the degree of:

\_\_\_\_\_

in:

\_\_\_\_\_

It is entitled:

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

**This work and its defense approved by:**

**Chair:** \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

**THE CORRECTIONAL ORIENTATION OF “CHILD SAVERS”:  
THE LEVEL, SOURCES, AND IMPACT OF SUPPORT FOR  
REHABILITATION AMONG JUVENILE CORRECTIONAL WORKERS**

A Dissertation Submitted to the:

Division of Research and Advanced Studies  
Of the University of Cincinnati

In Partial Fulfillment of the  
Requirements for the Degree of

Doctorate of Philosophy (Ph.D.)

In the Division of Criminal Justice  
Of the College of Education, Criminal Justice, and Human Services

2004

by

Kristie R. Blevins, M.A.

B.S., East Tennessee State University, 1997  
M.A., East Tennessee State University, 2000

Dissertation Committee: Francis T. Cullen, Ph.D. (Chair)  
James Frank, Ph.D.  
Edward J. Latessa, Ph.D.  
Jody L. Sundt, Ph.D.

## **ABSTRACT**

Prior to the 1970s, criminologists studying correctional issues focused almost exclusively on offenders. However, beginning in the late 1970s, there was a series of studies investigating those who work in the field of corrections. This research has explored how correctional workers view and react to their jobs, especially in terms of correctional orientation, work stress, and job satisfaction. However, the literature on correctional workers is still lacking in one important area. Specifically, the vast majority of research on correctional workers has been conducted in adult facilities; by contrast, assessments of those working in juvenile facilities are limited. Based on previous literature of correctional workers, this dissertation was an exploratory study to examine the levels, sources, and potential impact of the correctional orientations among a sample of juvenile correctional workers.

Using a secondary dataset comprised of self-report surveys from 195 juvenile correctional workers across the state of Ohio, the results revealed that the correctional orientations of these workers are complex. Similar to findings from samples of individuals working in adult facilities, these workers supported both rehabilitative and custodial sentiments. However, support for rehabilitation was secondary to custodial concerns. Considering the underlying rehabilitative mission of the American juvenile justice system, the higher levels of support for custodial statements were unexpected. Further, examinations of the possible sources of these orientations indicated that there was a large degree of consensus regarding rehabilitation. Support for custody, however, varied primarily by individual characteristics.

The potential influence of correctional orientation on work stress, job satisfaction, and use of physical force was also investigated. Overall, these workers had moderate amounts of both job stress and satisfaction. These levels were similar to those observed in other samples of correctional workers, and they varied by both work-related variables and individual characteristics. However, efforts to identify sources of physical force based on the sample's individual attributes and work-related experiences were less successful. Neither correctional orientation was significantly related to any of the work reactions examined. The implications of these findings and suggestions for future research are discussed.



## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

There are a number of people I wish to acknowledge for helping me, not only with this dissertation, but throughout my tenure as a graduate student. First, I would like to thank my entire dissertation committee, Dr. Francis T. Cullen, Dr. James Frank, Dr. Edward J. Latessa, and Dr. Jody L. Sundt, for their insightful comments and suggestions for improving my research. Thank you all so much for the time you spent helping me and for getting things back to me so quickly! I am grateful to each of you for helping me through the dissertation process. I could not have asked for a better committee.

I would also like to thank Dr. Stephen T. Holmes for taking the time to answer my questions about the dataset. Special thanks also go out to Dr. Mitchell B. Chamlin and Dr. John T. Wooldredge for helping me with methodological and statistical issues. I really appreciate your assistance.

To Dr. Cullen, also known as “Daddy C.,” I am so fortunate to have you as a mentor. You have taught me so much. Thank you for sharing your vast knowledge in the fields of corrections and criminology and for teaching me about publishing, job searches, and academic life in general. I am also grateful that you have given me so many opportunities. I have learned so much working on both research and in distance learning. Thank you for having faith in me, despite my quirks, neuroticism, and my obstinate goal of getting home to the farm.

My overall experiences at the University of Cincinnati have been invaluable. I want to express my gratitude to the faculty and staff in the Division of Criminal Justice. John Schwartz and Janice Miller, thank you so much for helping me with the administrative issues.

To Jennifer Pealer, my comrade, I am so glad we went through this experience together. The days have been long but the years have been short. Thank you for everything, from studying for comps and listening to my problems to showing me around the area and taking me to Friday's. I look forward to our continued friendship, as well as coauthorship.

Last, but certainly not least, I want to thank my family and the rest of my Southern support group. To my parents, Sharon and Luke Blevins, words cannot express how grateful I am to you. You have supported me in every possible way, believing in my ability even when I had doubts. Thank you for everything, from packing the U-Haul to "ringing that bell" for me. I could not have made it through this process without you. To Chris, Faye, Kay and the rest of the gang, thanks for all of your encouragement. Your confidence in me helped me to stick it out, even when I wanted to duck my tail and head to the house. Thank you all!

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1: ASSESSING JUVENILE CORRECTIONAL WORKERS' ORIENTATION TO THEIR WORK .....	6
WHY CORRECTIONAL WORKERS WOULD SUPPORT REHABILITATION .....	10
The Traditional Purpose of the Juvenile Court and Corrections .....	11
Studies of Correctional Workers .....	16
Studies of the General Public .....	19
WHY CORRECTIONAL WORKERS WOULD BE CUSTODIAL/PUNITIVE .....	23
The Changing Nature of the Juvenile Court and Corrections .....	23
Studies of Correctional Workers .....	28
Studies of the General Public .....	29
SOURCES OF CORRECTIONAL ORIENTATION .....	32
The Individual Experiences/Importation Model .....	33
The Work Role/Prisonization Model .....	36
THE IMPACT OF CORRECTIONAL ORIENTATION .....	40
The Influence of Correctional Orientation on Feelings of Work Stress .....	40
Individual Characteristics and Work Stress .....	41
Work-Related Variables and Work Stress .....	42
Correctional-Officer Attitudes and Orientations and Job Stress .....	43
The Influence of Correctional Orientation on Job Satisfaction: Individual Characteristics .....	44

The Influence of Correctional Orientation on Job Satisfaction: Work-Related Variables .....	45
Correctional Worker Attitudes and Orientations and Job Satisfaction .....	46
The Influence of Correctional Orientation on Use of Force .....	47
RESEARCH STRATEGY .....	50
CHAPTER 2:    METHODS .....	52
SAMPLE .....	52
INDEPENDENT VARIABLES .....	55
Individual Characteristics .....	55
Work-Related Variables .....	57
DEPENDENT VARIABLES .....	61
Correctional Orientation .....	61
Work Stress .....	63
Job Satisfaction .....	64
Use of Physical Force .....	65
STATISTICAL TECHNIQUES .....	65
LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY .....	66
CONCLUDING REMARKS .....	67
CHAPTER 3:    RESULTS .....	68
WORK-RELATED EXPERIENCES .....	68
LEVELS OF SUPPORT FOR REHABILITATION AND CUSTODY .....	73
Support for Rehabilitation .....	73

Support for Custody .....	79
DATA CONSIDERATIONS FOR MULTIVARIATE ANALYSES .....	83
SOURCES OF CORRECTIONAL ORIENTATION .....	88
Sources of Support for Rehabilitation .....	88
Sources of Support for Custody .....	90
THE IMPACT OF CORRECTIONAL ORIENTATON .....	94
Correctional Orientation and Work Stress .....	94
Correctional Orientation and Job Satisfaction .....	98
Correctional Orientation and Use of Physical Force .....	102
CHAPTER 4:    DISCUSSION .....	104
SUPPORT FOR REHABILITATION AND CUSTODY .....	104
SOURCES OF CORRECTIONAL ORIENTATION: THE IMPORTATION VERSUS PRISONIZATION DEBATE .....	109
Sources of Support for Rehabilitation .....	110
Sources of Support for Custody .....	111
WORK REACTIONS: THE INFLUENCE OF INDIVIDUAL CHARACTERISTICS, WORK-RELATED VARIABLES, AND CORRECTIONAL ORIENTATION .....	113
Work Stress .....	114
Job Satisfaction .....	116
Use of Physical Force .....	119
IMPLICATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH .....	121
REFERENCES .....	125

## LIST OF TABLES

Table 2.1	Sample Characteristics .....	54
Table 2.2	Reliability Coefficients for Multiple-Item Additive Indexes .....	59
Table 3.1	Items Composing Dangerousness Scale, Percentages Reported .....	70
Table 3.2	Items Composing Supervisory Support Scale, Percentages Reported .....	71
Table 3.3	Items Composing Role Conflict Scale, Percentages Reported .....	72
Table 3.4	Main Purpose of Prisons .....	74
Table 3.5	Juvenile Correctional Worker Support for Rehabilitation, Percentages Reported .....	76
Table 3.6	Juvenile Correctional Worker Support for Custody, Percentages Reported .....	80
Table 3.7	Support for Rehabilitation as a Goal of Corrections Among Respondents Who Support Custody .....	82
Table 3.8	Pearson Correlation Matrix for All Variables .....	85
Table 3.9	Rehabilitative Orientation Regressed on Individual Characteristics and Work-Related Variables .....	89
Table 3.10	Custodial Orientation Regressed on Individual Characteristics and Work-Related Variables .....	91
Table 3.11	Custodial Orientation Regressed on Individual Characteristics and Work-Related Variables, Interaction Term Included .....	93
Table 3.12	Items Composing Work Stress Scale, Percentages Reported .....	95
Table 3.13	Work Stress Regressed on Individual Characteristics, Work-Related Variables, and Correctional Orientation .....	97
Table 3.14	Items Composing Job Satisfaction Scale, Percentages Reported .....	99
Table 3.15	Job Satisfaction Regressed on Individual Characteristics, Work-Related Variables, and Correctional Orientation .....	100

Table 3.16 Use of Physical Force Regressed on Individual Characteristics, Work-Related Variables, and Correctional Orientation .....	103
Table 4.1 Selected Job Satisfaction Items for Detention Workers Compared to Correctional Officers in an Adult System, Prison Wardens, and a National Sample of Employed Adults, Percentages Reported .....	118

### **LIST OF FIGURES**

Figure 4.1 Suggested Model for Predicting Use of Physical Force by Juvenile Correctional Workers .....	122
---	-----

## CHAPTER 1

### ASSESSING JUVENILE CORRECTIONAL WORKERS' ORIENTATION TO THEIR WORK

Traditionally, criminologists studying correctional issues focused almost exclusively on offenders (e.g., Clemmer, 1940; Sykes, 1958). However, beginning in the late 1970s, there was a series of studies investigating those who work in the field of corrections. This research has explored how correctional workers view and react to their jobs, especially in terms of work stress, job satisfaction, and correctional orientation (e.g., Arthur, 1994; Britton, 1997; Cullen, Golden, and Cullen, 1983; Cullen, Latessa, Burton, and Lombardo, 1993; Cullen, Lutze, Link, and Wolfe, 1989; Louis Harris and Associates, 1968; Jacobs, 1978; Jacobs and Kraft, 1978; Jurik, 1985b; Poole and Pogrebin, 1988; Poole and Regoli, 1980a; Sundt and Cullen, 2002; Toch and Klofas, 1982; Van Voorhis, Cullen, Link, and Wolfe, 1991; Whitehead and Lindquist, 1989, 1992). While it is important to study the keepers as well as the kept, the literature on correctional workers is still lacking in one important area. The vast majority of research on correctional facilities has been conducted in adult facilities; by contrast, assessments of those working in juvenile facilities are limited.

The limited number of investigations into those working in juvenile corrections is significant given the number of juveniles held in detention. Juvenile detention facilities are used to hold juveniles under the jurisdiction of the juvenile court. While a small percentage of juveniles in detention are being held for status offenses or before they have been in front of the judge, the vast majority are held as a result of having been adjudicated delinquent (Bilchik, 1997). Flores (2003) reported that approximately

320,000 juveniles were sentenced to detention in 1999 alone. Additionally, there were about 110,000 juveniles held within 3,700 detention facilities nationwide on one day in 1999 (Sickmund and Wan, 2002).<sup>1</sup> Given the fact that close to half a million juveniles are subject to time in detention each year, it is important to explore the level and sources of correctional orientations and work reactions among those working with these youths.

To understand attitudes and job reactions for correctional workers in juvenile or adult facilities, it is important to realize that these employees generally serve in multiple roles. For example, they are responsible for maintaining custody of the offender population and ensuring safety for themselves and others; many are also involved in treatment efforts. Even if their primary role is custodial, correctional workers are often called upon to deliver human services because of limited staff (Johnson and Price, 1981; Lombardo, 1985). These dual roles may especially be problematic for those working in juvenile facilities because they may be obligated to provide extra services to youths – services that are more extensive than those administered in adult facilities – because of the underlying rehabilitative mission of juvenile justice (Dembo and Dertke, 1986; Poole and Pogrebin, 1988).

When correctional workers are faced with such conflicting roles, Rothman (1980) argues that the “convenience” of custodial goals will take precedence over rehabilitative efforts. Research has shown, however, that correctional officers and administrators in adult facilities do not embrace a purely custodial orientation. In fact, correctional workers often sustain both custodial and rehabilitative views (Arthur, 1994; Cullen et al., 1989, 1993; Louis Harris and Associates, 1968; Jacobs, 1978; Jacobs and Kraft, 1978;

---

<sup>1</sup> Juvenile detention sentences are often short, so a census of facilities on only one day is not an accurate estimate of the total number of juveniles detained throughout the year.

Sundt and Cullen, 2002; Toch and Klofas, 1982; Van Voorhis et al., 1991; Whitehead and Lindquist, 1989, 1992).

Understanding the correctional orientation of correctional workers is important because their attitudes may influence their ability to provide certain human services that are a part of the job, especially in juvenile facilities. Generally, prison programs, whether for adults or juveniles, are unlikely to be effective if staff members do not endorse their objectives (Gordon, 1999; Lariviere, 2001). Further, studies have shown that correctional workers' attitudes and orientations do affect their job performance and reactions to their work (Cullen, Link, Wolfe, and Frank, 1985; Jurik and Halemba, 1984; Poole and Pogrebin, 1988; Poole and Regoli, 1980a; Toch and Klofas, 1982). Additionally, researchers examining conditions of juvenile detention facilities have discussed the prevalence and possibility of physical and psychological abuse to detained youths (Feld, 1977; Liou, 1995; Lotz, Poole, and Regoli, 1985). In turn, the level and sources of correctional orientation of correctional workers may directly – or indirectly through job reactions – affect the amount of harm youths are subject to while in confinement. This information will also help to guide policymakers and correctional managers in improving and implementing policies.

In this context, this dissertation attempts to explore these issues through a secondary analysis of a dataset constructed from surveys of a sample of juvenile correctional workers across the state of Ohio. With over 4,500 juveniles in residential facilities in 1999, Ohio had the fifth highest number of detained juveniles in the United States (Sickmund and Wan, 2002). Fortunately, the dataset contains multiple outcomes, which allow for investigations into the level, determinants, and possible impacts of a

rehabilitative versus a custodial orientation to juvenile correctional work. Specifically, this project examines the effects of correctional orientation on work stress, job satisfaction, and use of force.

This study is potentially of significance because it will add to the literature on correctional workers within a juvenile system. The rehabilitative purpose of the juvenile system may lead to an expectation of higher levels of support for rehabilitation among those working in within it. It is important to realize, however, that the nature of the juvenile system has changed in recent years, making it more comparable to the adult system (Feld, 1993, 1998, 1999; Merlo, 2000). Therefore, it is possible that these juvenile correctional workers might have the same, or even more, custodial concerns than those working in the adult system. The current study should provide insight into these issues.

This chapter is divided into five major sections. The first section discusses why correctional workers would likely support rehabilitation. This section examines the traditional purpose of the juvenile court and corrections and reviews studies that reveal high levels of support for rehabilitation among both correctional workers and the general public.

The second section attempts to explain why correctional workers might be custodial or punitive in their job orientations. This section begins by describing the changing nature of the juvenile court and corrections. A discussion then follows of the research on correctional workers and the general public that indicates high levels of punitive and custodial concerns.

The third section explores the influences on correctional orientation. Two competing models of factors that may affect correctional orientation are discerned: the importation/individual experiences model and the work role/prisonization model. I end this section with a review of research on sources of correctional orientation.

The fourth section presents evidence that correctional orientation might affect job reactions among this sample of juvenile correctional workers. Particularly, there is reason to believe that correctional orientation might influence work stress, job satisfaction, and use of physical force. The section also contains with a review of relevant influences of these three job reactions.

The last section of this chapter is a discussion of the research strategy for this dissertation. It contains a brief description of the sample and measures for the study. The chapter ends with a list of research questions guiding the analysis.

## **WHY CORRECTIONAL WORKERS WOULD SUPPORT REHABILITATION**

The juvenile justice system in the United States was founded on the notion that juveniles are not as responsible for their actions as adults. Consequently, the primary focus of the original juvenile system was to rehabilitate, not punish, juvenile offenders (Cullen and Wright, 2002). Therefore, there is somewhat of an expectation that those working within the juvenile system would support rehabilitation as a goal of juvenile corrections. This section contains an explanation of the traditional purpose of the juvenile system, followed by a discussion of previous research that reports high levels of support for rehabilitation among correctional workers and the general public.

## **The Traditional Purpose of the Juvenile Court and Corrections**

Prior to the late 1800s, there was no distinction between adult and juvenile offenders in the justice system. Juveniles were treated as if they were adults. Therefore, they could receive the same sanctions for breaking the law, including long periods of incarceration in state prisons and even capital punishment (Empey, 1978). During this time, the common belief was that offenders, regardless of age, were somehow inherently deviant, and society must be protected from such individuals. Rehabilitating an individual was not an option. However, as the social context of the time started changing during the early 1800s, transformations within the justice system also began to emerge.

The growth of industrialization in American cities during the early 1800s rapidly attracted families from surrounding areas and immigrants from other countries. Consequently, inner cities became crowded, and there was an abundance of poverty. Many citizens believed the poor were threatening and in need of some type of help, and some of the more elite citizens began to realize that behavior might be influenced by the conditions surrounding the individual (Bernard, 1992). That is, poverty-stricken juveniles were no longer considered to be inherently deviant. In fact, they were considered amenable to change. Some citizens began to spread the idea that juveniles could become productive members of society with the right training. As a result, institutions were established to educate and train such “unproductive” juveniles in a more positive environment (Rothman, 1971). These institutions were known as houses of refuge. The first one was completed in 1825 in New York City, followed shortly by similar institutions in Boston and Philadelphia.

The goals of houses of refuge were to provide juveniles with (1) education, (2) vocational training, (3) religious values, and (4) discipline under a military-type structure (Pisciotta, 1983). Houses of refuge also offered an alternative to sentencing juvenile offenders to adult jails and prisons, where they had often been subject to poor influences and abuse from adult criminals (Krisberg and Austin, 1978). Additionally, they offered a sort of indeterminate sentence because some juveniles required longer periods of training than others. Ideally, juveniles were only to be held until they became productive members of society.

Houses of refuge quickly developed problems of their own. They became crowded because they were eventually opened not only to juvenile offenders but also to poor juveniles who were considered to be “in need of supervision,” though they had not violated the law. They also began to manage poverty-stricken adults and adult offenders. Therefore, houses of refuge became more like other state workhouses and institutions that housed both adult and juvenile offenders. Additionally, a lack of proper management within the houses resulted in juveniles being taken advantage of, abused, and incarcerated longer than they should have been (Pisciotta, 1982).

In response to the breakdown of the houses of refuge, cottage reformatories for juveniles were created in the mid-1800s. The cottage-style setup would ideally mirror a family, with adults acting as stand-in parents to properly train the juveniles. Like the houses of refuge, objectives of cottage reformatories included education, vocational training, religion, and discipline. They were often located in rural areas, so that the residents primarily would receive vocational training in outdoor and farm labor. Still, these cottage reformatories soon faced the same obstacles as houses of refuge. They

began to house poor non-offenders and some adults, and the focus moved from training to confinement as the reformatories became crowded (Pisciotta, 1982).

While both houses of refuge and cottage reformatories offered an alternative when detaining juveniles, youths were still subject to the same justice system as adults. That is, they went through the same courts and were awarded the same rights as adults. In the late 1800s, however, Progressives began to argue that juveniles, as compared to adults, were less accountable for their behavior and more likely to be redeemed through proper training (Cullen, Golden, and Cullen, 1983; Rothman, 1980). As early as the 1870s, some states began to provide separate dockets and hearings for juveniles, though they were still processed with adults in a single justice system (Platt, 1977; Ryerson, 1978).

Around the time the “new penology” was created at the 1870 meeting of the National Congress on Penitentiary and Reformatory Discipline held in Cincinnati, the Progressives proposed that there should be a completely separate system for juveniles in each state. The leaders of this movement, often referred to as “child savers,” were mostly elite upper-class women. They thought everyone should have a chance at middle-class life, and they worked toward reforms in the justice system and other aspects of societal life for poverty-stricken families. Among their priorities was “saving” juveniles, so they made a strong argument for creating a system specifically tailored for juveniles and for instituting other reforms such as child labor laws (Platt, 1995).

Adhering to the principles of the “new criminology” that guided reforms for the adult justice system, the Progressives realized that ecological and social factors influenced the behavior of juveniles (Bernard, 1992; Rothman, 1980; Ryerson, 1978). Specifically, the child savers maintained that juveniles were affected by conditions around them. Further,

they were not as accountable for their actions, and thus they should not be treated in the same manner as adult offenders. Rather, there should be a separate justice system for juveniles, with the stated goal of rehabilitating, not punishing, them because they were seen as the most promising prospects for treatment (Cullen, Golden, and Cullen, 1983). Realizing that causes of crime varied among individuals, Progressives recognized that the circumstances surrounding a particular juvenile offender should be identified and considered before deciding what actions to take. Therefore, the Progressive model called for decisions to be made based on the characteristics of the particular individual, not the crime (Wines, 1871).

Additionally, Progressives argued that the state should not act as an opponent against juveniles. Instead, states should adopt a legal doctrine of *parens patriae*, in which the state and those in the system act as parents to wayward youths. As a “parent,” the state would be trusted to act in the best interest of each juvenile.

Still, the *parens patriae* doctrine brought with it some new issues. For example, since the state would act in a parental role toward juveniles, they did not warrant the same protection they were granted when the state took an adversarial position. Therefore, juveniles were not allowed any legal rights. Additionally, the parental function of the state still allowed it to bring into the system juveniles in need of assistance or supervision, even if they had not broken the law. For instance, children with parents that did not properly care for or supervise them could be brought into the system under the guise of preventing them from becoming criminal. Moreover, “status offenses” would fall under authority of the juvenile system. These status offenses are those that only apply

to juveniles, such as curfew violations, drinking under age, and truancy (Cullen, Golden, and Cullen, 1983; Cullen and Wright, 2002; Empey, 1978).

Officials in the juvenile system were to have wide discretion with youths under their jurisdiction, and there were several options available when dealing with juveniles.

Youthful offenders could be diverted from the system, sentenced to community supervision, or incarcerated. Additionally, when juveniles were sentenced to a reformatory, they were not to be given determinate sentences. Instead, they were given indeterminate sentences in that they were to be held until they were reformed or until they reached legal adulthood (Cullen and Wright, 2002; Rothman, 1978, 1980).

The first separate juvenile court was established in Cook County, Illinois in 1899, and almost all states had some type of juvenile system within the next 20 years. By 1945, every state had implemented separate juvenile justice systems (Platt, 1969; Rothman, 1980). The main goal of each of these systems was to get involved and “save” juveniles from becoming adult criminals while also protecting the community. That is, the cause of delinquency was to be detected and treated. There was a strong focus on early intervention and rehabilitation, and individual treatment was an integral element of the juvenile court (Cullen, Golden, and Cullen, 1983; Cullen and Wright, 2002; Empey, 1978).

While there have been changes in the juvenile justice system since its inception over 100 years ago (these changes will be discussed later in this chapter), the original goals of the system are likely to be enduring. That is, one would expect to find a high level of support for rehabilitation for juvenile offenders. Prior research supports this expectation. Specifically, there is a high level of support for rehabilitation, especially for juveniles,

among the general public and correctional workers alike. The following two sections are reviews of these studies.

### **Studies of Correctional Workers**

There seems to be a consensus that correctional workers hold extremely punitive orientations. One possible explanation for this idea stems from findings that indicate individual correctional workers who favor rehabilitation often erroneously believe that coworkers hold purely custodial views. Therefore, they may reject rehabilitative concerns in the presence of others so they will not be ostracized by their coworkers (Cullen et al., 1989; Johnson, 1987; Kaufman, 1981; Toch and Klofas, 1982). In spite of the attitudes correctional workers may present in front of coworkers, survey research reveals that there is a high level of support for rehabilitation. Results of such empirical investigations are discussed below.<sup>2</sup>

In an early study of correctional workers, Louis Harris and Associates (1968) surveyed administrators in adult correctional facilities. When asked about the most emphasized correctional goal of their institution, most of the sample identified rehabilitation, followed by protecting society, and then punishment. Additionally, almost all administrators cited that rehabilitation should be a primary or secondary goal of corrections. Although the field of corrections has shifted in a much more punitive direction since the time of this study, more recent studies show there is still support for rehabilitation among correctional workers and administrators.

For example, Jacobs (1978) surveyed correctional officers in Illinois. When asked about the main reason for putting someone in prison, 46 percent of the respondents

---

<sup>2</sup> Although several studies have investigated the sources of correctional orientations among correctional workers, most do not report the actual levels of support for rehabilitation or custody.

believed it is to rehabilitate the offender. Additionally, 60 percent of the officers disagreed that rehabilitation is a waste of time and money.

In another Illinois study, Cullen, Golden, and Cullen (1983) explored levels of support for juvenile rehabilitation among both correctional officers and administrators. When asked about the effectiveness of rehabilitation for adults and juveniles, twice as many guards indicated that it does not work for adults as compared with juveniles. Additionally, more than half of the correctional administrators believed that rehabilitation, not punishment, is the best way to stop juvenile crime. Moreover, a full 100 percent of the administrators and 67.7 percent of the guards said that it is irresponsible to stop trying to rehabilitate juveniles.

Further, in a sample of correctional officers in a southern correctional facility, only 10.3 percent indicated that rehabilitation is the main reason for putting someone in prison (Cullen et al., 1989). However, when asked about rehabilitative issues in more detail, responses showed higher levels of support. Data revealed, for example, that the correctional officers saw themselves as more than guards and believed that prisons should not operate as warehouses for inmates. Additionally, the majority of the sample disagreed that hard time is the best strategy for making inmates go straight, and over 80 percent disagreed that they cared only if inmates stayed quiet and not if they were rehabilitated. Over half of the officers also disagreed that rehabilitation programs allow offenders to get off easily. Finally, 70 percent agreed that treating inmates is as important as punishing them, and over 60 percent disagreed that punishment is an effective way to reduce crime.

In a national sample of prison wardens, Cullen et al. (1993) found that wardens considered rehabilitation as an important function at their institutions, though it was secondary to custody and prison order. Specifically, wardens favored the delivery of human services and agreed that treatment is important in their facilities. They also favored the expansion of vocational, education, and counseling programs for inmates, and the majority rejected proposals of eliminating parole, good time, and indeterminate sentencing.

There is also a high level of support for rehabilitation among prison chaplains. While only 19.4 percent of a national sample of chaplains thought the main purpose of prisons is to rehabilitate offenders, 85 percent agreed that treating inmates is as important as punishing them. Additionally, 90 percent were in favor of expanding treatment programs, and 80 percent of chaplains agreed that rehabilitation is the most effective way to cure the crime problem. Further, 94 percent of chaplains disagreed that punishment is the only way to reduce crime (Sundt and Cullen, 2002).

In short, although correctional workers believe that preserving order is a central attribute of their jobs, they recognize the human services aspect of their jobs. They also see prisons as places where offenders may be rehabilitated, and they support rehabilitation and treatment programs for inmates, especially for juveniles (Cullen et al., 1989, 1993; Cullen, Gilbert, and Cullen, 1983; Cullen, Golden, and Cullen, 1983; Louis Harris and Associates, 1968; Jacobs, 1978; Johnson, 1987; Sundt and Cullen, 2002; Toch and Klofas, 1982). The enduring support of rehabilitation by correctional workers is comparable to attitudes of the general public. As discussed in the next section, the general public also harbors strong support for rehabilitation.

## **Studies of the General Public**

Measuring the public's support for correctional philosophies is important because legislative correctional policies are potentially influenced by what the public favors. Even though citizens have become more punitive since the 1960s, they tend to be reluctant to discard rehabilitation as a principal goal of corrections. Further, research exploring the correctional orientations of the general public is likely to lend credence to studies of correctional worker ideology. Specifically, correctional workers are, in fact, members of the general public. As such, they are likely to bring their attitudes into the workplace. This section reviews research showing that the public does not reject offender treatment. In fact, they continue to view it as an important goal of the correctional system, particularly for juveniles (Cullen, Cullen, and Wozniak, 1988; Cullen, Fisher, and Applegate, 2000; Cullen, Golden, and Cullen, 1983; Cullen and Moon, 2002; Cullen, Skovron, Scott, and Burton, 1990; Flanagan, 1996; Sundt, Cullen, Applegate, and Turner, 1998; Warr and Stafford, 1984).

Several recent national surveys show that Americans embrace strong rehabilitative sentiments, especially for young offenders. For example, almost half of respondents in a national sample chose rehabilitation as the preferred correctional goal over punishment and crime prevention (Flanagan, 1996). Additionally, 50 percent of Gerber and Engelhardt-Greer's (1996) sample indicated that rehabilitation should be the most important goal in sentencing juveniles, and more than 78 participants in another national study said that treatment and rehabilitation should be the main purpose of the juvenile court (Schwartz, Kerbs, Hogston, and Guillean, 1992). Similarly, more than three quarters of respondents in a national survey believed that rehabilitation should be the

main reason for incarcerating juveniles (Roush and Dunlap, 1997), and 53 percent said that juvenile records should be closed to prevent future problems from labeling them as offenders (Bureau of Justice Statistics, 2001).

A more recent national survey, conducted in 2001, has similar results. More than half of the respondents believed that the main emphasis of prisons should be to rehabilitate an offender, and 92 percent thought treatment should be provided to those already in prison. When asked specifically about rehabilitation for juveniles, 98 percent agreed it is important to rehabilitate juveniles that are already in the system, and 80 percent said that rehabilitation should be the main emphasis of juvenile prisons (Cullen, Pealer, Fisher, Applegate, and Santana, 2002).

Statewide surveys have produced parallel results. For example, in a study of the general public in Illinois, more than 80 percent agreed that it would be irresponsible to stop trying to treat juvenile delinquents. Additionally, over 75 percent suggested they support the rehabilitation of juvenile offenders, and almost half agreed that rehabilitation is the best way to stop juvenile crime. Likewise, more than twice as many respondents indicated they believed that rehabilitation does not work for adults than those believing that it does not work for juveniles (Cullen, Golden, and Cullen, 1983).

Similarly, 41.1 percent of a sample of Ohio residents believed that rehabilitating an offender so that he or she might become a productive citizen should be the main emphasis of prisons. Also, more than 80 percent of respondents agreed that rehabilitation is an important goal for offenders in prison, even for those who had been involved in a great deal of crime. Notably, over 95 percent concurred that it is important to provide

rehabilitation for convicted juveniles, while 85 percent said the same for adults (Applegate, Cullen, and Fisher, 1997).

A survey of Tennessee residents found that almost 95 percent believed that rehabilitation is an important goal of juvenile imprisonment and that it is important to provide treatment to juvenile offenders in detention and in the community. More than 63 percent of respondents said that rehabilitation should be the main goal of juvenile prisons. Further, 75 percent believed that rehabilitation should be provided even for juveniles that had participated in a lot of crime (Moon, Sundt, Cullen, and Wright, 2000).

Comparable outcomes have been found among residents of states in the western United States. For example, in a sample of California residents, more than two of three respondents disagreed that serious juvenile offenders cannot be rehabilitated (Steinhart, 1988). Additionally, Oregon residents preferred money to be used to rehabilitate youthful offenders rather than to rehabilitate adults and punish juveniles (Doble Research Associates, 1995).

Samples of city residents also show strong support for rehabilitation. For instance, in Cullen, Skovron et al.'s (1990) study of Cincinnati and Columbus residents, 15 percent more respondents said that rehabilitation was helpful for juveniles than for adults. More than half said that rehabilitation should be the main emphasis of prisons, and over 80 percent said that current prison rehabilitation programs should be expanded. Additionally, 20 percent more thought rehabilitation was helpful for juveniles as compared to adults.

More than 80 percent of respondents in a survey of Cincinnati residents believed that rehabilitation of juveniles is helpful, as compared to six in ten for adults. More than half

also thought prison rehabilitation programs should be expanded. Further, the number that believed rehabilitation is at least slightly helpful for juveniles increased six percent from 1986 to 1995, while it declined almost four percent for the same question for adults (Sundt, Cullen, Applegate, and Turner, 1998).

Despite the legislative and philosophical shifts from rehabilitation to punishment, the overall body of research into the views of the general public indicates that support for rehabilitation is not dead. In particular, even in a punitive correctional era, there seems to be an unwillingness to discard the child saving ideal of juvenile rehabilitation. It is evident that the American public supports treatment efforts by the correctional system to rehabilitate offenders, with exceptional support for juvenile rehabilitation (Applegate et al., 1997; Cullen, Golden, and Cullen, 1983; Cullen et al., 1988, 1989, 2000; Cullen, Wright, Brown, Moon, Blankenship, and Applegate, 1998; Cullen and Moon, 2002; Gerber and Engelhardt-Greer, 1996; Moon, Sundt, Cullen and Wright, 2000; McCorkle, 1993; Merlo, 2000; Moon et al., 2000; Schwartz, Kerbs, et al., 1992; Sundt et al., 1998; Warr and Stafford, 1984). The public has an expectation that the correctional system will provide rehabilitative services to young offenders (Gorczyk and Perry, 1997). Even when the public does call for harsher sanctions, it is usually aimed at adults more than juveniles (Hawkins, 1980; Miller, Rossi, and Simpson, 1986; Rossi and Berk, 1985; Warr, Meier, and Erickson, 1983). Evidently, the public has the insight to realize that rehabilitation works to change offenders before they are released back into the community, and there is a strong consensus that America's youths are amenable to change.

The recent punitive shift in correctional ideology is discussed in the next section. Nonetheless, it is important to note here that public opinion does not necessarily follow this trend. In addition to the evidence presented above, the National Opinion Research Center (2001) has presented data indicating that public opinion has actually become less punitive over the last 15 years. Specifically, in 1984, only three percent of the national sample believed that courts deal too harshly with criminals. That number increased to eight percent in 2000. During that same time period, there was a 14 percent decline in the number of respondents indicating criminals are not dealt with harshly enough by the courts. In fact, support for treatment is still surprisingly large when taking into account the criticisms on rehabilitation that have accrued over the last 30 years.

### **WHY CORRECTIONAL WORKERS WOULD BE CUSTODIAL/PUNITIVE**

Rehabilitation has been attacked on numerous grounds over the past 30 years, and the field of corrections has become much more punitive for both adults and juveniles (Cullen and Gilbert, 1982; Cullen, Golden, and Cullen, 1983; Cullen and Wright, 2002; Empey, 1978; Feld, 1993; Rothman, 1980; Sundt et al., 1998). This section includes a description of the changing nature of the juvenile court and corrections over the past three decades, followed by a review of research reporting the punitive orientation of correctional workers and the general public.

#### **The Changing Nature of the Juvenile Court and Corrections**

The field of corrections has experienced a philosophical change since the early 1970s. Discontent with rehabilitative efforts began to emerge in the late 1960s. There were concerns that the juvenile system was much more punitive than it was designed to be, and

the goal of rehabilitation had supposedly not been achieved (Feld, 1993). Therefore, the rehabilitative ideal for juveniles and adults came under attack by both liberals and conservatives (Cullen and Gilbert, 1982; Cullen, Golden, and Cullen, 1983; Cullen and Wright, 2002; Empey, 1978; Rothman, 1980; Sundt et al., 1998).

Those on the left argued that the state could not be trusted to act in the best interest of juvenile offenders. In fact, they claimed that states were acting as adversaries, rather than advocates, of juvenile delinquents (Bayer, 1981; Cullen et al., 2000; Cullen, Golden, and Cullen, 1983). Because of the apparent failure of rehabilitation, along with other social events of the time (e.g., the Vietnam War, the Civil Rights Movement, Watergate), liberals argued that coercive states had too much discretion with regard to juveniles. In particular, liberals contended that juveniles were subjected to unsystematic verdicts and victimization while being detained. They also claimed that state coercion was aimed primarily at minority and poor juveniles. Therefore, many liberals argued for legal rights for juveniles and suggested a “hands off” doctrine of nonintervention by the state (Cullen, Golden, and Cullen, 1983; Schur, 1973); while others maintained there should be only one court to handle both adults and juveniles (Feld, 1998, 1999).

Conservatives also attacked rehabilitation for adults and juveniles but did so for different reasons. Those on the right maintained that rehabilitative efforts resulted in lenient treatment of juvenile offenders, and they claimed that delinquents were being freed without being rehabilitated. Therefore, the state was virtually releasing predatory criminals back into the community. Contrary to the liberal solution of nonintervention, conservatives argued for more discipline and tougher punishments instead of

“ineffective” rehabilitative efforts that were currently undertaken (Cullen, Golden, and Cullen, 1983; Cullen and Wright, 2002; Sundt et al., 1998).

The attack on rehabilitation from both political spectrums, along with publications claiming that “nothing works” to rehabilitate offenders (Martinson, 1974), began to acquire public attention by the mid 1970s. Rehabilitation was all but discredited, and punishment quickly became the dominant correctional ideology for both juveniles and adults. The system once again concentrated on the crime rather than its causes or the circumstances surrounding the individual.

By the mid 1970s, legislatures began to constrain juvenile court discretion. The previous child saving philosophy was rejected and states began to alter goals of juvenile systems to focus primarily on the safety of the community and holding juvenile offenders accountable for their actions (Torbet and Szymanski, 1998). Consequently, juveniles began receiving many due process rights (Cullen, Golden, and Cullen, 1983; Cullen and Wright, 2002; Feld, 1993), and nondelinquent juveniles that needed some type of supervision were moved out of the juvenile justice system into state child welfare departments (Schwartz, Weiner, and Enosh, 1999).

State discretion was also limited by the introduction of determinate sentencing into the juvenile system, which standardized sentences according to the crime (Feld, 1998; Grasmick and McGill, 1994; Krajick, 1977; Merlo, 2000; Torbet, 1997). Under determinate sentencing, judges cannot consider individual circumstances when issuing punishment – the punishment is based only on the crime itself. Further, the previously private juvenile proceedings became more public, and confidential juvenile records could more easily be opened (Sickmund, Snyder, and Poe-Yamagata, 1997). In short, the

juvenile system has become much more like the adult justice system over the past 30 years.

The more punitive correctional ideology also resulted in more juvenile offenders being waived to the adult system. Many states added offenses that allowed for waivers. They also lowered, or completely eliminated, the minimum age at which juveniles may be waived to the adult system (Cullen and Wright, 2002; Merlo, 2000; Torbet and Szymanski, 1998). Consequently, there was a 68 percent nationwide increase in the total number of waivers to adult court from 1988 to 1992 (Parent, Dunworth, McDonald, and Rhodes, 1997). Additionally, there was a 100 percent increase of waivers for personal crimes from 1986 to 1995 (Sickmund, Stahl, Finnegan, Snyder, Poole, and Butts, 1998), and almost 1 percent of *all* juvenile cases were waived to adult court in 2000 (Stahl, Finnegan, and Kang, 2002). By 1997, there were 5,400 juveniles being held in state prisons (Strom, 2000), and the number of juveniles held in adult jails increased by almost 420 percent from 1983 to 2002 (Bureau of Justice Statistics, 2003b). There was also a 7 percent increase in the total number of juveniles being formally processed through juvenile courts from 1989 to 1999 (Stahl, 2003). By 1997, several states had officially changed the intention of the juvenile system from rehabilitation to retribution and/or public safety (Torbet and Szymanski, 1998).

The high level of support to incarcerate more and more juvenile offenders is often considered to be simply a part of the overall movement to get tough on juvenile offenders, a movement which has become routine in the American criminal justice system (Frazier, Bishop, and Lanza-Kaduce, 1999). Clear (1994) refers to this trend as the “penal harm” movement. Partially as a result of this punitive shift, 24 percent of

juveniles that were adjudicated delinquent were sentenced to detention in 2000 (Stahl, Finnegan, and Kang, 2002)

The punitive shift in the ideology of the juvenile system is often blamed on the increase of serious juvenile crime. While juvenile crime remained stable between the mid 1970s and late 1980s, there was a large increase in violent juvenile crime from 1980 to 1994. Specifically, Cook and Laub (1998) reported a 60 percent increase in juvenile arrests for violent crime, and Snyder (1998) reported a 100 percent increase in homicides by juveniles during this time period.

In response to the rising juvenile crime rate, DiIulio (1995) cautioned that the increase of violent juvenile crime was an indication of youthful “super-predators,” who would participate in violence for no decisive reason. He maintained that the increase in the number of youths in the American population would produce a dramatic increase in violent crime committed by juveniles in the next ten years. However, his prediction was not accurate. In fact, arrest rates for violent crimes committed by juveniles have been declining since 1994 (Cook and Laub, 1998; Fox, 2000; Snyder, 1998). In fact, according to the 2002 National Crime Victimization Survey, the total number of rapes, robberies, homicides, and aggravated assaults committed by individuals aged 12 to 17 declined a full 75 percent from 1993 to 2002 (Bureau of Justice Statistics, 2003a).

Still, the change to a more punitive philosophy for the juvenile system, along with a public fear of violent juveniles, has been reflected in the number of incarcerated juveniles. Despite the fact that certain rehabilitative programs have been shown to have significant treatment effects (see Andrews, Zinger, Hoge, Bonta, Gendreau, and Cullen, 1990; Cullen and Gendreau, 1989; Currie, 1985, 1989; Dowden and Andrews, 1999; Van

Voorhis, Braswell, and Lester, 2000), the number of youths held in juvenile facilities increased 11 percent from 1990 to 1999 (Flores, 2003).

The punitive shift in correctional ideology and policies also leads to expectations of a great deal of support for punishment and custody among both correctional workers and the general public. This expectation is confirmed with research. The next two sections are discussions of study results showing the punitive nature of correctional workers and the public.

### **Studies of Correctional Workers**

While studies reviewed previously in this chapter reveal support for rehabilitation among correctional workers, research also indicates they consider custody and maintaining order as primary functions of their occupations. For example, Cullen et al. (1993) found that wardens in their national sample ranked incapacitation as the most important concern for their institutions, followed by rehabilitation and deterrence, and then retribution. The majority also said the most important goal of an ideal prison is maintaining order and preventing escapes, and they put the most emphasis on custodial concerns for day-to-day operations of the prison. Additionally, they saw value in hard labor, which may be used as punishment or to keep inmates busy, and in mandatory life sentences for habitual offenders.

Similarly, more than three quarters of both prison guards and correctional administrators surveyed in Illinois said that most juveniles know what they are doing when they commit crimes and should be punished. Additionally, almost half indicated that all juveniles that commit violent crimes should be handled in the adult system, and the majority agreed that juveniles are treated too leniently by the courts. Further, over 20

percent agreed that the rehabilitation of prisoners has been a failure (Cullen, Golden, and Cullen, 1983).

When asked about the main reason for putting an offender in prison, 25.4 percent of correctional officers in a southern correctional system answered retribution and 24.5 percent said incapacitation. Over 75 percent of the sample agreed that keeping inmates from causing trouble is a major concern, and almost 80 percent thought the public is unaware that prisons are too soft on inmates. Additionally, 60 percent of these correctional officers agreed that offenders are shown too much sympathy. They were also skeptical that increased funding will make treatment efforts more effective (Cullen et al., 1989).

Even prison chaplains hold some punitive attitudes. In their national sample, Sundt and Cullen (2002) found that 47.2 percent thought protecting society is the main purpose of prisons. Also, 19.9 percent said the main purpose of prisons is to punish offenders.

It is clear that correctional workers are somewhat skeptical about rehabilitation. They do have high levels of support for custodial and punitive concerns. Still, these studies, along with those presented previously, demonstrate that correctional workers endorse punishment but also support rehabilitation as a goal of imprisonment (Cullen et al., 1989; 1993; Cullen, Golden, and Cullen, 1983; Sundt and Cullen, 2002). Overall, research shows that correctional workers support both punitive and rehabilitative goals simultaneously. These findings mirror results from studies of the general public. This public research is reviewed in the next section.

## **Studies of the General Public**

As discussed previously, public attitudes toward corrections shifted in a punitive direction in the 1970s (Cullen et al., 1988, 2000; Cullen, Golden, and Cullen, 1983; Flanagan and Caulfield, 1984; Rankin, 1979). Public opinion polls frequently report that the public has become punitive toward both adult and juvenile offenders (see Triplett, 1996). Specifically, the American public is portrayed as exacting punitive attitudes by favoring incarceration, determinate sentencing, three strikes laws, and other get tough policies (Cullen et al., 2000; Roberts and Stalans, 1997). Pettinico (1994) reported a 51 percent drop in overall support for rehabilitation from 1971 to 1993. In Cincinnati, there was over a 20 percent decline in those believing rehabilitation is helpful or very helpful for adults and juveniles from 1986 to 1995. There was also more than a 25 percent decline in those believing educational and vocational training is the best way to deal with inmates once they are in prison (Sundt et al., 1998).

When asked specifically about the courts, a majority of the public often indicates that they do not deal harshly enough with criminals (Smith, 1990; Warr, 1995). For instance, when asked about the harshness of the local courts in 2000, 68 percent of a national sample believed that courts are not harsh enough on criminals (National Opinion Research Center, 2001). Additionally, 65 percent of Gallup Poll respondents in 2000 said that violent juveniles should not get lenient treatment because of their age. Rather, they should be treated the same as adults (Bureau of Justice Statistics, 2002). These results mirror those found in national surveys by Schwartz, Abbey, and Barton (1990) and by Schwartz, Guo, and Kerbs (1992).

Some survey results also reveal that the American public endorses the incarceration of persistent juvenile offenders. Some research has reported that the majority of respondents believed that juveniles convicted of violent crime, or even serious property crime, should be treated and punished the same as adult offenders (Triplett, 1996). Many also support waiving juvenile cases to adult court under certain circumstances (Spratt, 1998). Statewide samples have produced analogous results.

In their sample of the general public in Illinois, Cullen, Golden, and Cullen (1983) found that the majority of the sample believed that juveniles know what they are doing when they break the law and they deserve to be punished. Further, the majority of the sample thought juvenile offenders are treated too leniently by the courts, and 40.9 percent of respondents disagreed that the best way to stop juvenile crime is to rehabilitate.

Moon et al. (2000) also found punitive attitudes toward youthful offenders among Tennessee residents. Specifically, 90 percent of their sample thought juvenile offenders should be punished because they harmed society. Further, just over 70 percent believed that courts were not dealing harshly enough with youthful offenders.

While the research presented above shows the punitive side of the American public, a different image is presented when these results are considered with the research on rehabilitation discussed previously. Overall, research shows that attitudes of the public are actually multifaceted. Like correctional workers, the public generally supports punishment but does not reject rehabilitation, especially for juvenile offenders (Applegate et al., 1997; Cullen et al., 1988, 2000; Cullen, Golden, and Cullen, 1983; Cullen and Moon, 2002; Cullen, Skovron et al., 1990; DiIulio, 1991; Duffee and Ritti, 1977; Durham, 1993; McCorkle, 1993; Moon et al., 2000; Sundt, 1999; Sundt et al., 1998;

Thomson and Ragona, 1987). It appears as though there is a general consensus that juvenile offenders should be both punished and rehabilitated. The public believes that these two seemingly opposite correctional philosophies should be used simultaneously in an approach to deal with juveniles.

## **SOURCES OF CORRECTIONAL ORIENTATION**

Researchers have been examining factors influencing inmate behavior and adaptation to prison life for more than half a century. However, it has only been in the last two and a half decades that investigators have examined sources of correctional employees' attitudes and beliefs toward their jobs and the purpose of corrections. These inquiries into correctional work have resulted in two competing models, similar to those used to explain inmate behavior.

The first model, the individual experiences/importation model, is similar to Irwin and Cressey's (1962) importation model of inmate behavior and adaptation. This position maintains that reactions to correctional work are the product of different individual attributes and experiences of employees. That is, correctional employees import certain characteristics into their jobs that affect their attitudes, beliefs, and work experience in general (Britton, 1997; Cullen et al., 1989, 1993; Fry and Glazer, 1987; Hepburn and Knepper, 1993; Jackson and Ammen, 1996; Jacobs and Kraft, 1978; Jurik, 1985b; Robinson, Porporino, and Simourd, 1997; Sundt and Cullen, 2002; Van Voorhis et al., 1991).

The second model is known as the work role/prisonization model, which is based on the notion that prisons have effects on those working within them (Jacobs and Retsky,

1975; Thomas, 1977; Lombardo, 1981). This perspective posits that correctional workers' reactions are influenced by the institution's organizational factors and the work role, rather than individual attributes. According to this model, organizational factors and role demands virtually negate individual variations in shaping reactions and attitudes toward the job (Cullen et al., 1989, 1993; Jacobs and Kraft, 1978; Jurik, 1985b; Jurik and Halemba, 1984; Sundt and Cullen, 2002; Van Voorhis et al., 1991; Whitehead and Linquist, 1989, 1992; Whitehead, Linquist, and Klofas, 1987). That is, characteristics of the job and the facility itself will influence individual beliefs and attitudes. Correctional workers are therefore "prisonized," and organizational and structural conditions of the institution shape beliefs and orientations.

Studies comparing the individual experience/importation model with the work role/prisonization model have yielded mixed conclusions. Each model generally explains only a small percent of the variance in correctional workers' orientations, and independent variables within each of the models sometimes yield opposite relationships from study to study. A review of research on sources of correctional orientations among correctional workers is presented in the following two sections.

### **The Individual Experience/Importation Model**

The individual experience/importation model commonly includes measures of age, race, gender, and education. Some have suggested that professionalizing the field of corrections by hiring more educated correctional officers, along with more minorities and women, will result in a more positive atmosphere with more positive attitudes toward inmates and rehabilitation (Jurik, 1985a, 1985b; Van Voorhis et al., 1991). Still, research exploring the influence of individual characteristics on correctional orientation has been

inconsistent, if not confusing (Philliber, 1987). Below is a summary of research findings for variables falling within this model.

**Age.** Most studies of correctional workers have found that age is significantly and positively related to rehabilitation, indicating that older officers hold more rehabilitative orientations (Jackson and Ammen, 1996; Jurik, 1985b; Jurik and Musheno, 1986; Jacobs, 1978; Robinson et al., 1997; Teske and Williamson, 1979; Van Voorhis et al., 1991). Similarly, research has shown that younger officers are more likely to hold custodial orientations (Farkas, 2000; Klofas and Toch, 1982; Toch and Klofas, 1982). Other research, however, has found a different relationship. Sundt and Cullen (2002), for example, found that age was positively related to custodial orientations among prison chaplains. This positive relationship is comparable to results from surveys of the general public (see Schwartz et al., 1992). Still, others have found that age is not a significant predictor of correctional orientation in both adult and juvenile correctional workers (Arthur, 1994; Gordon, 1999).

In a similar regard, individuals that became correctional officers at an older age tend to have higher levels of support for rehabilitation. For example, Cullen et al. (1989) found that rehabilitation was positively related to the age respondents became a correctional officer. Additionally, Jurik (1985b) found that those who began working in corrections at an older age had a significantly stronger human service orientation.

**Race.** Investigators have hypothesized that minority correctional workers often share similar cultural and economic backgrounds to many inmates, and thus they should be more supportive of treatment and rehabilitation (Jacobs and Kraft, 1978; Van Voorhis et al., 1991). Although some results support this hypothesis (Cullen et al., 1989; Jurik,

1985b; Van Voorhis et al., 1991; Wright and Saylor, 1992), other studies do not. For example, Jacobs and Kraft (1978) found black prison guards in Illinois did not hold more rehabilitative views. In fact, they were more likely to hold a punitive orientation. Similarly, Jacobs (1978) found that white prison guards were more supportive of rehabilitation than nonwhites. Further, Cullen et al. (1993) reported that nonwhite wardens had higher levels of both rehabilitative and custodial orientations than whites. Other studies of correctional workers in adult and juvenile systems have revealed no significant racial differences in support for rehabilitation (Gordon, 1999; Klofas, 1986; Sundt and Cullen, 2002; Whitehead and Lindquist 1989) or custody (Burton, Ju, Dunaway, and Wolf, 1991; Crouch and Alpert, 1982; Cullen et al., 1989; Gordon, 1999; Jurik et al., 1987; Van Voorhis et al., 1991).

***Education.*** Many correctional agencies and institutions have tried to “professionalize” their workforce by hiring more educated individuals (Burke, Rizzi, and O’Rear, 1992). Higher levels of education may improve the ability of correctional officers to deliver human service or rehabilitative objectives. Education may also supply employees with communication skills that help them successfully interact with inmates (Poole and Regoli, 1980a; Robinson et al., 1997). A few studies of correctional workers have shown this is a feasible hypothesis. For example, Burton et al. (1991) and Robinson et al. (1993, 1997) all found significant positive relationships between education and support for rehabilitation. Additionally, Poole and Regoli (1980a) found a negative relationship between education and custodial orientations, which is consistent with surveys of the general public (see Blumstein and Cohen, 1980; Schwartz et al., 1992). However, most studies of correctional workers have found effects of education to be

negligible among those working with both adults and juveniles (Arthur, 1994; Bazemore, Dicker, and Al-Gadheeb, 1994; Crouch and Alpert, 1982; Cullen et al., 1989, 1993; Gordon, 1999; Jurik, 1985b; Jurik et al., 1987; Philliber, 1987; Shamir and Drory, 1982; Sundt and Cullen, 2002; Van Voorhis et al., 1991; Whitehead and Linquist, 1989).

***Gender.*** Surveys of the general public have revealed that women tend to be more interpersonal and more supportive of human services and treatment (Blumstein and Cohen, 1980; Schwartz et al., 1990, 1992); commentators have suggested this may also be the case with female correctional workers (Crouch and Alpert, 1982; Jurik and Halemba, 1984; Zupan, 1986; Van Voorhis et al., 1991). Some research shows that male correctional workers are indeed more punitive, whereas females are less supportive of punishment as a way to reduce crime (Bazemore et al., 1994; Crouch and Alpert, 1982; Gordon, 1999; Whitehead and Lindquist, 1992). Others have reported that female correctional workers are more punitive than males. For example, Farkas (2000) found that female correctional officers held more punitive attitudes toward inmates, and Sundt and Cullen (2002) found that male chaplains were more likely to hold rehabilitative orientations. Still, the majority of empirical studies find no significant gender differences in support for rehabilitation or custody (Arthur, 1994; Burton et al., 1991; Cullen et al., 1989; Fry and Glazer, 1987; Jurik, 1985b; Robinson et al., 1993; Van Voorhis et al., 1991).

***Political Ideology.*** One individual characteristic that has not been measured in relation to correctional orientation very often is political ideology. Generally, republicans and those that consider themselves to be more conservative tend to be more punitive and favor harsher sentences than democrats and those that consider themselves

more liberal. However, relationships between levels of punitiveness and political ideology are rarely significant (Grasmick and McGill, 1994; Osbourne and Rappaport, 1985; Samuel and Moulds, 1986). Nonetheless, Grasmick, Cochran, Bursik, and Kimpel (1993) did find that liberals were significantly less punitive than conservatives.

### **The Work Role/Prisonization Model**

As discussed previously, the work role/prisonization model holds that correctional workers' reactions are shaped by the institution's organizational factors and the work role. Therefore, attributes of the job and institution will influence individual beliefs and attitudes. One of the most prominent examples of the contextual effects of prisons is found in the Stanford Prison Experiment (Haney, Banks, and Zimbardo, 1973). In this experiment, researchers constructed a simulated prison, using ordinary male college students who were randomly assigned to be prisoners and guards. After only a short period, students in the role of guards became antagonistic, even aggressive, toward the student prisoners. Additionally, even the more passive guards submitted to brutal behavior on the part of other guards. While the experiment had to be concluded early, the researchers deduced that reactions of the guards were due to the attributes of the prison itself and the roles of prison guards (Haney et al., 1973). Still, investigations into effects of variables within this model are not uniform across studies.

***Correctional Experience.*** Researchers have suggested that increased years of correctional experience and contact with inmates may affect the attitudes and orientations of correctional employees (Poole and Regoli, 1980a). There is some evidence that support for treatment declines as experience as a correctional worker increases (Cullen et al., 1989; Jurik, 1985b; Van Voorhis et al., 1991). Similarly, research has reported

positive, though not significant, relationships between experience and custodial orientations (Arthur, 1994; Cullen et al., 1989; Sundt and Cullen, 2002; Van Voorhis et al., 1991). However, Cullen et al. (1993) found that experience was positively related to both custodial and rehabilitative orientations among prison wardens.

***Role Conflict.*** Correctional workers often experience role conflict when they are unsure of the means by which to maintain order in their institutions (Cullen et al., 1985; Farkas, 2001). They may also experience role conflict when they are expected to balance roles of maintaining custody along with providing rehabilitative or human services. The majority of studies on correctional workers have found positive and significant relationships between role conflict and support for custody, meaning that those with higher levels of role conflict are more likely to have custodial orientations (Cullen et al., 1989; Farkas, 2000; Hepburn and Albonetti, 1980; Poole and Regoli, 1980a; Sundt and Cullen, 2002; Whitehead and Lindquist, 1989). Similarly, Shamir and Drory (1982) found a significant negative relationship between role conflict and support for rehabilitation. Cullen et al. (1989) suggest these results may be indicative of correctional workers trying to work out role conflict by responding to inmates in a strict manner rather than treating them individually with a less rigid approach. That is, it might be easier for workers to respond to inmates collectively with a custodial focus instead of taking a flexible approach with each individual inmate.

***Type of Facility.*** Prisons are usually characterized as minimum, medium, or maximum security. Overall, custodial concerns are usually strongest in maximum-security facilities, and thus one may expect that those working in maximum-security facilities would be more punitive. However, most studies find no significant relationship

between type of facility and correctional orientation (Cullen et al., 1989, 1993; Hepburn and Albonetti, 1980; Van Voorhis et al., 1991; Whitehead and Lindquist, 1989).

***Dangerousness.*** Similar to police officers, correctional officers must cope with the fact that there is a continuous possibility of being victimized by inmates. The hypothesis is that perceived dangerousness should be positively related to support for custody because the inmates need punishment and control. Sundt and Cullen (2002) found support for this hypothesis in their sample of prison chaplains. However, Cullen et al. (1989) found no significant difference in correctional orientation based on levels of perceived dangerousness.

***Work Shift.*** Correctional workers on night shift are generally not involved in treatment efforts, as inmates are usually in their cells through most of the night shift. Therefore, it is feasible that those working night shift would be more custody oriented, which is exactly what research shows. Cullen et al. (1989), Farkas (2000), and Van Voorhis et al. (1991) all found that working night shift was significantly and positively related to custodial orientations. Similarly, Cullen et al. (1989) found that working night shift was negatively related to rehabilitative orientations.

Although the extant research results are inconsistent, overall the data suggest that rehabilitative and custodial orientations may have different sources. Custodial orientations tend to be related more to work-related variables, particularly working night shift and role conflict. Rehabilitative orientations are occasionally found to be related to some work-related variables, but are more often associated with individual factors, especially race and age.

## **THE IMPACT OF CORRECTIONAL ORIENTATION**

The present study primarily focuses on the level and determinants of correctional orientation. There is some evidence, however, that correctional orientation might affect other reactions to correctional jobs. These reactions include feelings of work stress, job satisfaction, and use of force. Previous studies on sources of correctional employee work stress and job satisfaction are reviewed in the next two sections. The following section is a discussion of possible sources of correctional worker use of force.

### **The Influence of Correctional Orientation on Feelings of Work Stress**

Correctional research focusing on inmates has established that inmates often experience high levels of stress in day-to-day prison life (see Johnson and Toch, 1982). However, work stress faced by correctional workers was largely ignored until the 1980s. By the mid 1980s, researchers began exploring the effects of prison life on those who worked within them (Cheek and Miller, 1983; Cullen et al., 1985; Hepburn and Albonetti, 1980; Jurik and Halemba, 1984; Jurik et al., 1987; Lindquist and Whitehead, 1986; Marquart, 1986; Poole and Regoli, 1980a, 1980b; Toch and Klofas, 1982; Van Voorhis et al., 1991; Veneziano, 1984).

One of the frequently examined issues among correctional workers is job stress. It is important to understand sources of correctional worker job stress because it has been associated with reduced work behaviors and even health problems (Cheek and Miller, 1983; Cullen et al., 1985; Huckabee, 1992; Morris, 1986; Mitchell, MacKenzie, Styve, and Gover, 2000; Sims, 2001; Veneaiano, 1984). Similar to sources of correctional

orientation, several individual and work-related factors have been shown to be related to job stress.

### **Individual Characteristics and Work Stress**

***Gender.*** Almost all studies into sources of work stress among correctional workers have shown that males experience significantly lower levels of work stress than females (Blau, Light, and Chamlin, 1986; Britton, 1997; Cullen et al., 1985; Van Voorhis et al., 1991; Wright and Saylor, 1991; Zupan, 1986). However, women may not experience more work stress because of the occupation itself. As Jurik (1985a) points out, many women are frequently employed at male prisons and may experience problems from male coworkers and administrators. Therefore, their higher stress levels may be the result of problems that fall outside the realm of their actual job duties. Still, the expectation is that female correctional worker will have significantly higher levels of job stress than males.

***Education.*** Correctional workers with higher levels of education have often been trained in administering effective rehabilitative programs. However, a lack of funding and staff, along with attacks on rehabilitation, has resulted in a reduction of programs available in many facilities. The deficiency in rehabilitative programs has forced many correctional workers to serve in primarily custodial roles. These custodial positions are often not challenging enough for workers with higher levels of education. Therefore, there is an expectation that correctional workers with more education may experience significantly higher levels of work stress, which is what Lindquist and Whitehead (1986) found among a sample of southern correctional officers. However, other studies of correctional workers have found no significant relationship between educational levels and work stress (Cullen et al., 1985; Liou, 1995; Van Voorhis et al., 1991).

**Race.** Most researchers have not found significant relationships between race and work stress among correctional workers (Cullen et al., 1985; Liou, 1995; Van Voorhis et al., 1991). However, this relationship may be specified by race and gender. For example, Britton (1997) found that black male correctional officers reported lower levels of occupational stress than white males and both white and nonwhite females.

**Age.** Most previous research on correctional worker job stress has not included a measure of age. The omission of age probably stems from the fact that it often shares a great deal of variation with correctional experience, a variable that is generally included in such studies. However, Van Voorhis et al. (1991) did include a measure of age in their sample of correctional officers in a southern system, and they did not find a significant relationship between age and work stress.

### **Work-Related Variables and Work Stress**

**Role Conflict.** Unresolved role conflict may be a chief source of work stress for correctional workers. Qualitative investigations have shown that correctional officers recognize that role conflict is positively related to work stress (Cheek and Miller, 1983). Additionally, quantitative studies have revealed a significant positive relationship between role conflict and work stress (Cullen et al., 1985; Poole and Regoli, 1980a; Shamir and Drory, 1982; Whitehead and Lindquist, 1986).

**Perceived Dangerousness.** It is likely that correctional workers that perceive higher levels of dangerousness within their place of employment will have higher levels of work stress. Any perceived dangerousness could be a source of stress for such individuals. As expected, previous research has shown that perceived dangerousness and safety concerns were significantly and positively related to work stress among correctional workers

(Cullen et al., 1985; Grossi, Keil, and Vito, 1996; Jacobs and Gear, 1977; Jurik and Winn, 1987; Lombardo, 1981; Poole and Regoli, 1980a; Triplett, Mullings, and Scarborough, 1996; Veneziano, 1984).

***Correctional Experience.*** Correctional workers with more experience are more likely than others to be assigned to more dangerous areas in the facility. Additionally, those with more experience are likely to be employed in decision-making positions or positions of authority. Therefore, it is likely that correctional workers with more experience will have higher levels of work stress. Consistent with expectations, prior studies have found that correctional experience is positively related to work stress in samples of correctional workers (Blau et al., 1986; Britton, 1997; Cullen et al., 1985; Patterson, 1992; Van Voorhis et al., 1991; Whitehead and Lindquist, 1991; Wright and Saylor, 1991).

***Supervisory Support.*** In virtually any occupation, support from supervisors should serve to reduce work stress. Empirical research demonstrates this statement is applicable to correctional workers. Supervisory support has been shown to be negatively related to work stress in several studies of correctional officers (Cullen et al. 1985, Grossi et al., 1996; Liou, 1995; Van Voorhis et al., 1991).

### **Correctional-Officer Attitudes and Orientations and Job Stress**

There have been some studies investigating possible relationships between the attitudes and orientations of correctional workers and their levels of work stress. While the relationships are generally not significant, some studies have shown that correctional officers in adult systems with higher levels of treatment orientations had lower levels of job stress (Cullen et al., 1985; Poole and Pogrebin, 1988; Poole and Regoli, 1980a; Toch

and Klofas, 1982). However, in a sample of detention care workers, Liou (1995) found that those with a treatment orientation had more work stress than those who were punishment oriented. This difference between those working in adult and juvenile facilities may indicate there is something about the type of population being served, or the objectives therein, that affects correctional orientation or work stress.

### **The Influence of Correctional Orientation on Job Satisfaction: Individual Characteristics**

**Education.** Previous research has shown that education was negatively related to job satisfaction in samples of correctional workers (Cullen et al., 1985; Cullen, Link, Cullen, and Wolfe, 1990; Jurik et al., 1987; Lindquist and Whitehead, 1986; Robinson et al., 1997; Van Voorhis et al., 1991). That is, those with more education had significantly lower levels of job satisfaction. However, others have not found significant relationships between educational levels and job satisfaction (Hepburn and Knepper, 1993; Rogers, 1991). Additionally, Rogers (1991) did find that more educated correctional officers were less likely to enjoy working on the custody force.

**Race.** Prior research examining the relationship between race and job satisfaction for correctional workers has consistently revealed that whites are significantly more satisfied with their jobs than nonwhites. For example, Cullen et al. (1985) and Van Voorhis et al. (1991) found that white correctional officers had significantly lower levels of job dissatisfaction than nonwhite officers. Similarly, research by Cullen, Link et al. (1990) and Britton (1997) indicates that white correctional officers had significantly more job satisfaction than nonwhites.

**Gender.** The fact that female correctional officers often have significantly higher levels of work stress than males could lead to the hypothesis that females are more likely to be dissatisfied with their job. However, prior investigations into workers in adult systems have not found significant relationships between gender and job satisfaction (Blau et al., 1986; Britton, 1997; Cullen et al., 1985; Jurik and Halemba, 1984; Jurik and Winn, 1987; Van Voorhis et al., 1991; Wright and Saylor, 1991).

**Age.** As in the work stress model discussed above, age is often not measured in studies of correctional worker job satisfaction. Many investigators use correctional experience instead. However, age has been found to be positively related to levels of job satisfaction in samples of correctional workers in adult facilities (Blau et al., 1986; Saylor and Wright, 1992).

### **The Influence of Correctional Orientation on Job Satisfaction: Work-Related Variables**

**Correctional Experience.** There are two different perspectives concerning the relationship between correctional experience and job satisfaction. The first viewpoint is that correctional officers will eventually become tired of their work and ultimately experience burn-out (Cheek and Miller, 1983). Consequently, years of experience should have a negative relationship with levels of job satisfaction. In contrast, others posit that correctional experience helps workers to develop means to successfully manage aspects of the position. Therefore, years of experience should be positively related to job satisfaction. This positive relationship between correctional experience and job satisfaction has received consistent support from empirical studies (Britton, 1997; Jurik

and Halemba; 1984; Stevens, 1998; Van Voorhis et al. 1991). Still, Cullen et al. (1985) found that experience was not significantly related to job satisfaction.

***Perceived Dangerousness.*** The constant fear of being victimized on any day at work may lead to lower levels of job satisfaction. While perceived dangerousness has rarely been measured in studies of job satisfaction among correctional workers, Cullen et al. (1985) found that perceived job dangerousness was positively related to job dissatisfaction.

***Supervisory Support.*** Support from supervisors may help to increase work satisfaction in any occupation. The same can be said of correctional workers in particular. Cullen et al. (1985) and Van Voorhis et al. (1991) both found that supervisory support had a significant negative relationship with job dissatisfaction.

***Role Conflict.*** It is feasible that unresolved role conflict would be negatively related to job satisfaction. Specifically, it is likely that correctional workers with more role conflict will have lower levels of job satisfaction. However, in their sample of southern correctional officers, Cullen et al. (1985) did not find a significant relationship between conflict and job satisfaction.

### **Correctional Worker Attitudes and Orientations and Job Satisfaction**

While it has rarely been investigated, there is evidence that attitudes and orientations may affect levels of job satisfaction. For example, Jurik and Halemba (1984) found a significant relationship between attitudes of female correctional officers and job satisfaction. Specifically, their results show that officers with favorable attitudes toward inmates had higher levels of job satisfaction. In addition, Cullen et al. (1985) found that

correctional officers with a rehabilitative orientation had significantly lower levels of job dissatisfaction than those with more custodial attitudes.

### **The Influence of Correctional Orientation on Use of Force**

Similar to police officers, correctional officers potentially use various forms of coercion in their everyday occupation to maintain order in the facility. However, little systematic research has been conducted to examine predictors of use of force within correctional settings. Many of the structural and organizational measures used in studies of police use of force do not apply to correctional officers. The difference between correctional worker and police use of force is mainly found with the setting in which force was used. For example, correctional officers virtually always use force within the institution itself, while police officers may use force in a variety of situations in the field. Still, measures of individual and attitudinal characteristics are quite applicable to both police officers and correctional workers. Comparable to research into individual characteristics and correctional orientations, investigations into individual characteristics of police and use of force is inconsistent.

***Education.*** Investigators have hypothesized that more educated police officers should be less likely to use force when dealing with suspects. Theoretically, educated correctional workers should be able to communicate and interact successfully with coworkers and inmates (Jurik et al., 1987). Therefore, they should be able to handle suspects by means other than force. Several policing studies have supported this hypothesis. For example, in a sample of New York City police officers, Cohen and Chaiken (1972) found that officer education was negatively related to use of force. Results from other samples have supported this finding (Cascio, 1977; Terrill and

Mastrofski , 2002). However, using data from the Police Services Study (Ostrom, Parks, and Whitaker, 1981), Worden (1995) found that police officers with college degrees were significantly more likely to use force than those with less education.

**Race.** Generally, race has not been found to be significantly related to police officer use of force (Friedrich, 1980; Garner, Schade, Hepburn, and Buchanan, 1995; Garner, Maxwell, and Heraux, 1996, 2002; Hickman, Piquero, and Greene, 2000; Terrill and Mastrofski, 2002; Worden, 1995). However, Cohen and Chaiken (1972) found that nonwhite officers were significantly more likely to receive complaints for use of force. Additionally, while Garner et al. (2002) did not find significant differences between white and black police officers, Hispanic officers were significantly more likely than white officers to use force.

**Gender.** Early studies of police officers were unable to examine gender effects, as there were very few female officers. While more recent studies have included a measure of gender, results have been mixed. Garner et al. (1995, 2002) and Hickman et al. (2000) found that male officers were more likely than female officers to use force. However, Worden (1995) and Terrill and Mastrofski (2002) found no significant relationship between gender and use of force among police officers.

**Experience.** Experience as a police officer has not been a consistent predictor of use of force. Worden (1995) found no significant relationship between experience and use of force. Terrill and Mastrofski (2002), however, found that police experience was negatively related to use of force, indicating that officers with less experience were more likely to use force.

*Age.* Researchers have hypothesized that younger officers are more likely to use force. This hypothesis has been supported by several studies (Cohen and Chaiken, 1972; Garner et al., 2002; Terrill and Mastofski, 2002). However, Worden (1995) did not find a significant relationship between age and use of force.

*Attitudes and Orientations.* Another police officer characteristic that has rarely been studied in relation to use of force is officer attitudes and beliefs. However, some research into police use of force has incorporated attitudinal measures that are comparable to correctional orientation. For example, Muir (1977) created a system in which police officers were divided into four categories based on their attitudes toward the use of force and their views of human nature. He hypothesized that officers who believe that use of force is an adequate means of controlling arrestees and those who have little empathy for others are more likely to use force. Therefore, it may be that correctional officers with more of a custodial orientation may be more likely to use force than those with a rehabilitative orientation.

Studies of the relationship between police officer attitudes and beliefs and use of force have produced mixed results. Terrill and Mastofski (2002) and Worden (1995) devised measures of whether police officers perceived their primary role as primarily enforcing the law or as providing service-oriented activities, which may be analogous to custodial versus rehabilitative orientations among correctional workers. Neither study reported a significant relationship between officers' perceptions of the police role and their use of force.

In a slightly different approach, Garner et al. (2002) used an attitudinal measure of whether officers were antagonistic or civil toward the suspect. Their results showed that

officers that classified themselves as antagonistic were significantly more likely to use a higher severity of force. However, antagonistic officers did not use force significantly more often than officers that classified themselves as civil.

## **RESEARCH STRATEGY**

The secondary dataset for the present study comes from a survey of a sample of juvenile correctional workers throughout the state of Ohio. It contains measures of correctional orientation, including various items to measure both rehabilitation and punishment. The dataset also allows for examination of a number of determinants of correctional orientation, including those falling within the individual experiences/importation model and the work role/prisonization model. In addition, it is possible to investigate the impact of correctional orientation on work stress, job satisfaction, and use of physical force.

Using this secondary information, this dissertation attempts to answer the following research questions. These issues are derived from previous research on correctional workers.

1. What is the level of support for rehabilitation among juvenile correctional workers?
2. What is the level of support for custody among juvenile correctional workers?
3. What factors influence rehabilitative orientations among juvenile correctional workers?
4. What factors influence punitive orientations among juvenile correctional workers?
5. Does correctional orientation affect work stress among juvenile correctional workers?

6. Does correctional orientation affect job satisfaction among juvenile correctional workers?
7. Does correctional orientation affect physical use of force by juvenile correctional workers?

## **CHAPTER 2**

### **METHODS**

The last chapter reviewed the traditional purpose of – and changes that have occurred within – the juvenile justice system. This section also reviewed research on the levels of support for rehabilitation and custody among correctional workers and the general public. Further, there was a summary of studies that examined predictors of correctional orientation, job stress, job satisfaction, and use of force.

This chapter begins with a description of the sample and data collection procedures. The next section discusses the variables used to measure individual characteristics of those in the sample. Third, the work-related measures are described. The following section presents the questions and scales used to evaluate the levels and sources impact of support for rehabilitation and custody among the sample of juvenile correctional workers. In turn, the measures and statistical techniques that are used to explore the possible impact of correctional orientation on job stress, job satisfaction, and use of physical force are examined. This chapter ends with description of the limitations of the study.

### **SAMPLE**

The data used to test the research questions presented at the end of the first chapter come from a secondary dataset. The information was gathered as part of a survey entitled “Ohio Department of Youth Services’ Use of Force Questionnaire: Determining What is Reasonable.” These self-report surveys were distributed to staff members in juvenile facilities across the state of Ohio by Ohio Department of Youth Services (DYS) staff from September 1998 through February 1999. Respondents were given both written and

oral instructions for completing the survey. Further, most of the information used in the current study has not been analyzed previously.

The fact that DYS used a convenience sample of detention workers makes it impossible to report a response rate for completed surveys. Therefore, this dissertation is best viewed as an exploratory study in an under-researched area. Nevertheless, the sample is composed of a diverse group of juvenile correctional workers. Individuals in the sample were employed at both county detention centers and long-term treatment facilities. Most of the facilities were coed, while a few housed only boys or only girls. Additionally, some facilities housed juveniles only after they were adjudicated delinquent, whereas others held youths in the pre-adjudication stage.

There were 259 cases in the original dataset. However, 64 individuals indicated their work was clerical or involved only indirect contact with juveniles. These individuals were omitted, leaving 195 cases to be analyzed in this dissertation.

Table 2.1 contains descriptive statistics for individuals in the sample. An examination of the sample's individual characteristics reveals that the majority of respondents are white and male. Additionally, most respondents considered themselves to be politically neutral. The age range for the sample is 18 to 59, with an average age of 35.38 years. The mean level of formal education is just over 15 years, with a minimum of 9 and a maximum of 18 years. Further, a review of the descriptive statistics for the work-related experiences of the sample specifies that respondents had been employed with their current agency from 0 to 30 years, with a mean of 6.92 years. Moreover, almost three quarters of the sample were line officers. Respondents also reported having

Table 2.1: Sample Characteristics

Variable	Percentage	Number
<b>Sex</b>		
Male	67.5	131
Female	32.5	63
<b>Race</b>		
White	68.0	132
Black	32.0	56
<b>Political Orientation</b>		
Very Liberal	4.7	9
Liberal	19.9	38
Neutral	45.5	87
Conservative	28.3	54
Very Conservative	1.6	3
<b>Job Title</b>		
Supervisor	26.16	51
Line Staff	73.84	144
Mean Age	35.38	
Mean Years Education	15.02	
Mean Years at Present Agency	6.92	
Mean Number of Times Used Physical Force in the Last Year	4.89	

used physical force against a juvenile in their custody an average of 4.89 times over the previous year (see Table 2.1).<sup>1</sup>

## INDEPENDENT VARIABLES

### Individual Characteristics

As discussed previously, the individual experiences/importation model involves demographic factors of individuals. All of the variables within this model were measured with only one item. The measure for each characteristic is described below.

**Age.** Though results are inconsistent, previous research has shown that age is a significant predictor of correctional orientation (Farkas, 2000; Jackson and Ammen, 1996; Jurik, 1985b; Jurik and Musheno, 1986; Klofas and Toch, 1982; Robinson et al., 1997; Sundt and Cullen, 2002; Van Voorhis et al., 1991), job satisfaction (Nlau et al., 1986; Saylor and Wright, 1992) and use of force among police officers (Cohen and Chaiken, 1972; Garner et al., 2002; Terrill and Mastofski, 2002). In this study, respondents were asked about their age at the time of the survey. Each respondent's age was measured directly with an open-ended question that asked the person to report his or her "current age."

**Education.** Prior research has also demonstrated relationships between education and correctional orientation (Burton et al., 1991; Poole and Regoli, 1980a; Robinson et al., 1993, 1997), correctional worker job stress (Lindquist and Whitehead, 1986), job satisfaction (Cullen et al., 1985; Jurik et al., 1987; Lindquist and Whitehead, 1986; Robinson et al., 1997; Van Voorhis et al., 1991), and police officer use of force (Cascio,

---

<sup>1</sup> Three extreme outliers in the number of times respondents used physical force in the last year were excluded from the analysis. The values of these outliers were 40, 50, and 80.

1977; Cohen and Chaiken, 1972; Terrill and Mastrofski, 2002; Worden, 1995). While there are various ways to measure education, it was measured in years for the present study. Respondents were asked to report their “years of formal education.”

***Race.*** Studies research have revealed that race is sometimes related to correctional orientation (Cullen et al., 1989, 1993; Jacobs and Kraft, 1978; Jurik, 1985b; Van Voorhis et al., 1991; Wright and Saylor, 1992), job stress (Britton; 1997), job satisfaction (Britton, 1997; Cullen et al., 1985; Van Voorhis et al., 1991), and police use of force (Cohen and Chaiken, 1972; Garner et al., 2002). Respondents were asked an open-ended question to report their “race.” All of the respondents in the sample classified themselves as either white or black.

***Gender.*** Gender has been associated with correctional orientation (Bazemore et al., 1994; Crouch and Alpert, 1982; Gordon, 1999; Sundt and Cullen, 2002; Whitehead and Lindquist, 1992) and levels of work stress (Blau et al., 1986; Cullen et al., 1985; Van Voorhis et al., 1991; Wright and Saylor, 1991; Zupan, 1986). Gender has also been related to police use of force (Garner et al. 1995, 2002; Hickman et al., 2000). A straightforward open-ended question asked respondents to list their gender.

***Political Orientation.*** The political orientation of correctional workers has seldom been measured in studies of correctional orientation or reactions to the job. However, research on the general public has shown that political ideology is related to punitiveness (Grasmick et al., 1993). Therefore, it is possible that political beliefs may shape opinions and reactions of correctional workers. Individuals in this sample were given a five-item response set to indicate their political orientation. They were asked if they considered

themselves to be “very liberal,” “liberal,” “neutral,” “conservative,” or “very conservative.”

### **Work-Related Variables**

The work role/prisonization model maintains that a correctional institution’s organizational factors and the work role affect attitudes and reactions of correctional workers. The measures and scales for the work-related variables used in this study are explained below.

***Years at Present Agency.*** Other studies of correctional workers have revealed that correctional experience was significantly related to correctional orientation (Cullen et al., 1989, 1993; Jurik, 1985b; Sundt and Cullen, 2002; Van Voorhis et al., 1991), work stress (Blau et al., 1986; Britton, 1997; Cullen et al., 1985; Patterson, 1992; Van Voorhis et al., 1991; Whitehead and Lindquist, 1985; Wright and Saylor, 1991), and job satisfaction (Britton, 1997; Jurik and Halemba, 1984; Stevens, 1998; Van Voorhis et al., 1991). Policing research has also demonstrated that experience in the field may be related to use of physical force (Terrill and Mastrofski, 2002). For this study, experience was measured in terms of years at present agency. Respondents were asked one open-ended question to gauge their correctional experience with their employer. Specifically, each individual was asked to report the number of years of service with his or her present agency.

***Dangerousness.*** Perceptions of dangerous has been significantly related to correctional orientation (Sundt and Cullen, 2002), job stress (Cullen et al., 1985; Grossi, Keil, and Vito, 1996), and job satisfaction (Cullen et al., 1985) among correctional workers. Perceived dangerous was measured by an additive index consisting of five items. Individuals in the sample were asked to respond to each item by circling one

response on a six-item Likert scale ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree. The five items on the survey are:

1. I work in a dangerous job.
2. In my job, a person stands a good chance of getting hurt.
3. There is really not much chance of getting hurt at work.
4. My job is a lot more dangerous than other kinds of jobs.
5. A lot of the people I work with get physically injured in the line of duty.

These items have been used in previous research by Cullen et al. (1985, 1989) and Van Voorhis et al. (1991). Responses for each item were coded so that higher numbers represent higher levels of perceived dangerousness. The items were summed to form the overall dangerousness scale. The reliability coefficient (alpha) for the dangerousness index is .795 (see Table 2.2).

***Role Conflict.*** Correctional workers may experience role conflict when they are not sure of the means through which to maintain order in their institution or when they are forced to balance dual roles of providing custody and rehabilitation (Cullen et al., 1985; Farkas, 2001). Several previous studies have shown that role conflict is related to correctional orientation (Cullen et al., 1989; Farkas, 2000; Hepburn and Albonetti, 1980; Poole and Regoli, 1980a; Shamir and Drory, 1982; Sundt and Cullen, 2002; Whitehead and Lindquist, 1989). Role conflict has also been associated with work stress (Cheek and Miller, 1983; Cullen et al., 1985).

An additive index composed of four items was used to measure role conflict for this study. These items were drawn from Rizzo, House, and Lirtzman's (1970) research on role conflict in complex organizations. Respondents were asked to circle one response on

Table 2.2: Reliability Coefficients for Multiple-Item Additive Indexes

Index	Number of Cases	Number of Items	Cronbach's Alpha
Rehabilitative Orientation	188	9	.819
Custodial Orientation	191	7	.715
Supervisory Support	187	3	.689
Dangerousness	191	5	.795
Role Conflict	186	4	.715
Work Stress	189	4	.798
Job Satisfaction	190	5	.767

a six-item Likert scale that ranged from strongly agree to strongly disagree. The individual items are:

1. In my job, I receive incompatible requests from two or more people.
2. At work I receive assignments without the manpower to complete them.
3. I do things that are apt to be accepted by one person and not accepted by others.
4. I have to do things at work that should be done differently.

Before being added together to construct the index, each of the items was coded so that higher numbers represent more role conflict. The role conflict index has an alpha of .715 (see Table 2.2).

***Supervisory Support.*** Cullen et al., (1989) found that supervisory support was a significant predictor of custodial orientation among correctional workers. Levels of supervisory support have also been associated with work stress (Cullen et al. 1985, Grossi et al., 1996; Van Voorhis et al., 1991) and job satisfaction (Cullen et al., 1985; Van Voorhis et al., 1991).

Respondents were asked to use the same six-item Likert scale to respond to three items concerning supervisory support. These three items were used in previous research by Cullen et al. (1989). The items are:

1. The people I work with often have the importance of their job stressed to them by their supervisors.
2. My supervisors often encourage the people I work with if they do their job well.
3. When my supervisors have a dispute with one of my fellow coworkers they usually try to handle it in a friendly way.

Again, these variables were coded so that higher numbers represent higher levels of supervisory support before they were summed. The Cronbach's alpha for this scale is .689 (see Table 2.2).

**Job Title.** The survey data used in this dissertation do not contain an indicator of the extent individuals are involved in treatment efforts. However, one survey item asked respondents to specify their job title. Answers to this question made it possible to discern between line officers and those with supervisory responsibilities. For that reason, the variable is included in the analyses to examine potential differences between those with and without direct supervisory duties over other employees. Line officers include respondents that classified themselves as correctional officers, youth supervisors, and youth leaders. Supervisors included unit coordinators, shift managers, supervisors, and directors.

## **DEPENDENT VARIABLES**

### **Correctional Orientation**

Research has shown that support for punishment or rehabilitation should not be conceptualized as mutually exclusive (Cullen et al., 1989, 2000). It is clear that members of the general public, along with correctional workers, believe offenders should be both punished and rehabilitated. Therefore, it was necessary to use two measures, one scale to measure support for rehabilitation and another scale measuring support for custody.

**Rehabilitative Orientation.** Nine items were used to construct a scale to measure rehabilitative attitudes. The same six-item Likert scale was used for responses to the statements. These items have been used in prior research (see Cullen et al., 1985, 1989; Cullen, Skovron et al., 1990; Van Voorhis et al., 1991). Each of the items was coded so

that higher values indicate higher levels of rehabilitation. The alpha coefficient for the summed scale is .819 (see Table 2.2). The items composing the scale are:

1. Rehabilitating a criminal is just as important as making a criminal pay for his or her crime.
2. One of the reasons why rehabilitation programs often fail with prisoners is because they are underfunded; if enough money were available, these programs would work.
3. The most effective and humane cure to the crime problem in America is to make a strong effort to rehabilitate offenders.
4. We should stop viewing criminals as victims of society who deserve to be rehabilitated and start paying more attention to the victims of these offenders.
5. The rehabilitation of prisoners has proven to be a failure.
6. All rehabilitation programs have done is to allow criminals who deserve to be punished to get off easily.
7. The only way to reduce crime in society is to punish criminals, not try to rehabilitate them.
8. The rehabilitation of adult criminals just does not work.
9. I would support expanding the rehabilitation programs with criminals that are now being undertaken in our prisons.

***Custody Orientation.*** Seven items were used to explore support for custody. These items were originally used by Poole and Regoli (1980a) but have since been used in several other studies (see Cullen et al., 1985, 1989; Cullem, Skovron et al., 1990; Van Voorhis et al., 1991). The same Likert scale was used for these items, and responses for each item were coded so that higher values designate more support for custody. The reliability coefficient for the summed scale is .715 (see Table 2.2). The individual items are:

1. Keeping inmates from causing trouble is my major concern while I'm on the job.
2. So long as the inmates I supervise stay quiet and don't cause any trouble, I really don't care if they are getting rehabilitated or cured while they are in here.
3. My job isn't to rehabilitate inmates; it is only to keep them orderly so that they don't hurt anyone or tear this place apart.
4. An inmate will go straight only when he finds that prison life is hard.
5. Many people don't realize it, but prisons today are too soft on inmates.
6. We would be successful even if all we taught inmates was a little respect for authority.
7. Sleep 'em, feed 'em, and work 'em is the best way to handle inmates.

### **Work Stress**

It is important to examine levels and sources of correctional worker job stress because it has been related to reduced work performance and even health problems (Cullen et al., 1985; Huckabee, 1992; Morris, 1986; Mitchell, MacKenzie, Styve, and Gover, 2000; Sims, 2001). Job stress has been defined as, "an individual's feelings of job-related anxiety and pressure" (Liou, 1995, p. 427). Four items composed the additive scale to assess work stress in this study. These items were used in a previous study by Cullen and his colleagues (1989), and the scale's Cronbach's alpha for this dataset is .798. Respondents were asked to use the six-item Likert scale to respond to the following statements:

1. I usually feel that I am under a lot of pressure when I am at work.
2. When I am at work, I often feel tense or uptight.
3. I am usually calm and at ease when I am working.

4. There are a lot of aspects about my job that can make me pretty upset about things.

### **Job Satisfaction**

Five items were used to measure job satisfaction. These items were originally drawn from the *Quality of Employment Survey* (Quinn and Shepard, 1974) and have been used in other corrections research (e.g., Cullen et al., 1985; Van Voorhis et al., 1991). The items used in the survey are:

1. All in all, how satisfied are you with your job?
  - a. Not satisfied at all
  - b. Not too satisfied
  - c. Somewhat satisfied
  - d. Very Satisfied
2. Knowing what you know now, if you had to decide all over again whether to take the job you now have, what would you decide?
  - a. Decide definitely not to take the same job
  - b. Have second thoughts about taking my job
  - c. Decide without hesitation to take the same job
3. In general, how well would you say your job measures up to the sort of job you wanted when you took it?
  - a. Not very much like the job I wanted
  - b. Somewhat like the job I wanted
  - c. Very much like the job I wanted
4. If a good friend of yours told you he (or she) was interested in working in a job like yours for your employer, what would you tell him (or her)?
  - a. Advise my friend against taking the job
  - b. Have doubts about recommending this job
  - c. Strongly recommend the job
5. If you were free to go into any type of job you wanted, what would your choice be?
  - a. Prefer some other job to the job I have now
  - b. Want to retire and not work at all
  - c. Keep the job I now have

These items were coded by assigning each response a numeric value specified by Quinn and Staines (1979). Responses for each case were then summed and averaged. The final scale ranges from 1 to 5, and higher scores designate higher levels of job satisfaction. The job satisfaction index has an alpha coefficient of .767 (see Table 2.2).

### **Use of Physical Force**

Very little research has examined use of physical force within correctional institutions. In policing studies, researchers use various measures of use of force, often grouping it according to type of force (e.g., verbal or physical) or level of force (e.g., reasonable or excessive). Several studies have also used a dichotomous measure of force or no force (e.g., Friedich, 1980; Garner, Buchanan, Schade, and Hepburn, 1996). For the purposes of this study, physical force was defined as something more than verbal commands, ranging from balance displacement to deadly force. Respondents were asked to report the number of physical confrontations they had been involved in with juveniles in their custody within the past year.

## **STATISTICAL TECHNIQUES**

Univariate, bivariate, and multivariate statistical techniques are all used in this research. First, univariate descriptive statistics are presented to describe the sample and examine levels of support for both rehabilitation and custody. The majority of these descriptives are presented as percentages.

Second, bivariate correlations between all variables are presented. These correlations reveal the extent and direction in which two variables covary.

Correlations are also useful in determining the possibility of multicollinearity, which occurs when two variables are so highly correlated that they are essentially measuring the same thing (Bachman and Paternoster, 1997). Pearson correlation coefficients are presented, and any statistically significant relationships are noted.

Last, multivariate ordinary least squares (OLS) regression models are used to assess which individual and work-related factors are significant predictors of the dependent variables. This type of regression is used to show the level of change in the dependent variable for a one-unit change in the independent variable while controlling for other independent variables in the model (Bachman and Paternoster, 1997). OLS models are presented to examine effects of the independent variables on correctional orientation, work stress, job satisfaction, and use of physical force.

### **LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY**

There are three limitations of this study that should be discussed. First, the data are cross-sectional; that is, respondents were only surveyed at one point in time. Therefore, issues of causal ordering may arise. For example, some earlier cross-sectional research in this area has argued that job satisfaction is a significant predictor of a rehabilitative orientation (Arthur, 1994; Hepburn and Albonetti, 1980; Whitehead and Lindquist, 1989, 1992), whereas other research has contended that correctional orientation predicts levels of job satisfaction (Cullen et al., 1985). Nonetheless, causality cannot be definitively established without longitudinal data.

Second, working night shift has been found to be a significant predictor of correctional orientation (Cullen et al., 1989; Farkas, 2000; Van Voorhis et al., 1991).

Unfortunately, the dataset used in this study did not allow for examination of this variable. Therefore, it is possible that the models predicting correctional orientation are missing an important variable.

The third limitation is the amount of missing data. In the OLS regression equations, cases that have missing values for even one measure are excluded from the analysis. Therefore, up to 37 cases may be omitted from at least one of the regression models. Still, there are enough cases for reliable OLS regression models. Rather than replacing missing data with estimates that may not be accurate, each analysis uses only cases for which valid data were available.<sup>2</sup>

### **CONCLUDING REMARKS**

This chapter has discussed the sample, measures, and techniques used for this study. Using cross-sectional data collected from a sample of juvenile correctional workers in Ohio, this dissertation analyzes the levels of support for both rehabilitation and custody. Then, the dissertation examines individual and work-related predictors of correctional orientations among the sample. The last three analyses will explore affects of correctional orientation on work stress, job satisfaction, and use of physical force net of individual and work-related control variable. The following chapter contains the results of the analyses.

---

<sup>2</sup> Each model was also performed using: 1) mean replacement and 2) linear interpolation for missing data values. The results were consistent with those in the models presented that omit the missing data.

## **CHAPTER 3**

### **RESULTS**

The previous chapter was an explanation of the methods used to collect and analyze the data for this dissertation. This chapter is a discussion of the results of these analyses, beginning with a description of the work-related experiences of individuals in the sample. The second section is an examination of the levels of support for rehabilitation and custody among the sample. Next is a discussion of the assumptions of OLS regression and data considerations for the multivariate analyses that will follow. The fourth section reports the results of the OLS models regressing rehabilitative and custodial orientations on individual characteristics and work-related variables. The final section of this chapter contains results of the OLS models exploring the effect of correctional orientation on work stress, job satisfaction, and use of physical force while controlling for other individual and work-related characteristics.

#### **WORK-RELATED EXPERIENCES**

Prior research on adult correctional workers has indicated that work-related experiences are significantly related to correctional orientation and job reactions (e.g., Cullen et al., 1985; 1989; Farkas, 2000; Grossi et al., 1996; Hepburn and Albonetti, 1980; Poole and Regoli, 1980a; Shamir and Drory, 1982; Sundt and Cullen, 2002; Whitehead and Lindquist, 1989). Therefore, measures of perceived dangerousness, supervisory support, and role conflict provide are each included in the multivariate analyses presented later in this chapter. Further, these variables provide a context for understanding how

respondents experienced their work situations. This section is an examination of these three work-related experiences.

Correctional workers must cope with the constant possibility of being victimized while at work. Therefore, their levels of perceived dangerousness might influence their beliefs and work reactions. Overall, members of this sample perceived their jobs to be relatively dangerous. As shown in Table 3.1, the majority of the sample at least slightly agreed that they work in a dangerous job (item 1) and that they have a good chance of getting hurt at work (items 2 and 3). Further, more than three quarters of individuals in the sample believed that their jobs were more dangerous than other kinds of jobs.

Support from supervisors is important in any occupation, including correctional work. Cullen et al. (1985) and Van Voorhis et al. (1991), for example, found that supervisory support served to both increase job satisfaction and reduce work stress. Most of the juvenile correctional workers in this sample indicated that they did, in fact, receive support from their supervisors. Specifically, the majority of sample members at least slightly agreed with each item composing the supervisory support index (see Table 3.2).

Finally, prior research has shown that role conflict is related to correctional orientation and work stress (e.g., Cheek and Miller, 1983; Cullen et al., 1985, 1989; Farkas, 2000; Hepburn and Albonetti, 1980; Poole and Regoli, 1980a; Shamir and Drory, 1982; Sundt and Cullen, 2002; Whitehead and Lindquist, 1989). Answers to items in the role conflict scale reveal that these juvenile correctional workers experience a moderate amount of role conflict at work. As Table 3.3 reports, the majority indicated they “receive incompatible requests from two or more people” (item 1), they do things

Table 3.1: Items Composing Dangerousness Scale, Percentages Reported

Items	Strongly Agree	Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1. I work in a dangerous job.	8.3	29.2	33.9	8.3	15.1	5.2
2. In my job, a person stands a good chance of getting hurt.	15.6	29.7	29.2	13.0	9.9	2.6
3. There is really not much chance of getting hurt at work.	2.6	7.8	9.9	26.0	33.3	20.3
4. My job is a lot more dangerous than other kinds of jobs.	9.4	30.9	36.1	9.9	11.5	2.1
5. A lot of the people I work with get physically injured in the line of duty.	4.2	12.5	14.1	15.6	44.3	9.4
Dangerousness Scale Range	5 to 30					
Dangerousness Scale Mean	19.52					

Table 3.2: Items Composing Supervisory Support Scale, Percentages Reported

Items	Strongly Agree	Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1. The people I work with often have the importance of their job stressed to them by their supervisors.	9.9	36.6	19.4	14.7	16.8	2.6
2. My supervisors often encourage the people I work with if they do their job well.	13.1	34.6	24.6	12.0	9.9	5.8
3. When my supervisors have a dispute with one of my fellow coworkers they usually try to handle it in a friendly way.	14.3	41.3	27.0	10.6	4.8	2.1
Supervisory Support Scale Range	3 to 18					
Supervisory Support Scale Mean	12.53					

Table 3.3: Items Composing Role Conflict Scale, Percentages Reported

Items	Strongly Agree	Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1. In my job, I receive incompatible requests from two or more people.	7.9	21.7	22.2	11.1	20.7	6.3
2. At work I receive assignments without the manpower to complete them.	3.7	9.9	18.3	13.6	46.1	8.4
3. I do things that are apt to be accepted by one person and not accepted by others.	8.4	25.3	23.2	9.5	27.9	5.8
4. I have to do things at work that should be done differently.	9.4	23.0	23.0	16.2	25.7	2.6
Role Conflict Scale Range	4 to 24					
Role Conflict Scale Mean	13.60					

that are accepted by some but not others (item 3), and they do things that should be done differently (item 4).

## **LEVELS OF SUPPORT FOR REHABILITATION AND CUSTODY**

Chapter 1 contained a review of research investigating support for rehabilitation and custody among correctional workers and the general public. While several studies have explored sources of correctional orientation among correctional workers (e.g., Burton et al., 1991; Cullen et al., 1993; Farkas, 2000; Sundt and Cullen, 2002; Van Voorhis et al., 1991; Whitehead and Lindquist, 1989), many do not report the actual levels of support for rehabilitation and custody. It is important, however, to understand the *levels* of support for each orientation before exploring their respective sources.

As discussed in Chapter 1, previous research has shown that correctional workers hold complex views about rehabilitation and punishment (Cullen et al., 1989; 1993; Cullen, Golden, and Cullen, 1983; Sundt and Cullen, 2002). In particular, studies have shown that correctional employees are not exclusively rehabilitative or punitively oriented. Rather, they tend to embrace both ideals simultaneously. Using descriptive statistics for the items composing the rehabilitation and custody indexes, the following two sections contain a discussion of the levels of support for both rehabilitation and custody.

### **Support for Rehabilitation**

Table 3.4 presents results of the forced-choice question that asked respondents to choose “the main purpose for putting an offender in prison?” Consistent with Cullen et al.’s (1989) findings from a sample of prison guards in adult facilities, fewer

Table 3.4: Main Purpose of Prisons

	Percentage	Number
What, in your opinion, is the main reason for putting an offender in prison?		
To rehabilitate him	7.0	13
To protect society by making sure that he does not commit crimes for a while	38.0	71
To punish him for what he did wrong	32.0	60
To deter him from committing a crime in the future	23.0	43

respondents (7 percent) chose the rehabilitation option than any of the other choices. However, there are notable differences when these results are compared to findings from the general public. Specifically, about half of respondents in several public surveys chose rehabilitation as the main purpose of prisons (e.g., Applegate et al., 1997; Cullen et al., 2002; Cullen, Skovron et al., 1990; Flanagan, 1996).

Nevertheless, responses to this question among this sample are not an indication that these juvenile correctional workers hold a solely punitive orientation. In particular, protection of society was chosen as the main purpose of prisons more often than any of the other responses. This result indicates a preference for incapacitation over the other three options, including punishment. It is important to note, however, that while this forced-choice question taps the main goal an individual endorses, it does not fully measure that person's correctional orientation. That is, even if respondents choose an option other than rehabilitation as the main purpose of prisons, it is not an indication that they reject rehabilitation as an objective of their work. Prior research in the area has shown that more detailed measures indicate that most correctional workers do support rehabilitation as a goal of corrections, even if it is secondary to more custodial concerns (see Cullen et al., 1993). The results of the more specific questions concerning rehabilitation are discussed below.

Descriptive statistics for the items contained in the rehabilitative scale are presented in Table 3.5. The overall scores from the additive index indicate that members of the sample have moderate support for rehabilitation. Nevertheless, answers to the specific questions within the scale reveal the complex nature of the correctional ideologies of individuals within the sample. Thus, it might be argued

Table 3.5: Juvenile Correctional Worker Support for Rehabilitation, Percentages Reported

Items	Strongly Agree	Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1. Rehabilitating a criminal is just as important as making a criminal pay for his or her crime.	27.1	41.7	15.1	5.7	8.3	2.1
2. One of the reasons why rehabilitation programs often fail with prisoners is because they are underfunded; if enough money were available, these programs would work.	6.2	9.8	25.9	16.6	32.6	8.8
3. The most effective and humane cure to the crime problem in America is to make a strong effort to rehabilitate offenders.	10.9	26.0	26.0	13.5	18.8	4.7
4. We should stop viewing criminals as victims of society who deserve to be rehabilitated and start paying more attention to the victims of these offenders.	1.0	6.8	44.3	0.0	29.2	18.8

Table 3.5 (continued): Juvenile Correctional Worker Support for Rehabilitation, Percentages Reported

Items	Strongly Agree	Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
5. The rehabilitation of prisoners has proven to be a failure.	8.3	29.5	45.6	0.0	11.4	5.2
6. All rehabilitation programs have done is to allow criminals who deserve to be punished to get off easily.	8.3	31.6	46.1	0.0	10.4	3.6
7. The only way to reduce crime in society is to punish criminals, not try to rehabilitate them.	14.0	38.9	34.2	0.0	10.4	2.6
8. The rehabilitation of adult criminals just does not work.	7.3	30.6	49.2	0.0	9.3	3.6
9. I would support expanding the rehabilitation programs with criminals that are now being undertaken in our prisons.	7.3	29.8	31.4	17.3	11.5	2.6
Rehabilitation Scale Range	9 to 54					
Rehabilitation Scale Mean	30.87					

that responses to several of the questions within the rehabilitation index signify that these respondents do not embrace a rehabilitative orientation. For example, as displayed in Table 3.5, the majority of the sample at least slightly agreed that “the rehabilitation of prisoners has proven to be a failure” (item 5), and they were skeptical that more funding would increase the effectiveness of treatment programs (item 2). Additionally, respondents tended to believe that rehabilitation has allowed offenders to get off easily (item 6), and that punishment, not rehabilitation, is the best way to reduce crime (item 7). These results are not unlike those reported in other correctional worker and public opinion research (e.g., Cullen et al., 1988, 1989). Responses to one question, however, are substantially different from public opinion research. Specifically, 87.1 percent of the sample at least slightly agreed that “the rehabilitation of adult criminals just does not work” (item 8), whereas less than 30 percent of the public generally agree with similar statements (see Cullen et al., 1988; Cullen, Golden, and Cullen, 1983).

Responses to other questions within the rehabilitation index reveal that these juvenile correctional workers do, in fact, embrace some rehabilitative ideals. Consistent with Cullen et al.’s (1989) results for adult correctional officers, almost 70 percent of the sample agreed or strongly agreed that rehabilitating an offender is just as important as making him or her pay for the crime (item 1). Additionally, 62.9 percent at least slightly agreed that rehabilitation is the most effective and humane way to cure crime in America (item 3), and almost 7 of 10 respondents indicated that they would support the expansion of rehabilitative programs that are already in place (item 9).

Consistent with prior research on correctional workers in adult institutions, as well as the general public, these juvenile correctional workers appear to have mixed views about rehabilitation. Answers to the questions comprising the rehabilitation index indicate that they hold complex, if not inconsistent, views about rehabilitation. While answers to some items suggest these workers are not very concerned about rehabilitative issues, other responses suggest members of the sample do support some rehabilitative ideals. The next section presents responses to the questions contained within the custody index.

### **Support for Custody**

When asked the forced-choice question about the main reason for putting an offender in prison, 70 percent of the sample chose either “to punish him for what he did wrong” or protection of society (see Table 3.4). Therefore, more than twice as many respondents chose punishment or incapacitation over rehabilitation or deterrence as the main purpose of prisons. Again, this forced-choice question does not fully reflect the correctional orientation of respondents. The results of the survey questions composing the custody index are presented below.

The total scores on the additive custodial index specify moderate overall support for custody among the sample (see Table 3.6). Responses to many of the individual questions within the custody index also indicate support for custody. More than 70 percent of the sample, for instance, agreed or strongly agreed that they do not care if inmates are getting rehabilitated as long as they stay quiet and do not cause any trouble (item 2). Further, 70.3 percent at least slightly agreed that their job is not to rehabilitate but to keep inmates orderly (item 3), and almost 72 percent said that

Table 3.6: Juvenile Correctional Worker Support for Custody, Percentages Reported

Items	Strongly Agree	Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1. Keeping inmates from causing trouble is my major concern while I'm on the job.	4.1	11.4	26.4	0.0	35.2	22.8
2. So long as the inmates I supervise stay quiet and don't cause any trouble, I really don't care if they are getting rehabilitated or cured while they are in here.	24.9	46.1	21.2	0.0	5.2	2.6
3. My job isn't to rehabilitate inmates; it is only to keep them orderly so that they don't hurt anyone or tear this place apart.	14.6	27.1	28.6	0.0	20.8	8.9
4. An inmate will go straight only when he finds that prison life is hard.	19.2	34.7	32.1	0.0	9.3	4.7
5. Many people don't realize it, but prisons today are too soft on inmates.	5.7	22.9	43.2	0.0	15.1	13.0
6. We would be successful even if all we taught inmates was a little respect for authority.	7.3	29.0	46.6	0.0	14.5	2.6
7. Sleep 'em, feed 'em, and work 'em is the best way to handle inmates.	13.5	44.6	31.6	0.0	8.3	2.1
Custody Scale Range	7 to 42					
Custody Scale Mean	28.07					

prisons are too soft on inmates (item 5). The majority of respondents also agreed or strongly agreed that “sleep ‘em, feed ‘em, and work ‘em is the best way to handle inmates” (item 7). These results resemble those found among correctional officers in adult facilities (Cullen et al., 1989). However, 58 percent of the sample disagreed or strongly disagreed that keeping inmates from causing trouble is their main concern while they are on the job (item 1). While the survey did not contain an item assessing specific concerns while on the job, responses to this item are indicative that sample members have job concerns that are more than just custodial.

Overall, it appears that these juvenile correctional workers harbor some custodial views. However, even respondents that supported custody, as indicated by their scores on the overall custody index, often supported statements endorsing rehabilitation as a goal of corrections. As shown in Table 3.7, the majority of individuals that scored above the mid-point of the overall custody index also at least slightly agreed that rehabilitation is just as important as retribution (item 1) and that rehabilitation is the most effective and humane cure to the crime problem (item 2). Almost three quarters also indicated that they would support expanding rehabilitation programs that are already in place (item 4). These results, along with the previously discussed findings regarding rehabilitation, specify that these workers have *both* rehabilitative and custodial beliefs. Their ideals do not appear to be substantially different from correctional workers in adult facilities or the general public. The sources of these two orientations are examined later in this chapter.

Table 3.7: Support for Rehabilitation as a Goal of Corrections Among Respondents Who Support Custody (n = 142)\*

Items Measuring Support for Rehabilitation as a Correctional Goal	Percent
1. Rehabilitating a criminal is just as important as making a criminal pay for his or her crime. (At least slightly agree)	85.9
2. The most effective and humane cure to the crime problem in America is to make a strong effort to rehabilitate offenders. (At least slightly agree)	68.3
3. The only way to reduce crime in society is to punish criminals, not try to rehabilitate them. (At least slightly disagree)	35.9
4. I would support expanding the rehabilitation programs with criminals that are now being undertaken in our prisons. (At least slightly agree)	74.6

\*Support for custody is indicated as above the mid-point of the overall additive custody index

## **DATA CONSIDERATIONS FOR MULTIVARIATE ANALYSES**

The results presented previously in this chapter suggest that there is support for both rehabilitation and custody among this sample of juvenile correctional workers. However, the correctional orientations of individuals in this sample, along with their levels of work stress, job satisfaction, and use of physical force, might be influenced by the individual and work-related characteristics described in the preceding chapters. This section contains a discussion of the assumptions of OLS regression, including a review of the diagnostic information that suggests that these data are suitable for this technique.

Multiple OLS regression is a statistical technique that measures the relative linear effect of a set of independent variables on the specified dependent variable (Pedhazur, 1997). This procedure makes it possible to predict values of the dependent variable for each value of the independent variables while also examining the amount of variance in the dependent variable that is explained by the independent variables in the model. OLS regression has proven to be a robust statistical procedure as long as its assumptions are not violated (Bachman and Paternoster, 1997).

The first assumption of OLS regression is that there is a linear relationship between the dependent and independent variables within the model. That is, the value of the dependent variable is proportionate to the independent variable, and the relationship can be represented by a straight line (Pagano, 1990). For these data, scatter diagrams of the values of the independent and dependent variables included in each model do not give reason to doubt the specification of the relationships as linear.

Homoscedasticity is the assumption that the variance of the error term associated with prediction of the dependent variable is the same across values of the independent variables (Berry and Feldman, 1985). If the error term does not have constant variance across values, heteroscedasticity exists. While heteroscedasticity does not bias the regression coefficients, it will influence tests of significance. Therefore, a plot of the regression residuals against the values of the independent variables was conducted for each OLS model used in this dissertation. The results indicate that heteroscedasticity is not a problem for these data.

Another assumption of OLS is that there is no autocorrelation within the model. Autocorrelation occurs when the error associated with one observation is related to the error of another observation. The assumption, therefore, is that any existing error is random. Like heteroscedasticity, autocorrelation will not affect the regression coefficients but it is likely to bias significance tests (Lewis-Beck, 1980). While autocorrelation is much more common with time series data, it sometimes occurs with cross-sectional data. To determine if autocorrelation is a problem with data used in this dissertation, a Durbin-Watson statistic was calculated for each OLS model. Results of this technique ranged from 1.790 to 2.075, indicating that autocorrelation is not a concern with these data.

The presence of multicollinearity also violates an assumption of OLS. Multicollinearity occurs when two or more independent variables are so highly correlated that their individual influences cannot be discerned (Bachman and Paternoster, 1997). Further, multicollinearity is likely to bias regression coefficients. A review of the Pearson correlation matrix presented in Table 3.8 reveals that the

Table 3.8: Pearson Correlation Matrix for All Variables

	Age	Education	Race (White)	Gender (Male)	Political Orientation (Conservative)	Years at Present Agency	Dangerousness
1. Age	1.000						
2. Education	-.072	1.000					
3. Race (White)	-.036	.112	1.000				
4. Gender (Male)	.152*	.039	-.126	1.000			
5. Political Orientation (Conservative)	.088	.050	.038	.100	1.000		
6. Years at Present Agency	.623**	-.095	-.046	.156*	.022	1.000	
7. Dangerousness	-.087	-.251**	-.246**	.049	-.090	-.040	1.000
8. Role Conflict	.006	.067	.013	.062	.039	.039	.154*
9. Work Stress	-.036	.032	.000	.028	.061	.057	.339**
10. Supervisory Support	-.016	.104	-.030	.014	.087	.015	-.032
11. Job Satisfaction	.138	.049	.183*	-.076	.020	-.050	-.269**
12. Job Title (Supervisor)	.196**	.142	-.045	.114	.140	.255**	-.013
13. Rehabilitation Orientation	-.132	-.228**	-.079	-.065	.021	-.086	.200**
14. Custody Orientation	.204**	.135	-.149*	-.182*	-.078	.183*	-.248**
15. Use of Force	-.173*	.060	-.041	-.011	-.142	-.134	.073

\* p = .05, \*\* p = .01

Table 3.8 (continued): Pearson Correlation Matrix for All Variables

	Role Conflict	Work Stress	Supervisory Support	Job Satisfaction	Job Title (Supervisor)	Rehabilitation Orientation	Custody Orientation	Use of Force
1. Age								
2. Education								
3. Race (White)								
4. Gender (Male)								
5. Political Orientation (Conservative)								
6. Years at Present Agency								
7. Dangerousness								
8. Role Conflict	1.000							
9. Work Stress	.476**	1.000						
10. Supervisory Support	-.216**	-.187*	1.000					
11. Job Satisfaction	-.266**	-.395**	.358**	1.000				
12. Job Title (Supervisor)	.054	.055	.064	.105	1.000			
13. Rehabilitation Orientation	.094	.169*	-.039	-.058	-.002	1.000		
14. Custody Orientation	-.075	-.193**	.003	.095	.086	-.447**	1.000	
15. Use of Force	.131	.128	-.031	-.126	-.043	.117	-.123	1.000

\* p = .05, \*\* p = .01

highest correlation between variables occurs between age and years at present agency ( $r = .623$ ). This correlation falls below the common cutoff value of .70, indicating no problems with bivariate collinearity. To ensure there was not a problem with multicollinearity among three or more variables, a series of OLS models were conducted, regressing each of the independent variables on all of the other independent variables. An  $R^2$  value approaching 1.00 for any of these models would signify multicollinearity. However, the highest  $R^2$  value for the diagnostic models was .135, suggesting that the assumption of no multicollinearity has not been violated.

Four of the five OLS models in this dissertation will use limited scales as dependent variables. It might be argued that these limited scales are a violation of OLS regression, as OLS assumes a continuous dependent variable. In a review of the literature on this topic, however, Jaccard and Wan (1996) conclude that the use of scale dependent variables does not bias results of OLS regression. Further, it has been demonstrated that OLS regression remains a robust technique with as few as five ordinal categories representing a continuous dependent variable (see Binder, 1984; Bollen and Barb, 1981; Davison and Sharma, 1990; Zumbo and Zimmerman, 1993).

Using OLS regression, the following section attempts to identify which individual and work-related characteristics influence correctional orientation. Next, to explore the possible impact of correctional orientation on work reactions, work stress, job satisfaction, and use of physical force are each regressed on individual characteristics, work-related variables, and correctional orientation.

## **SOURCES OF CORRECTIONAL ORIENTATION**

The levels of support for rehabilitation and custody were discussed previously in this chapter. This section is concerned with the sources of support for rehabilitation and custody among the sample of juvenile correctional workers. Specifically, this section contains results of the OLS analyses in which rehabilitative and custodial orientation scales were each regressed on the sample's individual characteristics and work-related variables.

### **Sources of Support for Rehabilitation**

Table 3.9 contains the results of the OLS model regressing the rehabilitative orientation index on respondents' individual characteristics and work-related variables. The overall rehabilitative orientation model was statistically significant ( $F = 1.861$ ) and explained only 5 percent of the variance in the dependent variable (adjusted  $R^2 = .050$ ). As shown in the table, none of the work-related characteristics shared a statistically significant relationship with the rehabilitative orientation index. Further, the only significant individual characteristic was education. Specifically, respondents with fewer years of formal education were more likely to support rehabilitation. This result is contrary to previous research conducted among both correctional workers in adult facilities and members of the public, because education generally shares a positive relationship with rehabilitative orientations (e.g., Burton et al., 1991; Cullen, Golden, and Cullen, 1983; Robinson et al., 1993, 1997; Warr and Stafford, 1984).

Table 3.9: Rehabilitative Orientation Regressed on Individual Characteristics and Work-Related Variables

Variable	Rehabilitative Orientation			
	B	Beta	t	Sig
<b>Individual Characteristics</b>				
Age	-.006	-.150	-1.544	.125
Education	-.587	-.234	-2.857	.005
Race (White)	-.775	-.077	-.952	.343
Gender (Male)	-.365	-.039	-.492	.623
Political Orientation (Conservative)	.347	.069	.865	.388
<b>Work-Related Variables</b>				
Years at Present Agency	-.002	-.042	-.427	.670
Dangerousness	.006	.070	.838	.403
Role Conflict	.009	.091	1.135	.258
Supervisory Support	-.002	-.015	-.188	.851
Job Title (Supervisor)	.440	.044	.517	.606
Model Summary	F = 1.861, sig = .055			
	N = 162			
	R <sup>2</sup> = .109			
	Adjusted R <sup>2</sup> = .050			

The fact that only one of the ten predictors in the overall model was statistically significant suggests that these workers have a considerable amount of agreement concerning rehabilitation. Additionally, each of the two competing models only explained a very small amount of variation in the rehabilitation index. Therefore, it is difficult to specify whether the individual characteristics/importation model or the work role/prisonization model is more important in explaining and predicting a rehabilitative orientation among these juvenile correctional workers.

### **Sources of Support for Custody**

The OLS model predicting a custodial/punishment orientation was also statistically significant ( $F = 4.274$ ). This model explained almost 17 percent of the variance in custodial orientations (adjusted  $R^2 = .166$ ), which is more than three times the amount of variance explained in the rehabilitative model. With the exception of political orientation, each of the individual characteristics was a significant predictor of a custodial orientation. Specifically, respondents that were older, more educated ( $p = .10$ )<sup>1</sup>, black, and female were significantly more likely to have a custodial correctional orientation (see Table 3.10). Perceived dangerousness was the only significant work-related variable in the model. Unexpectedly, those who perceived their work to be less dangerous were more likely to hold a custodial orientation.

Although the results of previous research have been contradictory, the finding that blacks and females were more likely to have a custodial orientation is similar to results from some previous public opinion surveys and research in adult correctional facilities (e.g., Farkas, 2000; Jacobs and Kraft, 1978; McCorkle, 1993). The other

---

<sup>1</sup> A significance level of .10 was used throughout this dissertation because of its exploratory nature.

Table 3.10: Custodial Orientation Regressed on Individual Characteristics and Work-Related Variables

Variable	Custodial Orientation			
	B	Beta	t	Sig
<b>Individual Characteristics</b>				
Age	.111	.199	2.203	.029
Education	.482	.145	1.901	.059
Race (White)	-2.919	-.223	-2.959	.004
Gender (Male)	-2.871	-.233	-3.157	.002
Political Orientation (Conservative)	-.527	-.081	-1.091	.277
<b>Work-Related Variables</b>				
Years at Present Agency	.006	.085	.924	.357
Dangerousness	-.262	-.207	-2.662	.009
Role Conflict	-.007	-.051	-.682	.496
Supervisory Support	-.007	-.034	-.458	.647
Job Title (Supervisor)	.953	.071	.910	.364
Model Summary	F = 4.274, sig = .000			
	n = 164			
	R <sup>2</sup> = .217			
	Adjusted R <sup>2</sup> = .166			

significant individual attributes, however, are contrary to previous research on correctional workers. For instance, though Sundt and Cullen (2001) found a significant positive relationship between age and custodial orientations among prison chaplains, the majority of other studies have reported a negative relationship between age and custodial orientations (e.g., Farkas, 2000; Klofas and Toch, 1982). However, significant positive relationships between age and punitive orientations are more common among the public (e.g., Schwartz et al., 1992; Warr and Stafford, 1984). Moreover, when the relationship is significant, education is generally negatively related to custody among both correctional employees and members of the public (e.g., Grasmick, 1993; McCorkle, 1993; Poole and Regoli, 1980a; Schwartz et al., 1992).

The unusual negative relationship between dangerousness and support for custody might be an indicator that the effect of dangerousness might be specified by another variable. A review of the bivariate correlations presented in Table 3.8 reveals a significant correlation between race and dangerousness ( $r = -.246$ ). Therefore, an interaction term for these two variables was created and included in an additional OLS model (see Table 3.11).

The overall model is still significant ( $F = 4.400$ ), and the effects of the variables beyond those involved in the interaction were not substantially altered. The addition of the interaction term, however, increased the model's explained variation by 2 percent (adjusted  $R^2 = .186$ ). Further, the results indicate that the main effects of perceived dangerousness and race are specified by their interaction. When the interaction term is included, the main effects of the two variables are no longer

Table 3.11: Custodial Orientation Regressed on Individual Characteristics and Work-Related Variables, Interaction Term Included

Variable	Custodial Orientation			
	B	Beta	t	Sig
<b>Individual Characteristics</b>				
Age	.123	.220	2.450	.015
Education	.437	.131	1.734	.085
Race (White)	7.774	.594	1.538	.126
Gender (Male)	-2.863	-.232	-3.185	.002
Political Orientation (Conservative)	-.691	-.106	-1.429	.155
<b>Work-Related Variables</b>				
Years at Present Agency	.005	.068	.744	.458
Dangerousness	.138	.109	.661	.510
Role Conflict	-.005	-.041	-.546	.586
Supervisory Support	-.010	-.049	-.665	.507
Job Title (Supervisor)	.995	.074	.961	.338
Race x Dangerousness	-.511	-.802	-2.155	.033
Model Summary	F = 4.400, sig = .000 n = 164 R <sup>2</sup> = .240 Adjusted R <sup>2</sup> = .186			

statistically significant. That is, with all other variables held constant, the significant relationship and direction of the interaction term signify that black respondents with higher levels of perceived dangerousness are significantly more likely to hold custodial orientations.

## **THE IMPACT OF CORRECTIONAL ORIENTATION**

The results presented in the previous section indicate that rehabilitative and custodial correctional orientations among this sample of juvenile correctional workers appear to have some different sources. In particular, age had an opposite effect on the two correctional orientations, and more of the individual characteristics were significantly related to custodial orientations. While it is important to investigate the sources of each type of correctional orientation, it is also valuable to explore the potential influence of these orientations on other aspects of correctional work. Prior research has produced some evidence that correctional orientation might influence other reactions to correctional jobs (see Cullen et al., 1985; Jurik and Halemba, 1984; Poole and Pogrebin, 1988; Poole and Regoli, 1980a; Toch and Klofas, 1982). Work reactions examined in this dissertation include work stress, job satisfaction, and use of force. This section contains results of the analyses examining the possible impact of correctional orientation on these three job reactions.

### **Correctional Orientation and Work Stress**

The descriptive statistics for the items composing the work stress scale are presented in Table 3.12. According to the overall scores on the additive work stress index, members of the sample experienced a moderate amount of work stress. Responses to

Table 3.12: Items Composing Work Stress Scale, Percentages Reported

Items	Strongly Agree	Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1. I usually feel that I am under a lot or pressure when I am at work.	5.8	18.3	25.1	18.3	22.0	10.5
2. When I am at work, I often feel tense or uptight.	4.2	10.0	27.9	14.2	31.1	12.6
3. I am usually calm and at ease when I am working.	11.6	41.1	23.7	14.7	7.4	1.6
4. There are a lot of aspects about my job that can make me pretty upset about things.	14.1	22.5	25.7	12.6	21.5	3.7
Work Stress Scale Range	4 to 24					
Work Stress Scale Mean	12.92					

individual questions within the work stress scale also indicate that members of the sample experience some work stress. Almost half of the respondents, for example, at least slightly agreed that they are under a lot of pressure while at work (item 1) and feel tense or uptight when they are at work (item 2). Additionally, 62.3 percent at least slightly agreed that a lot of aspects about their jobs make them upset (item 4).

Table 3.13 contains the results of the OLS model regressing the work stress measure on the sample's individual characteristics, work-related variables, and correctional orientations. The overall model was significant ( $F = 6.507$ ) and explained almost 30 percent of the variance in work stress (adjusted  $R^2 = .291$ ). More of the variables within the work role/prisonization model were significantly related to work stress than those from the individual experiences/importation model. Perceived dangerousness and role conflict were significantly and positively related to work stress, indicating that those who perceived their job to be more dangerousness and those who experienced more role conflict have more work stress. These findings are consistent with previous research in adult facilities (e.g., Cullen et al., 1985; Grossi et al., 1996; Lombardo, 1981; Poole and Regoli, 1980a; Shamir and Drory, 1982; Triplett et al., 1996; Whitehead and Lindquist, 1986). Two other work-related variables, years at present agency and supervisory support, also approached significance. As expected, those with more work experience and less supervisory support had higher levels of work stress.

Of the individual characteristics, years of formal education, was the only statistically significant predictor of work stress ( $p = .10$ ). Consistent with previous research (e.g., Lindquist and Whitehead, 1986), those with more years of formal education had significantly higher levels of work stress.

Table 3.13: Work Stress Regressed on Individual Characteristics, Work-Related Variables, and Correctional Orientation

Variable	Job Stress			
	B	Beta	t	Sig
<b>Individual Characteristics</b>				
Age	-.001	-.024	-.277	.782
Education	.306	.127	1.739	.084
Race (White)	.498	.051	.707	.480
Gender (Male)	.005	.006	.082	.935
Political Orientation (Conservative)	.194	.040	.579	.563
<b>Work-Related Variables</b>				
Years at Present Agency	.007	.135	1.580	.116
Dangerousness	.264	.286	3.889	.000
Role Conflict	.377	.381	5.432	.000
Supervisory Support	-.164	-.110	-1.597	.112
Job Title (Supervisor)	-.183	-.019	-.257	.797
<b>Correctional Orientation</b>				
Rehabilitative Orientation	.009	.092	1.181	.239
Custody Orientation	-.006	-.081	-.973	.332
Model Summary	F = 6.507, sig = .000 n = 161 R <sup>2</sup> = .344 Adjusted R <sup>2</sup> = .291			

Neither correctional orientation shared a statistically significant relationship with work stress. Including the two correctional orientation indexes to the model added only 1 percent to the adjusted  $R^2$ . However, it is notable that the directions of the slopes for the two orientations are inconsistent with most studies of adult correctional workers (e.g., Cullen et al., 1985; Poole and Pogrebin, 1988; Poole and Regoli, 1980a; Toch and Klofas, 1982), but they are consistent with findings from Liou's (1995) sample of juvenile detention workers.

### **Correctional Orientation and Job Satisfaction**

Table 3.14 contains the descriptive statistics for the items composing the job satisfaction scale. The combined scores for the job satisfaction scale indicate that members of the sample had a moderate to high level of job satisfaction. However, consistent with prior research, answers to some of the individual questions within the scale reveal even higher levels of satisfaction. Specifically, more than 90 percent of sample members were at least somewhat satisfied with their current job (item 1), and 72 percent said they would take the same job again without hesitation (item 2). Further, half of respondents said they would choose the same job if they could have any type of job (item 5), and 62.5 percent would strongly recommend their job to a good friend (item 4).

The OLS model regressing job satisfaction on the sample's individual characteristics, work-related variables, and correctional orientations is presented in Table 3.15. As shown, the overall model was significant ( $F = 6.022$ ) and explained almost 28 percent of the variance in job satisfaction (adjusted  $R^2 = .275$ ). With the exception of job title, all of the work-related variables were significant. Years at present agency, dangerousness, and role conflict ( $p = .10$ ) were all significantly and negatively related to job satisfaction, and

Table 3.14: Items Composing Job Satisfaction Scale, Percentages Reported

Variable	Percentage	Number
1. All in all, how satisfied are you with your job?		
Not satisfied at all	0.0	0
Not too satisfied	9.9	19
Somewhat satisfied	57.8	111
Very Satisfied	32.3	62
2. Knowing what you know now, if you had to decide all over again whether to take the job you now have, what would you decide?		
Decide definitely not to take the same job	3.1	6
Have second thoughts about taking my job	24.9	48
Decide without hesitation to take the same job	72.0	139
3. In general, how well would you say your job measures up to the sort of job you wanted when you took it?		
Not very much like the job I wanted	13.0	25
Somewhat like the job I wanted	52.8	102
Very much like the job I wanted	34.2	66
4. If a good friend of yours told you he (or she) was interested in working in a job like yours for your employer, what would you tell him (or her)?		
Advise my friend against taking the job	2.1	4
Have doubts about recommending this job	35.4	68
Strongly recommend the job	62.5	120
5. If you were free to go into any type of job you wanted, what would your choice be?		
Prefer some other job to the job I have now	33.9	65
Want to retire and not work at all	16.1	31
Keep the job I now have	50.0	96
Job Satisfaction Scale Range	1 to 5	
Job Satisfaction Scale Mean	3.69	

Table 3.15: Job Satisfaction Regressed on Individual Characteristics, Work-Related Variables, and Correctional Orientation

Variable	Job Satisfaction			
	B	Beta	t	Sig
<b>Individual Characteristics</b>				
Age	.002	.246	2.861	.005
Education	-.004	-.075	-1.008	.315
Race (White)	.427	.190	2.574	.011
Gender (Male)	-.203	-.097	-1.326	.187
Political Orientation (Conservative)	-.002	-.018	-.249	.804
<b>Work-Related Variables</b>				
Years at Present Agency	-.003	-.267	-3.073	.003
Dangerousness	-.004	-.191	-2.571	.011
Role Conflict	-.003	-.139	-1.946	.054
Supervisory Support	.115	.334	4.755	.000
Job Title (Supervisor)	.251	.111	1.483	.140
<b>Correctional Orientation</b>				
Rehabilitative Orientation	.004	.019	.235	.815
Custody Orientation	.002	.085	1.021	.309
Model Summary	F = 6.022, sig = .000 n = 159 R <sup>2</sup> = .330 Adjusted R <sup>2</sup> = .275			

supervisory support shared a significant positive relationship with job satisfaction. As expected, respondents that perceived their jobs to be less dangerous and those with less role conflict had significantly higher levels of job satisfaction. Additionally, those with fewer years at their present agencies had more job satisfaction, lending support to the hypothesis that correctional employees will burn-out and have less job satisfaction as their years of experience increase (see Cheek and Miller, 1983). These results are comparable to those in many previous studies of adult correctional workers (e.g., Cullen et al., 1985; Grossi et al., 1996; Hepburn and Albonetti, 1980; Hepburn and Knepper, 1993; Lindquist and Whitehead, 1986; Saylor and Wright, 1992; Van Voorhis et al., 1991; Whitehead and Lindquist, 1986).

Race and age were the only two individual characteristics that were significantly related to job satisfaction. Consistent with prior research in adult institutions (e.g., Britton, 1997; Cullen et al., 1985; Cullen, Link et al., 1990; Van Voorhis et al., 1991), whites had significantly higher levels of job satisfaction than blacks. Additionally, the results indicate that older individuals had more job satisfaction. Contrary to several previous studies (e.g., Cullen et al., 1985; Jurik et al., 1987; Lindquist and Whitehead, 1986; Robinson et al., 1997; Van Voorhis et al., 1991), education was not significant in the model.

Again, neither type of correctional orientation was a significant predictor of job satisfaction. This result stands in contrast with Cullen et al.'s (1985) finding that correctional officers with a rehabilitative orientation had significantly lower levels of job satisfaction. Additionally, adding the correctional orientation measures to the model actually reduced the adjusted  $R^2$  by 1.8 percent.

## **Correctional Orientation and Use of Physical Force**

Unlike the previously reported models, the OLS model regressing use of physical force on individual characteristics, work-related variables, and correctional orientation was not significant ( $F = 1.215$ ). The entire model explained less than two percent of the variance in the number of times respondents used physical force over the previous year (adjusted  $R^2 = .016$ ). As shown in Table 3.16, none of the independent variables from either model were significant predictors of use of physical force. The only variable that approached significance was role conflict. The results indicate that respondents with more role conflict used physical force more frequently. Additionally, adding the two correctional orientation variables to the model only increased the adjusted  $R^2$  by only .002. The overall model is apparently lacking some important predictor variables. Suggestions for a better specified model will be discussed in the next chapter.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> A logistic regression model was also conducted to examine predictors of a dichotomous use of force measure. Results were consistent with the OLS model reported.

Table 3.16: Use of Physical Force Regressed on Individual Characteristics, Work-Related Variables, and Correctional Orientation

Variable	Use of Force in Previous Year			
	B	Beta	t	Sig
<b>Individual Characteristics</b>				
Age	-.007	-.085	-.838	.403
Education	-.443	.086	.988	.325
Race (White)	-1.364	-.065	-.752	.453
Gender (Male)	-.404	-.021	-.247	.805
Political Orientation (Conservative)	-1.059	-.102	-1.239	.217
<b>Work-Related Variables</b>				
Years at Present Agency	-.004	-.031	-.306	.760
Dangerousness	.004	.021	.238	.812
Role Conflict	.276	.130	1.567	.119
Supervisory Support	-.001	-.001	-.017	.986
Job Title (Supervisor)	-.467	-.022	-.255	.799
<b>Correctional Orientation</b>				
Rehabilitative Orientation	.144	.070	.756	.451
Custody Orientation	-.184	-.118	-1.187	.237
<b>Model Summary</b>				
	F = 1.215, sig = .278			
	N = 158			
	R <sup>2</sup> = .091			
	Adjusted R <sup>2</sup> = .016			

## **CHAPTER 4**

### **DISCUSSION**

The purpose of this research has been to examine the levels, sources, and possible impact of correctional orientations among a sample of juvenile correctional workers. Chapter 1 contained a description of the history and changes of the juvenile system in the United States, as well as a review of the literature concerning the levels, sources, and potential influences of correctional orientations among both correctional workers and the general public. The second chapter of this dissertation was a description of the research methods and statistical techniques used to explore these issues, and Chapter 3 presented the results of the analyses. This final chapter is a discussion of these results.

This chapter is divided into four main sections. First, the levels of support for both rehabilitation and custody are discussed and compared with prior research. Second, the significant sources of each correctional orientation are considered, especially in terms of the competing individual experiences/importation and work role/prisonization models. The next section addresses the levels and sources of three work reactions. The last section of the chapter contains suggestions for future research, as well as concluding comments about why it is important to continue examining juvenile correctional workers and correctional orientations in general.

#### **SUPPORT FOR REHABILITATION AND CUSTODY**

As discussed in Chapter 1, there are two perspectives concerning the correctional orientations of those working in juvenile corrections. First, the original “child saving” or rehabilitative mission that the American juvenile system was founded upon would

suggest that these workers should have high levels of support for rehabilitation. A different perspective, however, stems from the overall punitive shift in American corrections – including the juvenile system – that has occurred over the past three decades. If those working within juvenile corrections have followed this punitive trend, they would be expected to express more punitive or custodial views.

The results of this research confirms both perspectives. Consistent with previous research among correctional workers in adult facilities and the general public (e.g., Arthur, 1994; Cullen et al., 1989, 1993; Louis Harris and Associates, 1968; Jacobs, 1978; Jacobs and Kraft, 1978; Sundt and Cullen, 2002; Toch and Klofas, 1982; Van Voorhis et al., 1991; Whitehead and Lindquist, 1989, 1992), these juvenile correctional workers supported both rehabilitative and custodial sentiments. Specifically, reactions to items within the two indexes were inconsistent. Recall, for example, that the majority of respondents at least slightly agreed that rehabilitation is the most effective and humane way to cure the crime problem in America (see Table 3.5). However, almost 90 percent also felt that punishment, not rehabilitation, is the only way to reduce crime in society. Additionally, 68.8 percent agreed that rehabilitation is just as important as making a criminal pay for his or her crime, while over 80 percent indicated that the rehabilitation of prisoners has proven to be a failure. These inconsistent results confirm the complex nature of correctional orientations reported in other research. It is apparent that these respondents supported *both* perspectives simultaneously.

There were also inconsistencies within the custody scale. For instance, as reported in Table 3.6, the majority of respondents indicated that their job was to keep inmates orderly, not rehabilitate them. At the same time, most of the sample disagreed that

keeping inmates from causing trouble was their major concern while on the job. The majority of respondents, however, at least slightly agreed with the other items comprising the custody index, indicating that these individuals supported custodial sentiments. Further, when asked the forced-choice question about the main purpose of prisons, incapacitation was selected most often, and rehabilitation was chosen least frequently (see Table 3.4). While it is not unusual for incapacitation to be selected as one of the top two responses for the main purpose of prison among correctional workers in adult facilities or the general public (see Applegate et al., 1997; Cullen et al., 1989, 1993; Sundt et al., 1998), the low percentage (7 percent) of respondents choosing rehabilitation is somewhat unexpected.

It is important to reiterate that these results do not suggest that members of the sample did not support rehabilitation. The majority of respondents, in fact, agreed with some of the rehabilitative statements. Still, given the rehabilitative mission of the juvenile system, the relatively high level of support for custodial sentiments among juvenile correctional workers is surprising. There are several possible explanations for these findings.

First, the results might be a result of the general trend to “get tough” on offenders, including juveniles. While direct comparisons with other samples of detention workers are not available, trends among those working in adult facilities suggest that support for rehabilitation has declined over the years. For example, Louis Harris and Associates (1968) found that correctional administrators held strong support for rehabilitation. A decade later, Jacobs (1978) reported that 46.0 percent of correctional officers in his sample chose rehabilitation as the main goal of prisons. However, Cullen et al. (1989)

reported that only 10.3 percent of a sample of correctional officers indicated that rehabilitation is the main reason for putting someone in prison. Taken together, these results show that support for rehabilitation has declined since the “attack” on rehabilitation began in the 1970s. Therefore, the results might be a reflection of a continuation of the punitive shift in American corrections.

A second explanation is associated with the wording of the survey questions. In particular, the questions were not tailored to assess opinions pertaining to juveniles specifically. For example, the global question about the main purpose of prisons did not stipulate if it was referring to adult prisons or juvenile detention centers. Additionally, the one item that was specific asked about the effectiveness of rehabilitating adult offenders, not juveniles. Therefore, the results probably reflect the sample’s *general* views or orientations, not attitudes toward juveniles in particular. It is likely that the results would have been different if all items on the survey referred specifically to juveniles.

The high levels of support for custody might also reflect the objectives of the facilities or the work responsibilities of those in the sample. For example, Tipton (2002) has suggested that juvenile facilities have become more custodial – more like adult institutions – in recent years. Therefore, many of the respondents could be primarily responsible for maintaining custody of juveniles within the facilities. That is, it is possible that the majority of facilities from which the sample was drawn focused more on incapacitation than treatment efforts. Unfortunately, this information was not available for these analyses.

Finally, the levels of support for custody might reflect the work experiences of the respondents. For example, these workers might have had higher levels of support for rehabilitation at the beginning of their careers. As Bartollas, Miller, and Dinitz (1976: 198) observed, “new staff are quite excited and optimistic when they start work.” However, staff often become more negative over time, especially after being exposed to delinquents that spend as much as half of their time playing “control games” with staff (Bartollas et al., 1976). Additionally, research has consistently revealed that offending rates are generally highest during adolescence (Blumstein, Cohen, and Farrington, 1988), with life-course persistent offenders actively offending during this time (Moffitt, 1993). Of course, this period of frequent offending is also the time when offenders are likely to be in detention if they have been detected by authorities. While these adolescents may not be able to participate in the types of offenses they would commit on the outside, they are likely to continue offending or “analogous behaviors” while in detention.

Bartollas et al. (1976) describe crimes committed in detention not only against other youths but against staff as well. Detained juveniles often participate in incidents ranging from stealing items from staff members to physically assaulting them. Consequently, the majority of detention workers resign from their jobs within the first three years (Bartollas et al., 1976). Those who continue working in detention might experience a change in orientation, especially after dealing many youths that are unreceptive to treatment efforts. As Rothman (1980) has argued, even if these workers are involved in both treatment and custody functions, the “convenience” of custodial goals might take precedence over rehabilitative efforts. Therefore, it is feasible that some of these workers would “give up”

on rehabilitative efforts for juveniles in their care and develop more support for custodial concerns.

### **SOURCES OF CORRECTIONAL ORIENTATION: THE IMPORTATION VERSUS PRISONIZATION DEBATE**

As discussed in Chapter 1, research into the orientations of correctional workers has produced two competing models. The first model, the individual experiences/importation model, maintains that reactions to correctional work are the product of different individual characteristics and experiences of employees. Specifically, correctional employees import certain characteristics into their jobs that affect their attitudes, beliefs, and work experiences (Britton, 1997; Cullen et al., 1989, 1993; Fry and Glazer, 1987; Hepburn and Knepper, 1993; Jackson and Ammen, 1996; Jacobs and Kraft, 1978; Jurik, 1985b; Robinson, Porporino, and Simourd, 1997; Sundt and Cullen, 2002; Van Voorhis et al., 1991). The second model is known as the work role/prisonization model, which maintains that prisons have effects on those working within them. According to the prisonization model, the reactions of correctional workers are influenced by the institution's organizational factors and the work role, not individual attributes. This perspective posits that organizational factors and role demands serve to negate individual variations in determining reactions and attitudes toward the job (Cullen et al., 1989, 1993; Jacobs and Kraft, 1978; Jurik, 1985b; Jurik and Halemba, 1984; Sundt and Cullen, 2002; Van Voorhis et al., 1991; Whitehead and Linqvist, 1989, 1992; Whitehead, Linqvist, and Klofas, 1987). The results of the models produced to test the comparative effects of these two models in predicting correctional orientations are discussed below.

## Sources of Support for Rehabilitation

The OLS model for the rehabilitation index explained only five percent of the variation in support for rehabilitation, which is substantially less than similar models from samples of correctional workers in adult facilities (e.g., Cullen et al., 1989, 1993; Jurik, 1985b; Hepburn and Albonetti, 1980; Sundt and Cullen, 2002; Van Voorhis et al., 1991; Wright and Saylor, 1992). The model also revealed that only one variable, an individual characteristic, was statistically significant in predicting a rehabilitative orientation (see Table 3.9). Contrary to previous research in adult institutions and on the general public (e.g., Burton et al., 1991; Cullen, Golden, and Cullen, 1983; Robinson et al., 1993, 1997; Warr and Stafford, 1984), education was negatively related to support for rehabilitation. Therefore, those with fewer years of formal education were significantly more likely to hold rehabilitative orientations than those with more education.

There are three possible explanations regarding the unexpected negative relationship between education and support for rehabilitation. First, the data do not indicate what type of education these individuals have received. Those with more years of formal education, for example, might have been educated in fields other than corrections or criminal justice. Additionally, there is no indicator of the number of respondents that have been educated on the effectiveness of rehabilitation. More specific information about the *types* of education sample members have received would be helpful in explaining this relationship.

Second, the negative relationship between education and rehabilitation might be the result of something unique to working in juvenile facilities. It is possible that individuals

with higher levels education might have endorsed rehabilitation more strongly before working in juvenile detention facilities. However, as discussed previously, their particular work experiences within the facilities could serve to reduce their support for rehabilitation. A longitudinal dataset would be helpful in examining this possibility.

The third explanation for the negative relationship between education and rehabilitation is that the main effect of education could be explained by another variable that was not available in the current data set. Education, for example, might be specified by work roles. In particular, levels of education might be significantly different for those extensively involved in treatment efforts as compared to those charged primarily with custodial responsibilities.

None of the variables from the work role/prisonization model were significant. However, this finding is not indicative that these variables are unimportant. Given that only one variable in the entire model was significant and that the overall model explains such a small percentage of the variance in the dependent variable, a better conclusion is that these juvenile correctional workers were in agreement about their beliefs concerning rehabilitation. That is, even among those with different individual and work-related experiences, there is a great deal of conformity regarding rehabilitation. It is unclear whether this consensus is based on individual attributes, work-related experiences, or both.

### **Sources of Support for Custody**

The OLS model regressing the custody index on the individual and work-related characteristics of the sample produced several significant results. Comparable to other studies of correctional workers (e.g., Cullen et al., 1989, 1993; Jurik, 1985b;

Hepburn and Albonetti, 1980; Sundt and Cullen, 2002; Van Voorhis et al., 1991; Wright and Saylor, 1992), this model explained almost 17 percent of the variation in the custody index, which is more than three times that explained in the rehabilitation model. Further, individual characteristics were most important in predicting the dependent variable. The results indicate that blacks, females, older, and more educated individuals were more likely to embrace custodial orientations (see Table 3.10).

Although previous results have been inconsistent, the finding that blacks and females were more likely to have a custodial orientation is similar to results from some public opinion surveys and research on samples of workers in adult correctional facilities (e.g., Farkas, 2000; Jacobs and Kraft, 1978; McCorkle, 1993). The other significant individual attributes, however, are contrary to previous research on correctional workers. For example, when age is significant, it is usually negatively related to custodial orientations (e.g., Farkas, 2000; Klofas and Toch, 1982). However, significant positive relationships between age and support for custody are more common among the public (e.g., Schwartz et al., 1992; Warr and Stafford, 1984). These comparisons suggest that, as members of the public, these juvenile correctional workers import their beliefs into their jobs. Nonetheless, when education is a significant predictor of custody, the relationship is generally negative for both correctional employees and members of the public (e.g., Grasmick, 1993; McCorkle, 1993; Poole and Regoli, 1980a; Schwartz et al., 1992). Therefore, this unexpected positive relationship between education and custody might be the result of something particular about working in juvenile facilities. Additionally, the

effect of education might also be explained by a variable not included in this analysis, such as the extent respondents are involved in rehabilitative efforts.

Only one of the work-related variables was significant. In particular, perceived dangerousness had a negative relationship with the custody index. This unexpected significant negative relationship between the custody index and dangerousness suggested that the main effect of perceived dangerousness might be specified by another variable. Based on Van Vorrhis et al.'s (1991) finding that black correctional officers perceived significantly higher levels of dangerousness than whites, an interaction term was created for dangerousness and race. Recall that this interaction term was significant, and it accounted for the main effects of both dangerousness and race (see Table 3.11). Specifically, the interaction model revealed that blacks with higher levels of perceived dangerousness were significantly more likely to hold custodial orientations.

Overall, individual characteristics were more important in predicting custodial orientations. However, because of its significant interaction with race, the effect of dangerousness cannot be overlooked. Perhaps variables from the two models should not be viewed as competing but as complimentary.

### **WORK REACTIONS: THE INFLUENCE OF INDIVIDUAL CHARACTERISTICS, WORK-RELATED VARIABLES, AND CORRECTIONAL ORIENTATION**

This dissertation has primarily been concerned with the levels and determinants of correctional orientations. As discussed in Chapter 1, however, there is also some evidence that correctional orientations might affect other reactions to correctional jobs.

These reactions include levels of work stress, job satisfaction, and use of physical force. This section is a discussion of the results of the three OLS models that regressed these three job reactions on individual characteristics, work-related variables, and correctional orientations.

### **Work Stress**

The results reported in Chapter 3 indicate that these juvenile correctional workers experienced moderate levels of work stress. As reported in Table 3.12, almost half of the respondents at least slightly agreed that they are under a lot of pressure while at work and feel tense or uptight when they are at work. Further, the majority of respondents at least slightly agreed that a lot of aspects about their jobs make them upset. While it is evident that members of this sample experience some work stress, previous studies of work stress among adult correctional workers have not reported descriptive statistics regarding actual levels of stress. Therefore, it is not possible to surmise whether these juvenile correctional workers experience more or less job stress than those working in adult institutions. However, the overall levels of work stress among this sample are consistent with a previous study of detention workers. Although Liou (1995) used a different measure of work stress, the average levels of work stress for both samples were very near the midpoint of the respective stress measures. Still, comparing stress levels between those working in juvenile and adult facilities is an important issue for future research.

The OLS model exploring sources of work stress explained almost 30 percent of the variation in the work stress index, and several variables emerged as significant predictors of the dependent variable. Only one individual characteristic, years of formal education, shared a significant relationship with work stress. Consistent with Lindquist and

Whitehead's (1986) results from a sample of adult correctional officers, respondents with more years of formal education had higher levels of work stress. This result might be an indicator that formal education is not valued within the facilities. Another possibility is that those with higher levels of education are more likely to be employed in decision-making positions, which may add to their work stress. Therefore, more information about specific work roles would be helpful in understanding this relationship.

Work-related variables were more successful in explaining variations in work stress. In particular, those with higher levels of both perceived dangerousness and role conflict experienced significantly higher levels of work stress. Additionally, these two variables accounted for more explained variation than any of the other measures in the model (Beta = .286 and .381, respectively). Two other work-related variables, years at present agency and supervisory support, also approached significance. As expected, individuals with more work experience and those with less supervisory support had higher levels of work stress. Each of these relationships has been reported in prior research on correctional workers in adult facilities (e.g., Blau et al., 1986; Britton, 1997; Cullen et al., 1985; Grossi et al., 1996; Lombardo, 1981; Poole and Regoli, 1980a; Shamir and Drory, 1982; Triplett et al., 1996; Whitehead and Lindquist, 1986; Van Voorhis et al., 1991).

Policy implications based on the work stress model are straightforward. To reduce work stress among employees, administrators should encourage support on behalf of supervisors. Further, administrators should work toward reducing role conflict, perhaps by clearly defining work responsibilities and operating procedures. Additionally, levels of perceived dangerous can be decreased by addressing the staff's safety concerns.

While neither correctional orientation was significant in predicting work stress, adding the two orientations to the model increased the amount of explained variance by one percent. However, as mentioned in Chapter 3, it is notable that the directions of the slopes for the two orientations are inconsistent with most studies of adult correctional workers (e.g., Cullen et al., 1985; Poole and Pogrebin, 1988; Poole and Regoli, 1980a; Toch and Klofas, 1982). That is, studies of those working in adult facilities generally indicate that individuals with rehabilitative orientations have significantly less work stress than those with custodial orientations. These results, however, reveal that those with rehabilitative orientations had higher levels of work stress, and they are consistent with Liou's (1995) findings based on another sample of juvenile detention workers.

The contradictory findings concerning correctional orientation and job stress between those working with adults and juveniles might be indicative that there is something distinctive about working in juvenile facilities. For example, Liou (1995) suggested that those with rehabilitative orientations might experience more work stress because custodial and security concerns limit their ability to participate in rehabilitative efforts. Detailed information regarding the objectives of these workers and how they spend their time at work would make it possible to examine this hypothesis.

### **Job Satisfaction**

Overall, members of this sample were relatively satisfied with their jobs. For example, as shown in Table 3.14, the majority of respondents were at least somewhat satisfied with their jobs and would keep their jobs if they could have any type of job. Further, when compared to samples of correctional officers in adult facilities (Cullen, Link et al., 1990), prison wardens (Cullen et al., 1993), and the employed public (Quinn

and Staines, 1979), these detention workers had higher overall levels of job satisfaction than both the general public and the correctional officers (see Table 4.1).

While the comparisons presented in Table 4.1 suggest that members of this sample found their work to be more satisfying than correctional officers in adult facilities and the general public, the dataset did not provide information that would indicate why these workers experience particular levels of satisfaction. The questions comprising the job satisfaction scale are very general. The items did not measure *why* the workers were, or were not, satisfied with their work. More specific measures about certain aspects of the job would help clarify this question. For example, items measuring satisfaction concerning particular job duties, relationships with coworkers and supervisors, and salary would be helpful.

The OLS model regressing job satisfaction on individual characteristics, work-related variables, and correctional orientation explained almost 30 percent of the variance in levels of job satisfaction (see Table 3.15). Additionally, several variables were significant predictors of job satisfaction. Two individual characteristics, age and race, shared a statistically significant relationship with job satisfaction. Consistent with previous research (e.g., Blau et al., 1986; Saylor, 1992), older individuals had higher levels of job satisfaction. Also similar to other studies (e.g., Blau et al., 1986; Britton, 1997; Cullen et al., 1985, 1990; 1993; Van Voorhis et al., 1991) whites had significantly greater levels of job satisfaction. Although these data did not allow for more detailed analyses, the significant relationship between race and job satisfaction might be an indicator of differential treatment of black and white employees.

Table 4.1: Selected Job Satisfaction Items for Detention Workers Compared to Correctional Officers in an Adult System, Prison Wardens, and a National Sample of Employed Adults, Percentages Reported

Items	Samples			
	Detention Workers	Correctional Officers	Wardens	Employed Public
1. All in all, how satisfied are you with your job?				
Very Satisfied	32.3	25.5	66.0	46.7
2. Knowing what you know now, if you had to decide all over again whether to take the job you now have, what would you decide?				
Decide without hesitation to take the same job	72.0	50.7	78.4	63.9
3. In general, how well would you say your job measures up to the sort of job you wanted when you took it?				
Very much like the job I wanted	34.2	24.3	68.3	52.5
4. If a good friend of yours told you he (or she) was interested in working in a job like yours for your employer, what would you tell him (or her)?				
Strongly recommend the job	62.5	42.8	72.5	61.8
5. If you were free to go into any type of job you wanted, what would your choice be?				
Keep the job I now have	50.0	31.1	72.6	38.1
Job Satisfaction Scale Mean	3.69	3.12	4.26	3.66

Four of the work-related variables were significantly related to job satisfaction. First, years at present agency, a measure of experience, was significantly and negatively related with job satisfaction. This finding lends support to Cheek and Miller's (1983) "burn-out" hypothesis, which posits that job satisfaction will decrease as work experience increases. Dangerousness and role conflict also shared negative relationships with job satisfaction, while the supervisory support was positively related to satisfaction. Therefore, administrators can work to increase levels of job satisfaction by 1) addressing safety concerns to reduce perceived levels of dangerousness, 2) clearly defining work responsibilities and protocol, 3) emphasizing the importance of supervisory support, and 4) creating a more equitable work environment for all employees.

Again, neither correctional orientation was significantly related to job satisfaction. Further, variables from the prisonization model explained more of the variation in job satisfaction than those from the importation model. The individual characteristics, however, cannot be ignored. Race, in particular, explained more variation than both perceived dangerousness and role conflict. Consequently, variables from both models are important.

### **Use of Physical Force**

None of the variables, including the two correctional orientations, in the model predicting use of physical force were statistically significant (see Table 3.16). However, it is important to continue to investigate use of force in both adult and juvenile facilities. Insight into this under-researched area could lead to important policy improvements that might reduce unnecessary physical confrontations with those housed in the facilities.

This section contains suggestions for a better specified model predicting use of physical force.

The first suggestion pertains to the measurement of the dependent variable. The measure of physical force used in this dissertation was based on the number of self-reported number of times respondents used physical force over the previous year. A more accurate measure may be derived from official records or complaints regarding use of force by staff. Additionally, rather than using the number of times force was used, a better measure would contain a continuum of force, possibly including verbal commands, physical restraint, takedowns, and strikes to the body (see Holmes, Reynolds, and Frank, 1998; Terrill and Mastrofski, 2002).

Second, previous research has indicated that the characteristics of the individual force was used against are important. Specifically, use of physical force has been significantly related to suspects being male, nonwhite, and younger (see Garner et al., 1996; Holmes et al., 1998; Terrill and Mastrofski, 2002; Garner et al., 1996). This information should be available in the facility's official records.

Another important group of variables pertain to the situational characteristics surrounding the use of force incidents. These variables include 1) the level of perceived threat on behalf of the correctional officer, 2) whether the detainee had a weapon, 3) the level of resistance by the suspect, 4) the number of correctional workers present, and 5) where in the facility the incident occurred. Understandably, policing research (Terrill and Mastrofski, 2002) and a survey of detention workers (Holmes et al., 1998) both found that workers were more likely to use physical force when they perceived a greater threat, when the level of resistance was higher, and when the detainee brandished a weapon.

Studies concerning use of force by police have also shown that officers are more likely to use force when there are other officers present during the incident (Garner et al., 1996; Terrill and Mastrofski, 2002; Worden, 1995).

Location of the incident might also be important. Bartollas et al. (1976), for example, described areas of “indefensible space” within juvenile facilities. That is, some spaces within facilities are more private than others. Hallways and dorms, in particular, are more public than other areas such as showers or equipment rooms. It is possible that correctional workers would be more likely to use physical force in more private areas.

Incorporating the variables discussed above is likely to result in an improved model to explain use of physical force. An outline of the suggested model is presented in Figure 4.1. Unfortunately, the limited number of cases and a lack of measures made it impossible to examine these items in this dissertation.

## **IMPLICATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH**

This dissertation has been an exploratory study to contribute to the literature about juvenile detention workers. The lack of research on those working with detained youths is troubling, especially when considering that there are several detention centers in each state and almost half a million youths are sentenced to detention each year (Flores, 2003). Whether the objective of detention is to rehabilitate these juveniles or simply to incapacitate them, it is imperative that they are protected and not subjected to psychological or physical abuse while incarcerated. Therefore, it is important to continue exploring the attitudes and reactions of the “keepers” of these youths.

Figure 4.1: Suggested Model for Predicting Use of Physical Force by Juvenile Correctional Workers

Individual Characteristics			
Correctional Worker	Juvenile	Work-Related Variables	Situational Characteristics
1. Age	1. Age	1. Experience	1. Suspect had Weapon
2. Race	2. Race	2. Dangerousness	2. Where in the Facility
3. Gender	3. Gender	3. Role Conflict	3. Perceived Threat
4. Education		4. Job Title	4. Level of Resistance
5. Correctional Orientation		5. Supervisory Support	5. Number of Other Workers Present
		6. Defensive Tactics Training	
		7. Level of Security of the Facility	

Although the correctional orientations of the workers in this sample did not emerge as significant predictors of the three work reactions examined, the results do not warrant the conclusion that correctional ideologies are insignificant. While the results presented here revealed unexpectedly high levels of support for custody, the questions concerning correctional ideologies were very general. If the questions clearly referred to custodial or rehabilitative sentiments toward juveniles in particular, the results might have been substantially different. More specific questions regarding the particular population in question would be helpful in future research.

Throughout this discussion of the results, one consistent theme has emerged. Specifically, more information about the respondents' particular job duties and the objectives of the facilities from which the sample was drawn would have been helpful in virtually every model. Theoretically, if staff members with a great deal of involvement in treatment objectives do not support rehabilitation, treatment efforts will probably not be effective (Gordon, 1999; Lariviere, 2001). Therefore, it is important that future studies include measures of job responsibilities and the extent respondents are involved in rehabilitation.

It would also be beneficial for future research to have information about why respondents originally began to work in a juvenile facility. If those with higher levels of involvement in rehabilitation support more custodial concerns, it should be determined whether the wrong types of individuals are being recruited for these jobs, or if there is something about the job or work experiences that reduces support for treatment over time. Longitudinal data would be useful in determining if and how correctional orientations change with experience.

Other variables, not available in this dataset, might also be important in explaining correctional orientations. In a survey of the public, for example, Schwartz et al. (1992) found that African-American parents were significantly more punitive toward juveniles. Therefore, juvenile correctional workers with children might have different views than those that are not parents. Future surveys of those working in juvenile corrections should gather as much information as possible.

While it might seem that this dissertation has resulted in more questions than answers, this research has successfully identified some important issues that should be considered in the future. Hopefully, this exploratory study has been the first in a series of investigations that explore the correctional orientations and work reactions of individuals working in juvenile detention facilities. Exploring these issues can lead to implications that will help to improve the quality of work for detention workers, which, in turn, will benefit the juveniles within their custody.

## REFERENCES

- Andrews, D. A., I. Zinger, R. D. Hoge, J. Bonta, P. Gendreau, and F. T. Cullen. (1990). Does correctional treatment work? A clinically relevant and psychology informed meta-analysis. *Criminology*, 28, 369-404.
- Applegate, B. K., F. T. Cullen, and B. S. Fisher. (1997). Public support for correctional treatment: The continuing appeal of the rehabilitative ideal. *The Prison Journal*, 77, 237-258.
- Arthur, J. A. (1994). Correctional ideology of black correctional officers. *Federal Probation*, 58, 57-66.
- Bachman, R. and R. Paternoster. (1997). *Statistical Methods for Criminology and Criminal Justice*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Bartollas, C., S. J. Miller, and S. Dinitz. (1976). *Juvenile Victimization: The Institutional Paradox*. New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Bayer, R. (1981). Crime, punishment, and the decline of liberal optimism. *Crime and Delinquency*, 27, 169-190.
- Bazemore, G., T. J. Dicker, and H. Al-Gadheeb. (1994). The treatment ideal and detention reality: Demographic, professional/occupational, and organizational influences on detention worker punitiveness. *American Journal of Criminal Justice*, 19, 21-41.
- Bernard, T. J. (1992). *The Cycle of Juvenile Justice*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Berry, W. D. and S. Feldman. (1985). *Multiple Regression in Practice*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Bilchik, S. (1997). *States at a Glance: Juveniles in Public Facilities, 1995*. Department of Justice, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.
- Binder, A. (1984). Restrictions on statistics imposed by method of measurement: Some reality, some myth. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 12, 467-481.
- Blau, J. R., S. C. Light, and M. Chamlin. (1986). Individual and contextual effects on stress and job satisfaction: A study of prison staff. *Work and Occupations*, 13, 131-156.
- Blumstein, A. and J. Cohen. (1980). Sentencing of convicted offenders: An analysis of the public's view. *Law and Society Review*, 14, 223-261.

- Blumstein, A., J. Cohen, and D. R. Farrington. (1988). Criminal career research: Its value for criminology. *Criminology*, 26, 1-35.
- Bollen, K. A. and K. H. Barb. (1981). Pearson's r and coarsely categorized measures. *American Sociological Review*, 46, 232-239.
- Britton, D. M. (1997). Perceptions of the work environment among correctional officers: Do race and sex matter? *Criminology*, 35, 85-105.
- Bureau of Justice Statistics. (2001). *Public Attitudes Toward Uses of Criminal History Information*. Washington, DC: Department of Justice.
- Bureau of Justice Statistics. (2002). Attitudes toward the treatment of juveniles who commit violent crime. *Sourcebook of Criminal Justice Statistics 2001*. Washington, DC: Department of Justice.
- Bureau of Justice Statistics. (2003a). *The Proportion of Serious Violent Crimes Committed by Juveniles has Generally Declined Since 1993*. Washington, DC: Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs.
- Bureau of Justice Statistics. (2003b). Jail inmates 1983-2002. *Sourcebook of Criminal Justice Statistics 2002*. Washington, DC: Department of Justice.
- Burke, T. W., E. Rizzo, and C. E. O'Rear. (1992). National survey results: Do officers need college degrees? *Corrections Today*, 54, 174-176.
- Burton, Jr., V. S., X. Ju, R. G. Dunaway, and N. T. Wolfe (1991). The correctional orientation of Bermuda prison guards: An assessment of attitudes toward punishment and rehabilitation. *International Journal of Comparative and Applied Criminal Justice*, 15, 71-80.
- Cascio, W. F. (1977). Formal education and police officer performances. *Journal of Police Science and Administration*, 5, 89-96.
- Cheek, F. E. and M. D. Miller. (1983). The experience of stress for correction officers: A double-bind theory of correctional stress. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 11, 105-112.
- Clear, T. R. (1994). *Harm in American Penology: Offenders, Victims, and their Communities*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Clemmer, D. (1940). *The Prison Community*. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.
- Cohen, B. and J. M. Chaiken. (1972). *Police Background Characteristics and Performance*. New York: Rand.

- Cook, P. J. and J. H. Laub. (1998). The unprecedented epidemic in youth violence. In M. Tonry (Ed.), *Crime and Justice: A Review of Research, Volume 24*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Crouch, B. M. and G. P. Alpert. (1982). Sex and occupational socialization among prison guards: A longitudinal study. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 9, 159-176.
- Cullen, F. T., J. B. Cullen, and J. F. Wozniak. (1988). Is rehabilitation dead? The myth of punitive public policy. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 16, 303-317.
- Cullen, F. T., B. S. Fisher, and B. K. Applegate. (2000). Public opinion about punishment and corrections. In M. Tonry (Ed.), *Crime and Justice: A Review of Research, Volume 27*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Cullen, F. T., and P. Gendreau. (1989). The effectiveness of correctional rehabilitation: Reconsidering the "nothing works" debate. In L. Goodstein and D. L. MacKenzie (Eds.), *The American Prison: Issues in Research and Policy*. New York: Plenum.
- Cullen, F. T. and K. E. Gilbert. (1982). *Reaffirming Rehabilitation*. Cincinnati: Anderson.
- Cullen, F. T., K. E. Gilbert, and J. B. Cullen. (1983). Implementing determinate sentencing in Illinois: Conscious and convenience. *Criminal Justice Review*, 8, 1-16.
- Cullen, F. T., K. M. Golden, and J. B. Cullen. (1983). Is child saving dead? Attitudes toward juvenile rehabilitation in Illinois. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 11, 1-13.
- Cullen, F. T., E. J. Latessa, V. S. Burton, Jr., and L. X. Lombardo. (1993). The correctional orientation of prison wardens: Is the rehabilitative ideal supported? *Criminology*, 31, 69-92.
- Cullen, F. T., E. J. Latessa, R. Kopache, L. X. Lombardo, and V. S. Burton, Jr. (1993). Prison Wardens' Job Satisfaction. *The Prison Journal*, 73, 141-161.
- Cullen, F. T., B. G. Link, J. B. Cullen, and N. T. Wolfe. (1990). How satisfying is prison work? A comparative occupational approach. *Journal of Offender Counseling, Services, and Rehabilitation*, 14, 89-108.
- Cullen, F. T., B. G. Link, N. T. Wolfe, and J. Frank. (1985). The social dimensions of correctional officer stress. *Justice Quarterly*, 2, 505-533.
- Cullen, F. T., F. Lutze, B. G. Link, and N. T. Wolfe. (1989). The correctional orientation of prison guards: Do officers support rehabilitation? *Federal Probation*, 53, 33-42.

- Cullen, F. T. and M. M. Moon. (2002). Reaffirming rehabilitation: Public support for correctional treatment. In H. E. Allen (Ed.), *Risk Reduction: Interventions for Special Needs Offenders*. Lanham, MD: American Correctional Association.
- Cullen, F. T., J. A. Pealer, B. S. Fisher, B. K. Applegate, and S. A. Santana. (2002). Public support for correctional rehabilitation in America: Change or consistency? In J. V. Roberts and M. Hough (Eds.), *Changing Attitudes to Punishment: Public Opinion, Crime, and Justice*. Cullompton, UK: Willan Publishing.
- Cullen, F. T., S. E. Skovron, J. E. Scott, and V. S. Burton, Jr. (1990). Public support for correctional treatment: The tenacity of the rehabilitative ideal. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 17, 6-18.
- Cullen, F. T. and J. P. Wright. (2002). Criminal justice in the lives of American adolescents: Choosing the future. In J. T. Mortimer and R. W. Larson (Eds.), *The Changing Adolescent Experience: Societal Trends and the Transition to Adulthood*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Cullen, F. T., J. P. Wright, S. Brown, M. M. Moon, M. B. Blankenship, and B. K. Applegate. (1998). Public support for early intervention programs: Implications for a progressive policy agenda. *Crime and Delinquency*, 44, 187-204.
- Currie, E. (1985). *Confronting Crime: An American Challenge*. New York: Pantheon.
- Currie, E. (1989). Confronting crime: Looking toward the twenty-first century. *Justice Quarterly*, 6, 5-25.
- Davison, M. L. and A. R. Sharma. (1990). Parametric statistics and levels of measurement: Factorial designs and multiple regression. *Psychological Bulletin*, 107, 384-400.
- Dembo, R. and M. Dertke. (1986). Work environment correlates of staff stress in a youth detention facility. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 13, 328-344.
- DiIulio, Jr., J. J. (1991). *No Escape: The Future of American Corrections*. New York: Basic Books.
- DiIulio, Jr. J. J. (1995). The coming of super-predators. *The Weekly Standard*, November 27, 23-28.
- Doble Research Associates. (1995). *Crime and Corrections: The Views of the People of Oregon*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Doble Research Associates.
- Dowden, C. and D. A. Andrews. (1999). What works in young offender treatment: A meta-analysis. *Forum on Correctional Research*, 11, 21-24.

- Duffee, D. and R. R. Ritti. (1977). Correctional policy and public values. *Criminology*, 14, 449-459.
- Durham, A. M. (1993). Public opinion regarding sentences for crime: Does it exist? *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 21, 1-11.
- Empey, L. T. (1978). *American Delinquency: It's Meaning and Construction*. Homewood, IL: Dorsey Press.
- Farkas, M. A. (2000). Attitudes of correctional officers in a "get tough" era. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 27, 495-506.
- Farkas, M. A. (2001). Correctional factors: What factors influence work attitudes? *Corrections Management Quarterly*, 5, 20-26.
- Feld, B. (1977). *Neutralizing Inmate Violence*. Cambridge, MA: Ballinger.
- Feld, B. C. (1993). Criminalizing the American juvenile court. In M. Tonry (Ed.), *Crime and Justice: A Review of Research, Volume 17*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Feld, B. C. (1998). Juvenile and criminal justice systems' responses to youth violence. In M. Tonry and M. H. Moore (Eds.), *Crime and Justice: A Review of Research, Volume 24*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Feld, B. C. (1999). The honest politician's guide to juvenile justice in the twenty-first century. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 564, 10-27.
- Flanagan, T. J. (1996). Reform or punish: Americans' views of the correctional system. In T. J. Flanagan and D. R. Longmire (Eds.), *Americans View Crime and Justice: A National Public Opinion Survey*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Flanagan, T. J. and S. L. Caulfield. (1984). Public opinion and prison policy: A review. *The Prison Journal*, 64, 31-46.
- Flores, J. R. (2003). *Detention in Delinquency Cases, 1990-1999*. Washington, DC: Department of Justice, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.
- Fox, J. A. (2000). Demographics and U.S. Homicide. In A. Blumstein and J. Wallman (Eds.), *The Crime Drop in America*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Frazier, C. E., D. M. Bishop, and L. Lanza-Kaduce. (1999). Get-tough juvenile justice reforms: The Florida experience. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 564, 167-184.

- Friedrich, R. J. (1980). Police use of force: Individuals, situations, and organizations. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 452, 82-97.
- Fry, L. J. and D. Glazer. (1987). Gender differences in work adjustment of prison employees. *Journal of Offender Counseling, Services, and Rehabilitation*, 12, 39-52.
- Garner, J. H., T. Shade, C. D. Maxwell, and C. G. Heraux. (1995). Measuring the continuum of force used by and against the police. *Criminal Justice Review*, 20, 146-168.
- Garner, J. H., C. D. Maxwell, and C. G. Heraux. (1996). *Understanding the Use of Force by and Against the Police*. Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice.
- Garner, J. H., C. D. Maxwell, and C. G. Heraux. (2002). Characteristics associated with the prevalence and severity of force used by the police. *Justice Quarterly*, 19, 705-746.
- Gerber, J. and S. Engelhardt-Greer. (1996). Just and painful: Attitudes toward sentencing criminals. In T. J. Flanagan and D. R. Longmire (Eds.), *Americans View Crime and Justice: A National Public Opinion Survey*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Gorczyk, J. F. and J. G. Perry. (1997). What the public wants: Market research finds support for restorative justice. *Corrections Today*, 59, 78-83.
- Gordon, J.A. (1999). Do staff attitudes vary by position? A look at one juvenile correctional center. *American Journal of Criminal Justice*, 24, 81-93.
- Grasmick, H. G., J. K. Cochran, R. J. Bursik, and M. Kimpel. (1993). Religion, punitive justice, and support for the death penalty. *Justice Quarterly*, 10, 289-314.
- Grasmick, H. G. and A. L. McGill. (1994). Religion, attribution style, and punitiveness toward juvenile offenders. *Criminology*, 32, 23-46.
- Grossi, E., T. Keil, and G. Vito. (1996). Surviving the joint: Mitigating factors of correctional officer stress. *Journal of Crime and Justice*, 19, 103-120.
- Haney, C., C. Banks, and P. Zimbardo. (1973). Interpersonal dynamics in a simulated prison. *International Journal of Criminology and Penology*, 1, 69-97.
- Harris, L. and Associates. (1968). *Corrections 1968: A Climate for Change*. Washington, D.C.: Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training.
- Hawkins, D. F. (1980). Perceptions of punishment for crime. *Deviant Behavior*, 1, 193-215.

- Hepburn, J. R. and C. Albonetti. (1980). Role conflict in correctional institutions: An empirical examination of the treatment-custody dilemma among correctional staff. *Criminology*, 17, 445-459.
- Hepburn, J. R. and P. Knepper. (1993). Correctional officers as human service workers: The effects on job satisfaction. *Justice Quarterly*, 10, 315-337.
- Hickman, M. J., A. R. Piquero, and J. R. Greene. (2000). Does community policing generate greater numbers and different types of citizen complaints than traditional policing? *Police Quarterly*, 3, 70-84.
- Holmes, S. T., K. M. Reynolds, and J. Frank. (1998). *Defining the Appropriate Parameters of the Use of Force Within Juvenile Correctional Facilities: An Exploratory Analysis of Officers' Opinions and Perspectives*. Unpublished reported submitted to the University of Central Florida.
- Huckabee, R. G. (1992). Stress in corrections: An overview of the issues. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 20, 479-486.
- Irwin, J. and D. Cressey. (1962). Thieves, convicts, and the inmate culture. *Social Problems*, 10 142-155.
- Jaccard, J. and C. K. Wan. (1996). *LISREL approaches to interaction effects in multiple regression*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Jackson, J. and S. Ammen. (1996). Race and correctional officers' punitive attitudes toward treatment programs for inmates. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 24, 153-166.
- Jacobs, J. B. and M. P. Gear. (1977). Dropouts and rejects: An analysis of the prison guard's revolving door. *Criminal Justice Review*, 2, 57-70.
- Jacobs, J. B. (1978). What prison guards think: A profile of the Illinois force. *Crime and Delinquency*, 25, 185-196.
- Jacobs, J. B. and L. J. Kraft. (1978). Integrating the keepers: A comparison of black and white prison guards in Illinois. *Social Problems*, 25, 304-318.
- Jacobs, J. B. and H. G. Retsky. (1975). Prison guard. *Urban Life*, 4, 5-29.
- Johnson, R. (1987). *Hard Time: Understanding and Reforming the Prison*. Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole.
- Johnson, R. and S. Price. (1981). The complete correctional officer: Human services and the human environment of the prison. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 8, 343-373.
- Johnson, R. and H. Toch. (1982). *The Pains of Imprisonment*. Beverly Hills: Sage.

- Jurik, N. C. (1985a). An officer and a lady: Organizational barriers to women working as correctional officers in men's prisons. *Social Problems*, 32, 375-388.
- Jurik, N. C. (1985b). Individual and organizational determinants of correctional officer attitudes toward inmates. *Criminology*, 23, 523-539.
- Jurik, N. C. and G. J. Halemba. (1984). Gender, work conditions, and job satisfaction of women in a non-traditional occupation: Female correctional officers in men's prisons. *Sociological Quarterly*, 22, 551-566.
- Jurik, N. C., G. J. Halemba, M. C. Musheno, and B. V. Boyle. (1987). Educational attainment, job satisfaction, and the professionalization of correctional officers. *Work and Occupations*, 14, 106-125.
- Jurik, N. C. and M. C. Musheno. (1986). The internal crisis of corrections: Professionalization and the work environment. *Justice Quarterly*, 3, 457-480.
- Jurik, N. C. and R. Winn. (1987). Describing correctional security dropouts and rejects: An individual or organizational profile? *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 14, 5-25.
- Kaufmann, K. (1981). Prison officers' attitudes and perceptions of attitudes: A case of pluralistic ignorance. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 18, 272-294.
- Klofas, J. (1986). Discretion among correctional officers: The influence of urbanization, age, and race. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 30, 111-121.
- Klofas, J. and H. Toch. (1982). The guard subculture myth. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 19, 238-254.
- Krajick, K. (1977). A step toward determinacy for juveniles. *Corrections*, 3, 37-42.
- Krisberg, B. and J. Austin. (1978). *The Children of Ishmael*. Palo Alto: Mayfield.
- Lariviere, M. (2001). *Antecedents and Outcomes of Correctional Officer Attitudes Towards Federal Inmates: An Exploration of Person-Organization Fit*. Unpublished doctoral thesis. Ottawa, ON: Carleton University.
- Lewis-Beck, M. S. (1980). *Applied Regression: An Introduction*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Lindquist, C. A. and J. T. Whitehead. (1986). Burnout, job stress, and job satisfaction among southern correctional officers: Perceptions and causal factors. *Journal of Offender Counseling, Services, and Rehabilitation*, 10, 5-26.

- Liou, K. T. (1995). Role stress and job stress among detention care workers. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 22, 425-436.
- Lombardo, L. X. (1981). *Guards Imprisoned: Correctional Officers at Work*. Cincinnati, OH: Anderson.
- Lombardo, L. X. (1985). Mental health work in prisons and jails: Inmate adjustment and indigenous correctional personnel. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 12, 17-27.
- Lotz, R. E., E. D. Poole, and R. M. Regoli. (1985). *Juvenile Delinquency and Juvenile Justice*. New York: Random House.
- Marquart, J. W. (1986). Prison guards and the use of physical coercion as a mechanism of prisoner control. *Criminology*, 24, 347-364.
- Martinson, R. (1974). What works? Questions and answers about prison reform. *The Public Interest*, 35, 22-54.
- McCorkle, R. C. (1993). Research note: Punish and rehabilitate? Public attitudes toward six common crimes. *Crime and Delinquency*, 39, 240-252.
- Merlo, A. (2000). Juvenile justice at the crossroads: Presidential address to the Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences. *Justice Quarterly*, 17, 639-661.
- Miller, J., P. H. Rossi, and J. E. Simpson. (1986). Perceptions of justice: Race and gender differences of appropriate prison sentences. *Law and Society Review*, 20, 313-334.
- Mitchell, O., D. L. MacKenzie, G. J. Styve, and A. R. Gover. (2000). The impact of individual, organizational, and environmental attributes on voluntary turnover among juvenile correctional staff members. *Justice Quarterly*, 17, 333-357.
- Moffitt, T. E. (1993). Adolescence-limited and life-course persistent antisocial behavior: A developmental taxonomy. *Psychological Review*, 100, 674-701.
- Moon, M. M., J. L. Sundt, F. T. Cullen, and J. P. Wright. (2000). Is child saving dead? Public support for juvenile rehabilitation. *Crime and Delinquency*, 46, 38-60.
- Morris, R. M. (1986). Burnout: Avoiding the consequences of on-the-job stress. *Corrections Today*, 48, 122-126.
- Muir, Jr., W. K. (1977). *Police: Streetcorner Politicians*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- National Opinion Research Center. (2001). *General Social Surveys, 1972-2000*. Storrs, CT: The Roper Center for Public Opinion Research, University of Connecticut.

- Osbourne, Y. H. and N. B. Rappaport. (1985). Sentencing severity with mock jurors: Predictive validity of three variable categories. *Behavioral Sciences and the Law*, 3, 467-473.
- Ostrom, E., R. Parks, and G. Whitaker. (1981). *Police Referral Practices and Social Service Agency Practices in Three Metropolitan Areas, 1977*. Bloomington: Indiana University.
- Pagano, R. R. (1990). *Understanding Statistics in the Behavioral Sciences*. St. Paul, MN: West.
- Parent, D., T. Dunworth, D. McDonald, and W. Rhodes. (1997). *Key Legislative Issues in Criminal Justice: Transferring Serious Juvenile Offenders to Adult Court*. Washington, DC: Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice.
- Patterson, B. L. (1992). Job experience and perceived job stress among police, correctional, and probation/parole officers. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 19, 260-285.
- Pedhazur, E.J. (1997). *Multiple Regression in Behavioral Research: Explanation and Prediction*. Fort Worth: Harcourt Brace.
- Pettinico, G. (1994). Crime and punishment: America changes its mind. *Public Perspective*, 5, 29-32.
- Philliber, S. (1987). The brother's keeper: A review of the literature on correctional officers. *Justice Quarterly*, 4, 9-37.
- Pisciotta, A. W. (1982). Saving the children: The promise and practice of *Parens Patriae*, 1838-98. *Crime and Delinquency*, 28, 410-425.
- Pisciotta, A. W. (1983). Race, sex, and rehabilitation: A study of differential treatment in the juvenile reformatory, 1825-1900. *Crime and Delinquency*, 29, 254-269.
- Platt, A. M. (1969). *The Child Savers: The Invention of Delinquency*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Platt, A. M. (1977). *The Child Savers: The Invention of Delinquency*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Platt, A. M. (1995). The child-saving movement and the origins of the juvenile justice system. In P. M. Sharp and B. W. Hancock (Eds.), *Juvenile Delinquency: Historical, Theoretical, and Societal Reactions to Youth* (pp. 13-28). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

- Poole, E. D. and M. R. Pogrebin. (1988). Deputy sheriffs as jail guards: A study of correctional policy orientations and career phases. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 15, 190-209.
- Poole, E. D. and R. M. Regoli. (1980a). Role stress, custody orientation, and disciplinary actions: A study of prison guards. *Criminology*, 18, 215-226.
- Poole, E. D. and T. M. Regoli. (1980b). Work relations and cynicism among prison guards. *Criminology*, 7, 303-314.
- Quinn, R. P. and L. Shepard. (1974). *The 1972-1973 Quality of Employment Survey*. Survey Research Center, Institute of Social Research, Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan.
- Quinn, R. P. and G. I. Staines. (1979). *The 1977 Quality of Employment Survey*. Survey Research Center, Institute of Social Research, Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan.
- Rankin, J. H. (1979). Changing attitudes toward capital punishment. *Social Forces*, 58, 194-211.
- Rizzo, J. R., R. J. House, and S. I. Lirtzman. (1970). Role conflict and ambiguity in complex organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 15, 150-163.
- Roberts, J. V. and L. J. Stalans. (1997). *Public Opinion, Crime, and Criminal Justice*. Boulder, CO: Westview.
- Robinson, D., F. Porporino, and L. Simourd. (1993). The influence of career orientation on support for rehabilitation among correctional staff. *Prison Journal*, 73, 162-177.
- Robinson, D., F. Porporino, and L. Simourd. (1997). The influence of educational attainment on the attitudes and job performance of correctional officers. *Crime and Delinquency*, 43, 60-77.
- Rogers, R. (1991). The effects of educational level on correctional officer job satisfaction. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 19, 123-137.
- Rossi, P. H. and R. A. Berk. (1985). Varieties of normative consensus. *American Sociological Review*, 50, 333-347.
- Rothman, D. J. (1971). *The Discovery of the Asylum: Social Order and Disorder in the New Republic*. Boston: Little, Brown.

- Rothman, D. (1978). The state as parent: Social policy in the progressive era. In W. Gaylin, I. Glasser, S. Marcus, and D. Rothman (Eds.), *Doing Good: The Limits of Benevolence*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Rothman, D. J. (1980). *Conscience and Convenience: The Asylum and its Alternatives in Progressive America*. Boston: Little, Brown.
- Roush, D. W. and E. L. Dunlap. (1997). Juveniles in adult prisons: A very bad idea. *Corrections Today*, 59, 21.
- Ryerson, E. (1978). *The Best-Laid Plans: America's Juvenile Court Experiment*. New York: Hill and Wang.
- Samuel, W. and E. Moulds. (1986). The effect of crime severity on perceptions of fair punishment: A California case study. *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*, 77, 931-948.
- Schur, E. M. (1973). *Radical Non-intervention: Rethinking the delinquency problem*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Schwartz, I. M., J. M. Abbey, and W. H. Baron. (1990). *The Perception and Reality of Juvenile Crime in Michigan*. Ann Arbor, MI: Center for the Study of Youth Policy.
- Schwartz, I. M., S. Guo, and J. J. Kerbs. (1992). The impact of demographic variables on public opinion regarding juvenile justice: Implications for public policy. *Crime and Delinquency*, 39, 5-28.
- Schwartz, I. M., J. J. Kerbs, D. M. Hogston, and C. L. Guillean. (1992). *Combating Juvenile Crime: What the Public Really Wants?* Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan, Center for the Study of Youth Policy.
- Schwartz, I. M., N. A. Weiner, and G. Enosh. (1999). Myopic justice? The juvenile court and child welfare systems. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 564, 126-141.
- Shamir, B. and A. Drory. (1982). Some correlates of prison guards' beliefs. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 8, 233-249.
- Sickmund, M., H. N. Snyder, and E. Poe-Yamagata. (1997). *Juvenile Offenders and Victims: 1997 Update on Violence*. Washington, DC: Department of Justice, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.
- Sickmund, M., A. L. Stahl, T. A. Finnegan, H. N. Snyder, R. S. Poole, and J. A. Butts. (1998). *Juvenile Court Statistics, 1995*. Washington, DC: Department of Justice, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.

- Sickmund, M. A. and Y. Wan. (2002). *Census of Juveniles in Residential Placement Databook*. Washington, DC: US Department of Justice, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.
- Sims, B. (2001). Surveying the correctional environment: A review of the literature. *Corrections Management Quarterly*, 5, 1-12.
- Smith, T. W. (1990). Liberal and conservative trends in the United States since World War II. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 54, 479-507.
- Snyder, H. N. (1998). Juvenile arrests 1997. *Juvenile Justice Bulletin*. Washington, DC: Department of Justice, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.
- Sprott, J. B. (1998). Understanding public opposition to a separate youth system. *Crime and Delinquency*, 44, 399-411.
- Stahl, A. L. (2003). *Delinquency Cases in Juvenile Courts, 1999*. Washington, DC: Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.
- Stahl, A., T. Finnegan, and W. Kang. (2002). *Easy Access to Juvenile Court Statistics: 1985-2000* [Online]. Washington, DC: Department of Justice, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. Available: <http://ojjdp.ncjrs.org/ojstatbb/ezajcs>.
- Steinhart, D. (1988). *California Opinion Poll: Public Attitudes on Youth Crime*. San Francisco: National Council on Crime and Delinquency.
- Stevens, D. J. (1998). Correctional officer attitudes: Job satisfaction levels linked to length of employment. *Corrections Compendium*, 23, 1-20.
- Strom, K. J. (2000). Profile of state prisoners under the age of 18, 1985-1997. *Bureau of Justice Statistics Special Report*, February, 1-12.
- Sundt, J. L. (1999). Is there room for change? A review of public attitudes toward crime control and alternatives to incarceration. *Southern Illinois Law Journal*, 23, 519-537.
- Sundt, J. L. and F. T. Cullen. (2002). The correctional ideology of prison chaplains: A national survey. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 30, 369-385.
- Sundt, J. L., F. T. Cullen, B. K. Applegate, and M. G. Turner. (1998). The tenacity of the rehabilitative ideal revisited: Have attitudes toward rehabilitation changed? *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 25, 426-442.
- Sykes, G. M. (1958). *The Society of Captives: A Study of a Maximum Security Prison*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

- Terrill, W. and S. D. Mastrofski. (2002). Situational and officer-based determinants of police coercion. *Justice Quarterly*, 19, 215-248.
- Teske, R. and H. Williamson. (1979). Correctional officers' attitudes toward selected treatment programs. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 6, 64-82.
- Thomas, C. (1977). Theoretical perspectives on prisonization: A comparison of the importation and deprivation models. *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*, 68, 135-145.
- Thomson, D. R. and A. J. Ragona. (1987). Popular moderation versus governmental authoritarianism: An interactionist view of public sentiments toward criminal sanctions. *Crime and Delinquency*, 33, 337-357.
- Tipton, J. A. (2002). Attitudes and perceptions of South Carolina's juvenile correctional officers, insight into the turnover epidemic. *Journal of Crime and Justice*, 25, 81-98.
- Toch, H. and J. Klofas. (1982). Alienation and desire for job enrichment among correction officers. *Federal Probation*, 46, 35-44.
- Torbet, P. (1997). States respond to violent juvenile crime. *National Centre for Juvenile Justice in Brief*, 1, 1.
- Torbet, P. and L. Szymanski. (1998). State legislative responses to violent juvenile crime: 1996-97 update. *Juvenile Justice Bulletin*. Washington, DC: Department of Justice.
- Triplett, R. (1996). The growing threat: Gangs and juvenile offenders. In T. J. Flanagan and D. R. Longmire (Eds.), *Americans View Crime and Justice: A National Public Opinion Survey*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Triplett, R., J. L. Mullings, and K. E. Scarborough. (1996). Work-related stress and coping among correctional officers: Implications from organizational literature. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 24, 291-308.
- Van Voorhis, P., F. T. Cullen, B. G. Link, and N. T. Wolfe. (1991). The impact of race and gender on correctional officers' orientation to the integrated environment. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 28, 472-500.
- Van Voorhis, P., M. Braswell, and D. Lester. (2000). *Correctional Counseling and Rehabilitation*. Cincinnati: Anderson.
- Veneziano, C. (1984). Occupational stress and the line correctional officer. *Southern Journal of Criminal Justice*, 8, 214-231.

- Warr, M. (1995). Public opinion on crime and punishment. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 59, 296-310.
- Warr, M., R. F. Meier, and M. L. Erickson. (1983). Norms, theories of punishment, and publicly preferred penalties for crimes. *Sociological Quarterly*, 24, 75-91.
- Warr, M. and M. Stafford. (1984). Public goals of punishment and support for the death penalty. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 21, 95-111.
- Whitehead, J. T. and C. A. Lindquist. (1985). Job stress and burnout among probation/parole officers: Perceptions and causal factors. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 29, 109-119.
- Whitehead, J. T. and C. A. Lindquist. (1986). Correctional officer job burnout: A path model. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 23, 23-42.
- Whitehead, J. T. and C. A. Lindquist. (1989). Determinants of correctional officers' professional orientation. *Justice Quarterly*, 6, 69-87.
- Whitehead, J. T. and C. A. Lindquist. (1992). Determinants of probation and parole officer professional orientation. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 20, 13-24.
- Whitehead, J. T., C. A. Lindquist, and J. Klofas. (1987). Correctional officer professional orientation: A replication of the Klofs-Toch measure. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 14, 468-486.
- Wines, E. C. (1871). *Transactions of the National Congress on Penitentiary and Reformatory Discipline*. Albany: Weed, Parsons and Company.
- Worden, R. (1995). The causes of police brutality: Theory and evidence on police use of force. In W. Geller and H. Toch (Eds.), *And Justice for All: Understanding and Controlling Police Use of Force*. Washington, DC: Police Executive Research Forum.
- Wright, K. N. and W. G. Saylor. (1991). Male and female employees' perceptions of prison work: Is there a difference? *Justice Quarterly*, 8, 505-524.
- Wright, K. N. and W. G. Saylor. (1992). A comparison of perceptions of the work environment between minority and non-minority employees of the federal prison system. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 20, 63-71.
- Zupan, L. (1986). Gender-related differences in correctional officers' perceptions and attitudes. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 14, 349-361.
- Zumbo, B. D. and D. W. Zimmerman. (1993). Is the selection of statistical methods governed by level of measurement. *Canadian Psychology*, 34, 390-399.