



Federal Probation

Implementing Community Service: The Referral Process *Probation Division, Administrative Office of the United States Courts*

Strategies for Working With Special-Needs Probationers *Ellen C. Wertlieb, Martin A. Greenberg*

Do Correctional Industries Adversely Impact the Private Sector? *Robert C. Grieser*

of State Correctional Officials regarding Causes, Court Orders, and Solutions *Fred Holbert, Jack E. Call*

Orientation of Prison Guards: Support Rehabilitation? *Francis T. Cullen, Faith E. Lutze, Bruce G. Link, Nancy Travis Wolfe*

NCJRS

MAY 15 1989

ACQUISITIONS

of Correctional Privatization: in the 19th Century Experience and for Modern Corrections *Alexis M. Durham III*

Prisons' Reformatory: A Example of Failed Institutional Reform *Beverly A. Smith*

Justice Mass Program: A Private for Financing and Control *Samuel P. ...*

of Corrections: A Study of the *John P. ...*

117255
117263

MARCH 1989

U.S. Department of Justice
National Institute of Justice

117255-
117263

This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated in this document are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the National Institute of Justice.

Permission to reproduce this copyrighted material has been granted by

Federal Probation

to the National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS).

Further reproduction outside of the NCJRS system requires permission of the copyright owner.

This Issue in Brief

Implementing Community Service: The Referral Process.—A community service sentence can serve many purposes—to deter, punish, or rehabilitate, while at the same time assuring that an offender receives a publicly discernable penalty. With increased interest in community service, many questions and issues have arisen regarding its use. This article, an excerpt from the monograph, *Community Service: A Guide for Sentencing and Implementation*, concentrates on the practical aspects of operating a community service program. Among the issues addressed are how to select appropriate agencies to receive community service; how to prepare the offender for community service; how to follow up after the offender is placed with an organization; and how to evaluate the success of a community service program. The information is especially directed to Federal probation officers but will also serve as a guide for other criminal justice and corrections professionals involved in sentencing and sentence implementation.

Strategies for Working With Special-Needs Probationers.—Authors Ellen C. Wertlieb and Martin A. Greenberg discuss the results of a survey of what alternatives to incarceration probation officers use with their disabled clients. Findings indicate a great deal of disparity regarding the approaches used within and across probation jurisdictions. All probation officers agreed, however, that they needed additional training to better serve their special-needs clients. The article concludes with some suggested strategies for improving service-delivery to probationers with disabilities.

Do Correctional Industries Adversely Impact the Private Sector?—Correctional industries have been the subject of much attention and often unfavorable publicity over the past several years. Complaints have gotten stronger in recent months as prison industries nationally are seeking to expand to keep pace with rapidly rising prison populations. Author Robert C. Grieser responds to those com-

plaints by addressing some of the numerous myths about prison industries that exist on the part of many in the private sector. The author also suggests ways in which the private sector and prison industries can work together to the benefit of both.

The Perspective of State Correctional Officials on Prison Overcrowding: Causes, Court Orders, and Solutions.—Overcrowding continues to be a major problem facing prison administrators

CONTENTS

[Implementing Community Service: The Referral Process	Probation Division, Administrative Office of the United States Courts	117255
			3
[Strategies for Working with Special-Needs Probationers	Ellen C. Wertlieb Martin A. Greenberg	117256
			10
[Do Correctional Industries Adversely Impact the Private Sector?	Robert C. Grieser	117257
			18
[The Perspective of State Correctional Officials on Prison Overcrowding: Causes, Court Orders, and Solutions	Fred Holbert Jack E. Call	117257
			25
[The Correctional Orientation of Prison Guards: Do Officers Support Rehabilitation?	Francis T. Cullen Faith E. Lutze Bruce G. Link Nancy Travis Wolfe	117259
			33
[Rehabilitation and Correctional Privatization: Observations on the 19th Century Experience and Implications for Modern Corrections	Alexis M. Durham III	117260
			43
[Ireland's Ennis Inebriates' Reformatory: A 19th Century Example of Failed Institutional Reform	Beverly A. Smith	117261
			53
[The Kentucky Substance Abuse Program: A Private Program to Treat Probationers and Parolees	Gennaro F. Vito	117262
			65
[The Forgotten Few: Juvenile Female Offenders	Ilene R. Bergsmann	117263
			73
	Departments		
	News of the Future		79
	Looking at the Law		85
	Reviews of Professional Periodicals		89
	Your Bookshelf on Review		95
	Letter to the Editor		105
	It Has Come to Our Attention		106

The Correctional Orientation of Prison Guards: Do Officers Support Rehabilitation?

BY FRANCIS T. CULLEN, FAITH E. LUTZE, BRUCE G. LINK, AND NANCY TRAVIS WOLFE*

SINCE THE early 1970's, a sustained attack has been levied against the notion that rehabilitation should be the guiding philosophy of the correctional system. The origins and nature of this attack have been discussed at length elsewhere (Allen, 1980; Cullen and Gilbert, 1982; Currie, 1985; Greenberg and Humphries, 1982; Rothman, 1978); for our purposes, it is sufficient to note the growing acceptance among criminologists that little support exists for treating offenders. Few scholars have taken issue with the claim that the "rehabilitative ideal has declined" (Allen, 1980); indeed, in an era when rejecting rehabilitation has become "fashionable," as Currie (1985: 235) observes, many criminologists have welcomed this trend (cf. von Hirsch, 1985).

It would be difficult to dispute that the power of the rehabilitative ideal to shape correctional policy has been diminished substantially. The vocabulary used in today's discussions of criminal justice reform leaves little room for notions of individualized treatment; more common, of course, are such terms as determinate sentencing, mandatory incarceration, career criminal programs, selective incapacitation, scaring offenders straight, and just plain "getting tough."

On an ideological level, however, the need exists to determine the extent to which, and in what social and political circles, rehabilitation's appeal has in fact waned. Some evidence that attitudes have hardened can be drawn from the policies now being implemented. But the risk in this line of analysis is that it assumes that crime policies are a direct manifestation of the "public will" and not a reflection, in greater or lesser part, of prevailing structural and political circumstances (Cullen, Clark, and Wozniak, 1985; Scheingold, 1984). Other evidence for the ideo-

logical decline of rehabilitation can be drawn from opinion polls: support for capital punishment increased dramatically after the mid-1960's and support for treatment as the "purpose of imprisonment" slid in the past decade (Flanagan and Caulfield, 1985; Rankin, 1979; Stinchcombe, Adams, Heimer, Scheppele, Smith, and Taylor, 1980).

Even so, this empirical evidence is not sufficient to confirm that a wholesale rejection of rehabilitation has taken place. A much larger body of survey data supports the opposite assessment. Thus, throughout the late 1970's and into 1980's, state and national polls have consistently indicated that the public continues to view rehabilitation as a legitimate and important goal of the correctional system; moreover, support for rehabilitation typically equals or surpasses citizen support for the punitive objectives of retribution, deterrence, and/or incapacitation (Cullen, Clark, and Wozniak, 1985; Cullen, Cullen, and Wozniak, 1988; Cullen, Golden, and Cullen, 1983; Cullen, Skovron, Scott, and Burton, forthcoming; Thomson and Ragona, 1987).

Still, important empirical questions remain. One of these, which defines the focus of the research reported here, is the extent to which rehabilitation has retained support among correctional employees. Assessing the nature of citizen attitudes is important, particularly when one considers the frequency with which policies are legitimate on the grounds that they are "what the public wants." At the same time, the fabric of life within the correctional system is shaped intimately, and daily, by the system's employees. Achieving a more adequate understanding of how these employees view the nature and purpose of their work thus seems a worthy enterprise.

The present study builds upon research that has investigated the level and sources of correctional officer support for rehabilitation. Though still relatively sparse, the existing data reject the portrait of the "prison guard" as someone either inherently authoritarian or transformed into a brutish creature by an inhumane prison environment. Indeed, the literature indicates that correctional officers do not simply embrace punitive and custodial views but also are supportive of rehabilitative and human services

*Dr. Cullen is professor, University of Cincinnati. Ms. Lutze is graduate research assistant, Pennsylvania State University. Dr. Link is associate professor, Columbia University. Dr. Wolfe is associate professor, University of South Carolina. Direct all correspondence to: Francis T. Cullen, Department of Criminal Justice, Mail Location 108, University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, Ohio, 45221-0108.

goals (Cullen and Gilbert, 1982: 259; Harris, 1968: 15; Jacobs, 1978: 192; Toch and Grant, 1982; Toch and Klofas, 1982; Shamir and Drory, 1981; more generally, see Johnson, 1987 and Philliber, 1987).

At issue, however, is the extent to which these data allow us to generalize regarding the status of rehabilitation among correctional officers. Again, research specifically addressing guards' support for treatment is still rudimentary: the studies are few, descriptive data are not always reported, single items are often used to measure concepts, and only a small number of states (Alabama, Illinois, New York, and "Western State") have been surveyed systematically. (Harris's poll used a national sample, but was conducted in the 1960's.) Our research does not claim to fill completely these voids, but we are able to present results based on a fairly recent survey (collected in late 1983 and early 1984) of a sample of southern officers. We also rely on data from a survey that contained multiple items assessing guards' orientation toward both custody and rehabilitation.

Beyond the question of the level of support accorded rehabilitation, we explore the potential sources of such support. In doing so, we build on a line of analysis highlighted initially by Jacobs and Kraft (1978) and more recently by Jurik (1985; Jurik and Halemba, 1984): the relative effects on job-related attitudes of individual status characteristics (gender, race, education) and work or organizational conditions. Although some research indicates that the impact of individual characteristics is attenuated by the structure of work roles within prison (and other) formal organizations (Jacobs and Kraft, 1978; Jurik and Halemba, 1984), Jurik (1985) reported recently that both "individual attributes" and "organizational-level" variables influenced "attitudes toward inmates" (cf. Whitehead and Lindquist, 1989). We replicate much of Jurik's (1985) analysis and attempt to extend her study by including a wider range of independent and dependent variables.

Methods

Sample

In late 1983, we sent questionnaires to 250 correctional officers employed in a southern correctional system. These officers were a simple random sample of "All Active Correctional Officers" in the state as of November 3, 1983 (N = 1,169). The list was limited to line staff and thus did not contain supervisory personnel. Two weeks after the initial contact, the sample was sent a second questionnaire. In all, we received 155 questionnaires, a response of 62 percent.¹

The sample's main background characteristics are reported in table 1. The state's Department of Corrections (DOC), which gave official approval for this study, generated characteristics for the population of officers in the state. This information allows for a comparison of sample-population characteristics.

As can be seen in table 1, the sample is fairly representative with the possible exception of two factors. First, the sample includes a disproportionate percentage of white officers, who are now a numerical minority on the force. Second, although the mean years of education are similar,² the Department of Corrections notes that 36 percent of the force has graduated from college. The sample figure is 19.4 percent, with another 50.3 percent having attended but not completed college (the DOC did not provide data on this latter category). Consequently, the sample underestimates the percentage of college graduates in this population. Even so, while the national trend is to diversify socially and professionalize through education the guard force (Jurik and Musheno, 1986; Philliber, 1987), our sample has a higher percentage of blacks, women, and educated officers than the average across correctional systems (Camp and Camp, 1986; Travisono and Ludwig, 1986).

TABLE 1. CHARACTERISTICS OF SAMPLE COMPARED WITH CHARACTERISTICS OF TOTAL OFFICER POPULATION (N = 155)

Characteristics	Sample	Population
<i>Gender (Percent Male)</i>	78.8	82.0
<i>Race (Percent White)</i>	56.9	46.0
<i>Mean Age</i>	38.1	37.0
<i>Mean Years Correctional Experience</i>	3.5	3.0
<i>Mean Years Education</i>	13.2	13.0
<i>Percent College Graduate</i>	19.4	36.0
<i>Percent Working in Maximum Security Institution</i>	42.1	47.6

¹One respondent listed his/her rank as "Correctional Officer Assistant Supervisor." Since we only sampled line-staff officers, this response was puzzling. A possibly exists that the officer had been promoted between the time the questionnaire was sent and the time it was answered. Regardless, because the officer was included in the list provided by the Department of Corrections, we used this person in our sample.

²Because education was measured through categories as opposed to the exact number of years completed, the mean years of education reported for the sample in table 1 was computed by assigning a value to each category and using this score for all respondents who selected this category to indicate their level of education. The specific values assigned were as follows: Non-high school graduates: 10 years of education completed; high school graduates: 12 years of education completed; attended but did not finish college: 13 years; college graduate: 16 years; went to graduate school: 17 years. While other values could arguably be chosen, we believe that the figures here are sufficient to show the approximate educational level of the sample.

Assessing how the composition of the sample might influence results is difficult. As Philliber (1987) observes in her summary of research on "attitudes toward inmates," the research on this topic has produced inconsistent, if not "confusing," findings. Thus, in their study of Illinois officers, Jacobs and Kraft (1978: 314, 317) concluded that compared to whites, black guards "do not hold more rehabilitative views" and, if anything, are more likely to "express a punitive orientation." Crouch and Alpert (1982) reported the similar result that neither race nor education was related to punitiveness toward inmates, though they did reveal data suggesting that female officers in women's prisons were socialized to hold less "tough-minded" views than males working in men's prisons. Jurik's (1985) research on "attitudes toward inmates" also found no education effects; unlike Crouch and Alpert (1982), however, her analysis found no gender differences as well. Moreover, she reported that minority officers—a group that included blacks, Hispanics, and Native Americans—had more favorable attitudes toward inmates. As will be discussed, our findings correspond closely to Jurik's (1985): we also discovered that gender and education had no impact on either custody or rehabilitative orientations, but we did find, like Jurik (1985), that minority officers were more favorable toward rehabilitation. Accordingly, since our sample's percentage of black officers underrepresents the figure for the state correctional system we examined but is higher than the national percentage (46.0 percent versus 19.8 percent), our data on the level of support for rehabilitation may underestimate the level for all officers in the state and be greater than that found in states with fewer minority guards.

Measures

Correctional Orientations. The purpose of this study was to explore the nature and sources of prison guards' correctional orientations or ideology. To assess the sample's attitudes, we included two scales, one measuring support for custody and the other measuring support for rehabilitation. The items comprising these scales are presented, respectively, in tables 2 and 3. Also, the scales' items were randomly placed within a questionnaire that contained 57 statements. For each item, the respondents were instructed to use a seven-point Likert scale ranging from "1 = very strongly agree" to "7 = very strongly disagree" to express "the extent to which you agree or disagree with the statements listed below." Finally, each scale was scored by summing the responses to the items composing it and dividing by

TABLE 2. CORRECTIONAL OFFICER SUPPORT FOR CUSTODIAL ORIENTATION, PERCENT AGREEING-DISAGREEING REPORTED

Items	Percent Agree	Percent Uncertain	Percent Disagree
1. <i>Keeping the inmates from causing trouble is my major concern while I'm on the job.</i>	75.3	2.6	22.1
2. <i>Many people don't realize it, but prisons are too soft on the inmates.</i>	78.1	7.1	14.8
3. <i>An inmate will go straight only when he finds that prison life is hard.</i>	27.1	18.7	54.2
4. <i>Sleep 'em, feed 'em, and work 'em is the best way to handle inmates.</i>	22.1	14.3	63.6
5. <i>We would be successful even if all we taught inmates was a little respect for authority.</i>	43.8	13.7	42.5
6. <i>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.</i>	14.4	3.9	81.8
7. <i>My job isn't to help rehabilitate inmates; it's only to keep them orderly so that they don't hurt anyone in here or tear this place apart.</i>	41.2	4.6	54.2

the number of items in the scale.

Four items for the "custody scale" (see items 2, 3, 4, and 5 in table 2) were drawn from a measure developed by Pool and Regoli (1980: 225), while we added the remaining three items (items 1, 6, and 7). The scale's reliability (Cronbach's Alpha) was .64.

The items for the "rehabilitation scale" were taken from a previous study (Cullen et al., forthcoming) based on a 1982 survey of citizens in Galesburg, Illinois. One advantage of using this measure is that it allows for a comparison of the correctional officers' attitudes with public attitudes (see table 3). Cronbach's Alpha for the scale was .79.

Finally, we also asked the sample to answer a forced-choice question, used previously by Jacobs (1978: 192), which asked, "What, in your opinion, is

the main reason for putting the offender in prison?" Possible responses included: "to rehabilitate him"; "to protect society by making sure that he does not commit any more crimes for a while"; "to punish him for what he did wrong"; "to deter him from committing a crime in the future." Although nearly 90 percent of the sample chose only one answer, the remaining officers circled more than one response. As a result, some caution should be exercised in interpreting the data based on this question.

Work-Related Variables. Since a purpose of this research was to explore the extent to which work conditions and individual characteristics are sources of correctional officers' orientations, we included several work-related variables in our analysis. Four of the variables—role problems, dangerousness, work stress, and supervisory support—were measured through multiple items. As with the custody and rehabilitation scales, the items comprising these measures were contained among a larger set of statements and responded to with a seven-point Likert scale assessing the degree to which an officer agreed or disagreed with the item. These scales were derived from measures used in a previous study of police officers (Cullen, Lemming, Link, and Wozniak, 1985; Cullen, Link, Travis, and Lemming, 1983). The reliabilities for the scales are acceptable for both studies, suggesting that the scales mean roughly the same thing to different kinds of criminal justice employees (police versus guards) in different regions of the country (the police sample was drawn from mid-western suburban communities). This pattern lends added confidence that the scales are reliable and valid. The items for each of these scales are listed in appendix A.

The "role problems" scale (Alpha = .66) was used not only in the police study noted above but also was almost identical to the items used by Poole and Regoli (1980: 224-225) in their research on correctional officers. One item developed by Poole and Regoli was deleted because it could have been interpreted as assessing supervisory support, another variable in our analysis. The five-item scale measured the degree to which officers experienced such problems as role conflict and ambiguity. Previous research has suggested that role problems precipitate a custodial-punitive orientation toward inmates (Hepburn and Albonetti, 1980; Poole and Regoli, 1980) and lessen support for rehabilitation (Shamir and Drory, 1981).

The "dangerousness" scale (Alpha = .78) assessed the extent to which officers felt they work in a dangerous job, had a more hazardous job than other oc-

cupations, and had a good chance at being injured. We had intended to include a variable on actual physical victimization, but deleted this from the analysis when 87 percent of the officers reported no physical assaults "within the past year." We used this scale because prison work is often portrayed as a dangerous occupation.

The "work stress" scale (Alpha = .74) examined the extent to which officers felt "tense," "frustrated," "worried," or "upset" while working. Since numerous researchers argue that correctional work is stressful (for a summary, see Philliber, 1987), the potential impact of this variable on officers' orientation seemed to merit consideration.

The "supervisory support" scale (Alpha = .82) assessed whether officers felt that their supervisors offered encouragement, emphasized the importance of their work, and handled disputes in a friendly way. Previous research on work relations has observed the impact of supervisory support on a range of job-related outcomes (House, 1981; Cullen, Lemming, Link, and Wozniak, 1985).

As Philliber (1987) notes, research has indicated that correctional experience or length of service affects officers' orientations, usually in the direction of heightening a custodial orientation or negative attitudes toward inmates (Jurik, 1985: 533-535; Poole and Regoli, 1980: 219-220). In our study, correctional experience was measured by asking officers how many years they had been employed as a correctional officer.

We also assessed two other work conditions. First, we examined the potential effects of working in prisons of different levels of security. The sample was divided into those assigned to a maximum security institution versus those who were not. Since the women's facilities contained offenders from all classification levels, this raised a coding problem. Following the assumption that female prisons generally pose less of a security risk than male prisons, officers employed in the women's institutions were coded with those in the minimum-medium security category.

Second, the nature of officers' interaction with inmates varies by the shift to which they are assigned. In our study, we asked officers whether they worked the "day shift" (beginning between 6:30 and 8 a.m.), "evening shift" (beginning between 2:30 and 4 p.m.), or "night shift" (beginning between 10:30 p.m. and 12 a.m.). We incorporated the three-category shift variable in our analysis by including two dummy variables: one reflecting the day shift, the other the night shift. This left the evening shift as the reference or comparison group. As such, the analysis will

show whether officers on the day and night shifts differ significantly in their orientations from those on the evening shift.

Individual Characteristics. Data were collected on three individual characteristics: gender, race, and level of education. We also created a fourth variable: the age at which a respondent became a correctional officer. As Philliber (1987) observes, previous research has risked confounding the effects of correctional experience (time on the job) and officers' ages. To address this issue, we subtracted the number of years an officer had been a guard (correctional experience) from his or her age. This procedure allowed us to obtain an estimate of when the respondent became a correctional officer. The only caution is that we were unable to determine if any officers in the sample had been employed as a prison guard, left correctional work for another occupation, and eventually returned to the force. For these officers, subtracting correctional experience from age would not measure precisely when they entered correctional work. Even so, at the very least, our procedure has the advantage of separating for all officers in the sample their years working as a correctional officer from their years as a member of the general public.

In our sample, the correlation between correctional experience and years since became a correctional officer is .170; the correlation is .403 for correctional experience and age.

Multicollinearity. An examination of the zero-order correlations indicated some overlap among our predictor variables. The risk of multicollinearity is not severe, however, since only moderate intercorrelations existed among a small subset of our predictor variables. The highest correlations occurred between role problems and supervisory support ($r = -.544$), work stress ($r = .461$), and dangerousness ($r = .483$).

Findings and Analysis

Officers' Correctional Orientation

We begin our analysis by reporting the results on the forced-choice questions asking officers to state the "main reason for putting the offender in prison." These data do not indicate much support for treatment, as only 10.3 percent selected "to rehabilitate" the offender. By contrast, 24.5 percent favored as the purpose of imprisonment the protection of society (incapacitation), 25.4 percent favored punishing offenders for their wrongdoings (retribution), and 29.0

percent favored deterrence. (As noted, the remaining 10.8 percent of the officers erroneously selected more than one response.) Notably, in Jacobs' (1978: 192) Illinois study, 46 percent chose the rehabilitation response to this same question. The decline in level of support for treatment may reflect changing correctional ideology over the past decade (Jacobs' data were collected in 1974-75) or regional differences between the two samples (midwestern versus southern).

The idea that prison guards hold strong custodial attitudes (ostensibly at the expense of rehabilitative sentiments) gains added credence from responses on several of the items tapping a custodial orientation. For each item, table 2 reports the percentage of the sample "agreeing" (1 = very strongly agree, 2 = strongly agree, and 3 = agree), "uncertain" (4 = uncertain), or "disagreeing" (5 = disagree, 6 = strongly disagree, 7 = very strongly disagree). Table 3 presents the same descriptive statistics for the rehabilitation items.

Thus, over three-fourths of the officers agreed that "keeping inmates from causing trouble is my major concern" (item 1), while nearly 80 percent felt that the public is unaware that "prisons are too soft on the inmates" (item 2). But at this point the data challenge the view that the correctional orientation of the guards sampled is purely custodial. If officers believe that punitive goals justify sending offenders to prison, place a great emphasis on the security function of their role, and have some negative attitudes toward inmates (as the responses to the questions above suggest), they also appear to believe that correctional officers should do more than guard inmates and that prisons should not be reduced to warehouses. Consistent with the conclusions reached by Johnson (1987) and Toch and Klofas (1982), the officers see the human services side to their work and see prisons as places in which the reformation of offenders should, and can, take place.

It is instructive that we learn from table 2 that a majority of the sample disagreed that hard time is the strategy for making inmates "go straight" (item 3) and that the most effective way to control inmates is "to sleep 'em, feed 'em, and work 'em" (item 4). There was also no strong endorsement of the idea that officers would be "successful" if they achieved the modest goal of teaching inmates a "little respect for authority" (item 5). Most important, over 80 percent of the sample disagreed with the view that they cared only if inmates stayed quiet and not if they were rehabilitated (item 6), while a majority of the

TABLE 3. CORRECTIONAL OFFICER SUPPORT FOR REHABILITATION, PERCENT AGREEING-DISAGREEING REPORTED

Items	Percent Agree	Percent Uncertain	Percent Disagree	Percent Public Agree*
1. <i>All rehabilitation programs have done is to allow criminals who deserve to be punished to get off easily.</i>	26.6	20.8	52.6	23.9
2. <i>Rehabilitating a criminal is just as important as making a criminal pay for his or her crime.</i>	70.1	9.7	20.2	55.5
3. <i>The only effective and humane cure to the crime problem in America is to make a strong effort to rehabilitate offenders.</i>	43.1	16.3	40.6	31.2
4. <i>The only way to reduce crime in our society is to punish criminals, not try to rehabilitate them.</i>	20.3	19.0	60.8	28.8
5. <i>We should stop viewing criminals as victims of society who deserve to be rehabilitated and start paying more attention to the victims of these criminals.</i>	59.3	14.8	25.9	82.0
6. <i>I would support expanding the rehabilitation programs with criminals that are now being undertaken in our prisons.</i>	53.9	24.7	21.4	48.1
7. <i>One of the reasons why rehabilitation programs often fail with prisoners is because they are under-funded; if enough money were available, these programs would work.</i>	29.7	20.6	49.7	22.1
8. <i>The rehabilitation of adult criminals just does not work.</i>	21.9	29.0	49.1	43.2
9. <i>The rehabilitation of prisoners has proven to be a failure.</i>	28.1	26.8	45.1	27.6

*Public responses from 1982 Galesburg, Illinois sample.

officers rejected the idea that their job was not to "rehabilitate inmates" but to "keep them orderly" (item 7).

The data in table 3 generally reinforce the conclusion that officers do not embrace an exclusively custodial orientation toward offenders. To be sure, some negative attitudes toward inmates are evident: nearly 60 percent of the sample agreed that offenders are shown too much sympathy (item 5). They were also skeptical that increased funding will make treatment programs more effective; perhaps they feel that when programs fail, the fault lies with the inmates' character, not with the integrity of the intervention (item 7).

Even so, support for treatment ideology remains strong. A majority disagreed that rehabilitation programs have allowed criminals "to get off easily" (item 1), while 70 percent agreed that treating offenders is as important as punishing them (item 2). The officers also agreed that merely punishing criminals is not an effective crime control agenda; they felt that rehabilitation should be included as part of the strategy (items 3 and 4). Moreover, they favored the

expansion of prison rehabilitation programs, perhaps because they rejected the fashionable notions that such programs "do not work" and have "proven to be a failure" (items 6, 8 and 9).

As noted, we are able to compare the guards' responses on the rehabilitation items with those obtained in a 1982 survey of Galesburg, Illinois residents. We are well aware of the risks of comparing a sample of southern correctional officers with a sample drawn from a small city in rural Illinois (though the responses of the Galesburg sample are not inconsistent with the results of other public surveys). Still, the results of this comparison are, in the least, suggestive, and allow us to have a different vantage point in our efforts to determine whether working in prison hardens, softens, or leaves unchanged attitudes toward inmates.

Thus, table 3 presents the percent in the two samples that agreed with each of the rehabilitation items. The responses appear more similar than different; moreover, in only two instances (items 1 and 9) were the correctional officers less likely than the public sample to favor the rehabilitative answer. This pat-

tern indicates that corrections may attract workers that are inclined toward a human services orientation and/or that contact with offenders does not substantially lessen support for treatment ideology (Jurik, 1985: 536; cf. Bynum, Greene, and Cullen, 1986; Link and Cullen, 1986).³

TABLE 4. SOURCES OF CORRECTIONAL OFFICER SUPPORT FOR CUSTODY

Independent Variables	B	Beta	Significance Level
<i>Role Problems</i>	.232	.271	.01
<i>Dangerousness</i>	.019	.023	.81
<i>Working in Maximum Security Prison</i>	.162	.093	.30
<i>Work Stress</i>	.073	.078	.47
<i>Day Shift</i>	-.041	-.023	.81
<i>Night Shift</i>	.447	.230	.01
<i>Supervisory Support</i>	.138	.172	.08
<i>Correctional Experience</i>	.042	.136	.11
<i>Age Became Correctional Officer</i>	.003	.031	.72
<i>Gender (1 = Male, 0 = Female)</i>	-.014	-.006	.94
<i>Race (1 = White, 0 = Black)</i>	.115	.065	.44
<i>Education</i>	.045	.042	.61

$R^2 = .15$; Adjusted $R^2 = .08$.

F Value for Equation = 2.133, df = 12,142; p = .02

Sources of Officers' Correctional Orientation

Table 4 presents the results when custody is regressed on work and individual variables. Overall, only a relatively small percentage of the variance is explained ($R^2 = .15$). Several relationships, however, are suggested.

First, consistent with previous research (Poole and Regoli, 1980; cf. Hepburn and Albonetti, 1980), the role problems variable is positively related to custody. It seems that officers seek to resolve the conflicts and ambiguities of their occupational role by responding to inmates rigidly and impersonally, rather than in a flexible and individualized manner as encouraged by a human services model (Johnson, 1987). Second, officers on the night shift also are

more likely to embrace a custodial orientation. Since these officers supervise inmates who are predominantly in their cells, this result makes intuitive sense. Third, supervisory support is positively related ($p = .08$) to custody, indicating that supervisors may encourage custodial responses. Fourth, correctional experience is related positively, though not significantly ($p = .11$), to custody.

Table 5 reports a regression analysis of the rehabilitation scale. Again, night shift exerts a significant effect in the expected direction, with officers on this shift less likely to favor rehabilitation. Though gender and education are not significantly related to rehabilitation, black officers are more likely to support treatment. This result corresponds to Jurik's (1985) finding that minority officers had more favorable attitudes toward inmates and to general survey evidence suggesting that blacks are more supportive than whites of rehabilitation (Carter, 1986). Also similar to Jurik's (1985) results, we found that correctional experience is negatively related to a rehabilitative orientation (though only at the level of $p = .10$), while the age a person became a correctional officer is positively and significantly related. Therefore, some tendency exists for tenure on the job to diminish overall belief in rehabilitation and perhaps heighten a custodial response; officers who choose correctional work at a more mature age, however, apparently come to their work with a stronger human services orientation. Finally, the R^2 for the equation is .17.

TABLE 5. SOURCES OF CORRECTIONAL OFFICER SUPPORT FOR REHABILITATION

Independent Variables	B	Beta	Significance Level
<i>Role Problems</i>	-.062	-.068	.51
<i>Dangerousness</i>	.077	.091	.34
<i>Working in Maximum Security Prison</i>	-.178	-.097	.28
<i>Work Stress</i>	-.105	-.106	.32
<i>Day Shift</i>	-.208	-.111	.24
<i>Night Shift</i>	-.376	-.183	.05
<i>Supervisory Support</i>	.046	.054	.58
<i>Correctional Experience</i>	-.045	-.137	.10
<i>Age Became Correctional Officer</i>	.019	.217	.01
<i>Gender (1 = Male, 0 = Female)</i>	.068	.030	.73
<i>Race (1 = White, 0 = Black)</i>	-.313	-.167	.05
<i>Education</i>	.034	.029	.71

$R^2 = .17$; Adjusted $R^2 = .10$

F Value for Equation = 2.365, df = 12,142; p = .008

³At the same time, as we note below, our data indicate that officers with more correctional experience (contact with offenders) do tend to be less in favor of rehabilitation, though the relationship is not statistically significant. Our data also show that officers who begin correctional work at an older age are more supportive of treatment, suggesting that these officers may account for the tendency for officers' support for rehabilitation to be higher than that of the general public sample.

Conclusion

Previous research on the structure of public attitudes toward corrections has shown that it is, in Flanagan and Caulfield's (1984: 41) words, "diverse, multidimensional, and complex" (cf. Cullen et al., 1988; Thomson and Ragona, 1987). This characterization would also appear applicable to the correctional orientation of prison guards. Although they see maintaining order as a core feature of their role and harbor some negative attitudes toward inmates, they also appear to define themselves more as "correctional" officers than as "guards" and to believe in the potential of prison treatment programs to reform inmates. Indeed, the level of officers' support for rehabilitative ideology is remarkably high, when one considers the past decade's pervasive assault on the treatment ideal by politicians, criminal justice policy makers, and academic criminologists.

These data lend support to those who have argued against the view of the correctional officer as an authoritarian "hack" or "screw" and for the view that most officers seek to enrich their work through a human services or rehabilitative orientation (Johnson, 1987; Toch and Grant, 1982; Toch and Klofas, 1982). At the same time, these revisionist scholars have elucidated the disjunction between the guards' public culture and private beliefs. Although officers as individuals embrace a rehabilitative orientation to their work, they overestimate the degree to which other officers endorse custody as the preferred mode of interaction with inmates. This "pluralistic ignorance" serves to bolster a public custodial culture: fearing sanctions from other guards, officers give legitimacy to custodial goals while in the company of coworkers (Johnson, 1987; Kaufmann, 1981; Klofas and Toch, 1982).

In this context, survey results such as ours are best considered as assessing the private beliefs of prison guards. This caveat, however, should not be taken to suggest that these beliefs are unimportant. For one thing, they help to explain why officers adopt a human services approach to dealing with inmates

in non-public institutional settings (Johnson, 1987). For another, these results suggest that the ideological context exists for reforms aimed at using correctional officers to deliver a range of human services. As several researchers have observed, such reforms not only enrich the occupational roles of officers but also allow for the more effective use of personnel in an environment often lacking the staff to handle prevailing needs for services (Johnson, 1987; Johnson and Price, 1981; Lombardo, 1985; Toch and Grant, 1982).

Our efforts to build on Jurik's (1985) research and explore the sources of officers' orientations yielded mixed results. Our model incorporating work conditions and individual characteristics allowed us to explain only a relatively small amount of the variance in custody and rehabilitation attitudes, though this is also true of other studies (cf. Jurik, 1985: 533; Hepburn and Albonetti, 1980: 455; Whitehead and Lindquist, 1989). The inability to explain a greater percentage of the variance may be because we have not included important predictor variables in our model. Another interpretation for the modest effects of the independent variables, however, is that a fairly high degree of social consensus exists on the purposes of imprisonment: most people—whether guards or members of the public—agree that prisons should be places that serve both punitive and rehabilitative goals. If this observation is accurate, and our comparison showing the similarities of officer-public attitudes suggests it might be, then we might expect that individual status characteristics would exert only modest impacts and general correctional ideology would be resistant to substantial change under various work conditions.⁴

Regardless, our data suggest that to the extent that determinants of correctional orientation can be specified, custody and rehabilitation may have different sources. Supportive custodial attitudes were related exclusively to work conditions, especially role problems and assignment to the night shift, indicating that such attitudes may represent an officer's attempt to cope with his or her place in the prison organization. By contrast, supportive rehabilitative attitudes were significantly related only to one work condition (night shift), but were related to both race and the age a person became an officer. These results indicate that the socio-demographic composition of the guard force could have some influence on the level of support for treatment ideology and on the likelihood that reforms would be resisted or welcomed.

⁴This line of analysis is taken from research focusing on consensus in crime seriousness ratings. Researchers have argued that the lack of statistically significant effects of status characteristics on such ratings indicates that members of different social groups (males-females, old-young, black-white) do not differ in their seriousness evaluations and thus that "consensus" exists (Cullen, Link, Travis, and Wozniak, 1985). In the current study, the presence of significant effects argues against the conclusion that complete consensus exists in the sample's correctional orientations. As noted, however the tendency of officers—among themselves and in comparison with citizens—to agree (or to manifest consensus) on the goals of imprisonment is one possible interpretation for the inability of the independent variables to exert stronger effects that explain more variance in the custody and rehabilitation measures.

REFERENCES

- Allen, F.A. *The Decline of the Rehabilitative Ideal: Penal Policy and Social Purpose*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1981.
- Bynum, T.S., J.R. Greene, and F.T. Cullen. "Correlates of Legislative Crime Control Ideology." *Criminal Justice Policy Review*, 1, September 1986, pp. 253-265.
- Carter, Nealya. *The Impact of Race on Attitudes Toward Crime and Criminal Justice*. Unpublished masters thesis, University of Cincinnati, 1986.
- Camp, G. and C. Camp. *The Corrections Yearbook*. South Salem, NY: Criminal Justice Institute, 1986.
- Crouch, B.M., and G.P. Alpert. "Sex and Occupational Socialization Among Prison Guards: A Longitudinal Study." *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 9, June 1982, pp. 159-176.
- Cullen, F.T., G.A. Clark, and J.F. Wozniak. "Explaining the Get Tough Movement: Can the Public Be Blamed?" *Federal Probation*, 49, June 1985, pp. 16-24.
- Cullen, F.T., J.B. Cullen, and J.F. Wozniak. "Is Rehabilitation Dead? The Myth of the Punitive Public." *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 16(4), 1988, pp. 303-317.
- Cullen, F.T. and K.E. Gilbert. *Reaffirming Rehabilitation*. Cincinnati: Anderson, 1982.
- Cullen, F.T., K.M. Golden, and J.B. Cullen. "Is Child Saving Dead? Attitudes Toward Juvenile Rehabilitation in Illinois." *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 11(1), 1983, pp. 1-13.
- Cullen, F.T., T. Lemming, B.G. Link, and J.F. Wozniak. "The Impact of Social Supports on Police Stress." *Criminology*, 23, August 1985, pp. 503-522.
- Cullen, F.T., B.G. Link, L.F. Travis, and T. Lemming. "Paradox in Policing: A Note on Perceptions of Danger." *Journal of Police Science and Administration*, 11(4), 1983, pp. 457-462.
- Cullen, F.T., B.G. Link, L.F. Travis III, and J.F. Wozniak. "Consensus in Crime Seriousness: Empirical Reality or Methodological Artifact?" *Criminology*, 23, February 1985, pp. 99-118.
- Cullen, F.T., S.E. Skovron, J.E. Scott, and V.S. Burton, Jr. "Public Support for Correctional Treatment: The Tenacity of the Rehabilitative Ideal." *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, forthcoming.
- Currie, E. *Confronting Crime: An American Challenge*. New York: Pantheon Books, 1985.
- Flanagan, T.J. and S.L. Caulfield. "Public Opinion and Prison Policy: A Review." *The Prison Journal*, 64, Fall-Winter 1984, pp. 31-46.
- Greenberg, D.F. and D. Humphries. "The Cooptation of Fixed Sentencing Reform." *Crime and Delinquency*, 26, April 1980, pp. 206-225.
- Harris, Louis and Associates. *Corrections 1968: A Climate for Change*. Washington, DC: Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training, 1968.
- Hepburn, J.R. and C. Albonetti. "Role Conflict in Correctional Institutions: An Empirical Examination of the Treatment-Custody Dilemma Among Correctional Staff." *Criminology*, 17, February 1980, pp. 445-459.
- House, J.S. *Work Stress and Social Support*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley, 1978.
- Jacobs, J.B. "What Prison Guards Think: A Profile of the Illinois Force." *Crime and Delinquency*, 25, April 1978, pp. 185-196.
- Jacobs, J.B. and L.J. Kraft. "Integrating the Keepers: A Comparison of Black and White Prison Guards in Illinois." *Social Problems*, 25, February 1978, pp. 304-318.
- Johnson, R. *Hard Time: Understanding and Reforming the Prison*. Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole, 1987.
- Johnson, R. and S. Price. "The Complete Correctional Officer: Human Service and the Human Environment of the Prison." *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 8, September 1981, pp. 343-373.
- Jurik, N. "Individual and Organizational Determinants of Correctional Officer Attitudes Toward Inmates." *Criminology*, 23, August 1985, pp. 523-539.
- Jurik, N. and G.J. Halernba. "Gender, Working Conditions and the Job Satisfaction of Women in a Non-Traditional Occupation: Female Correctional Officers in Men's Prisons." *Sociological Quarterly*, 25, Autumn 1984, pp. 551-556.
- Jurik, N. and M. Musheno. "The Internal Crisis of Corrections: Professionalization and the Work Environment." *Justice Quarterly*, 3, December 1986, pp. 457-480.
- Kauffman, K. "Prison Officers' Attitudes and Perceptions of Attitudes: A Case of Pluralistic Ignorance." *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 18, July 1981, pp. 272-294.
- Klofas, J. and H. Toch. "The Guard Subculture Myth." *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 19, July 1982, pp. 238-254.
- Link, B.G. and F.T. Cullen. "Contact with the Mentally Ill and Perceptions of How Dangerous They Are." *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, 27, December 1986, pp. 289-302.
- Lombardo, L.X. "Mental Health Work in Prisons and Jails: Inmate Adjustment and Indiginous Correctional Personnel." *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 12, March 1985, pp. 17-27.
- Poole, E.D. and R.M. Regoli. "Role Stress, Custody Orientation, and Disciplinary Actions: A Study of Prison Guards." *Criminology*, 18, August 1980, pp. 215-226.
- Philliber, S. "Thy Brother's Keeper: A Review of the Literature of Correctional Officers." *Justice Quarterly*, 4, March 1987, pp. 9-37.
- Rankin, J.H. "Changing Attitudes Toward Capital Punishment." *Social Forces*, 48, September 1979, pp. 194-211.
- Rothman, D.J. "The State as Parent: Social Policy in the Progressive Era." In W. Gaylin, I. Glasser, S. Marcus, and D. Rothman, *Doing Good: The Limits of Benevolence*. New York: Pantheon Books, 1978.
- Scheingold, S.A. *The Politics of Law and Order: Street Crime and Public Policy*. New York: Longman, 1984.
- Shamir, B. and A. Drory. "Some Correlates of Prison Guards' Beliefs." *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 8, June 1981, pp. 233-249.
- Stinchcombe, A.L., R. Adams, C.A. Heimer, K.L. Scheppele, T.W. Smith, and D.G. Taylor. *Crime and Punishment: Changing Attitudes in America*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1980.
- Toch, H. and J.D. Grant. *Reforming Human Services: Change Through Participation*. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, 1982.
- Toch, H. and J. Klofas. "Alienation and Desire for Job Enrichment Among Correction Officers." *Federal Probation*, 46, March 1982, pp. 35-44.
- Thomson, D.R. and A.J. Ragona. "Popular Moderation Versus Governmental Authoritarianism: An Interactionist View of Public Sentiments Toward Criminal Sanctions." *Crime and Delinquency*, 33, July 1987, pp. 337-357.
- Travisano, D.N. and A.M. Ludwig (eds). *Vital Statistics in Corrections*. Washington, DC: American Correctional Association, 1986.
- von Hirsch, A. *Past or Future Crimes: Deservedness and Dangerousness in the Sentencing of Criminals*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1985.
- Whitehead, J.T. and C.A. Lindquist. "Determinants of Correctional Officer Professional Orientation." *Justice Quarterly*, 6, March 1989.

Appendix A.
Items Composing Scales Measuring
Work Conditions

Role Problems:

1. When a problem comes up here, the people I work with seldom agree on how it should be handled.
 2. The rules that we're supposed to follow here never seem to be very clear.
 3. There are so many people telling us what to do here that you never can be sure who is the boss.
 4. The rules and regulations are clear enough here that I know specifically what I can and cannot do.
 5. A problem in this profession is that no one really knows what his fellow officers are doing.
-

Dangerousness:

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

Work Stress:

1. When I'm at work I often feel tense or uptight.

2. A lot of times, my job makes me very frustrated or angry.
 3. Most of the time when I am at work, I don't feel that I have much to worry about.
 4. I am usually calm and at ease when I am working.
 5. I usually feel that I am under a lot of pressure when I am at work.
 6. There are a lot of aspects about my job that can make me pretty upset about things.
-

Supervisory Support:

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 to think of better ways of getting the work done which may never have been thought of before.
 3. My supervisors often encourage us to do the job in a way that we really would be proud of.
 4. My supervisors often encourage the people I work with if they do their job well.
 5. My supervisors often blame others when things go wrong, which are possibly not the fault of those blamed.
 6. When my supervisors have a dispute with one of my fellow guards, they usually try to handle it in a friendly way.
-