

Correctional Officers Professional Orientation Scales

Claude Tellier
Craig Dowden
Julie Fournier
Jeffrey Franson

Research Branch
Correctional Service Canada

August, 2001

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors will like to acknowledge the important contribution of Jennifer Hunt in the realization of this Research Report.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	ii
TABLE OF CONTENTS	iii
INTRODUCTION	1
A) OFFENDER RELATED SCALES	2
Attitudes Toward Inmates - Jurik (1985).....	2
View of Average Inmate - Gerstein, Topp & Correll (1987)	3
Attitudes Toward Prisoners - Melvin, Gramling, & Gardner (1985)	4
Perceptions of Inmates - Kropp, Cox, Roesch, & Eaves (1989).....	6
Contact with inmates - Gerstein, Topp, & Correll (1987).....	7
Social Distance - Klofas and Toch (1982)	8
Social Distance - Hepburn (1984)	9
B) ORIENTATION TO CORRECTIONAL WORK SCALES	10
Attitudes Toward Correctional Work - Robinson, Porporino & Simourd (1992).....	10
Human Service Orientation - Robinson, Porporino, & Simourd (1992).....	12
C) ATTITUDES TOWARDS CORRECTIONS SCALES.....	13
Punishment/Control Orientation - Bazemore & Dicker (1994)	13
Punitiveness Scale - Hepburn & Albonetti (1980)	14
Punitive Orientation - Klofas & Toch (1982)	15
Custody Orientation Scale - Cullen, Lutze, Link, & Wolfe (1989)	17
Rehabilitation Orientation Scale - Cullen, Lutze, Link, & Wolfe (1989).....	18
Counseling Roles - Toch & Klofas (1982)	19
Concern with Corruption of Authority - Toch & Klofas (1982).....	20
Beliefs about the Prison, the Prisoners and the Guard's Role - Shamir & Drory (1981)	21
Punishment - Leiber & Woodrick (1997).....	23
Deterrence - Cullen, Cullen, & Wozniak, 1988	24
REFERENCES	25

INTRODUCTION

A study on correctional officer attitudes is currently being designed and developed in the Correctional Service of Canada. One challenge that surfaces immediately from such an undertaking is the determination of the assessment tools to be used as part of the study, especially in an area of research where an array of scales exists to measure similar attitudinal constructs. It was important to review the literature to identify existing instruments to avoid replicating these scales in the process of developing a questionnaire to evaluate attitudinal change. Additionally the use of existing reliable and valid scales allows for comparison of current study results with previous research findings.

This document provides a review of these scales organized by their various areas of focus they are designed to measure. Mainly, the scales are grouped into three categories of focus: (A) Offender related scales, (B) Orientation to correctional work scales, and (C) Attitudes towards corrections scales. In addition to providing a brief description of each scale and its corresponding items, we included the relevant psychometric properties derived from each study.

The goal of this scale review is to provide a framework for the study of correctional officer attitude change in a clear and concise manner. Professional orientation scales measuring varying degrees of correctional officer perceptions and attitudes towards correctional work have been included as part of this Brief. This report can also serve as a future reference tool for researchers, who may choose to conduct research in this area of staff attitudes.

A. OFFENDER RELATED SCALES

Attitudes Toward Inmates - Jurik (1985)

This 3-item scale is utilized to measure correctional officers' attitudes toward inmates and is scored on a five-point Likert-type scale, ranging from Strongly Agree (1) to Strongly Disagree (5). Higher scores indicate more positive attitudes towards inmates. The scale has been utilized by its' author and her colleagues in the following articles:

- i) Jurik & Halemba (1984) - no psychometric properties were reported.
- ii) Jurik & Winn (1987) - Cronbach's alpha = .71.
- iii) Jurik (1985) - item-to-total correlations ranged from .38 to .55. Item-to-item correlations ranged from .77 to .83.
- iv) Jurik & Musheno (1986) - no psychometric properties were reported.

The scale is comprised of the following three statements:

- 1) Very little can be done in prison to rehabilitate the prisoner.
- 2) The treatment given to prisoners in prison is too good and it creates troubles.
- 3) The courts have given inmates so many rights that it is practically impossible to maintain satisfactory discipline.

View of Average Inmate - Gerstein, Topp & Correll (1987)

This scale measures the correctional officers' perceptions of the quality of their interactions with inmates. Each respondent is asked to check the appropriate blank between the adjectives to indicate the strength of their thoughts or feelings. Higher scores on this scale indicate a more positive view of the interactions the correctional officer has with inmates.

Study where used: Gerstein, Topp, & Correll (1987) - Coefficient alpha =.94.

This scale is comprised of the following items:

- | | | |
|------------------|-------|------------------|
| 1) unfriendly | _____ | friendly |
| 2) social | _____ | antisocial |
| 3) cold | _____ | warm |
| 4) motivated | _____ | unmotivated |
| 5) unintelligent | _____ | intelligent |
| 6) sensitive | _____ | insensitive |
| 7) arrogant | _____ | intimidated |
| 8) willing | _____ | resistant |
| 9) manipulative | _____ | non-manipulative |
| 10) truthful | _____ | deceiving |
| 11) afraid | _____ | confident |
| 12) hostile | _____ | agreeable |
| 13) cooperative | _____ | uncooperative |
| 14) flexible | _____ | inflexible |
| 15) irrational | _____ | rational |
| 16) moral | _____ | immoral |

Attitudes Toward Prisoners - Melvin, Gramling, & Gardner (1985)

This 5-point Likert-type scale is used with responses ranging from Disagree strongly, disagree, undecided, agree, agree strongly. Each item receives a score from 1 to 5, with 1 representing the choice of the alternative reflecting the most negative attitude and 5 the most positive attitude toward prisoners. Positive scores suggest that prisoner's are viewed as a normal person capable of positive change, whereas the negative scores reflect the view that prisoners are basically deviant individuals.

Study where used: Melvin, Gramling, & Gardner (1985) - Split-half reliability = fluctuated between .84 and .92 in five different samples. Test-retest reliability (pre and post test) = .82.

This scale is comprised of the following items:

- 1) Prisoners are different from most people
- 2) Only a few prisoners are really dangerous
- 3) Prisoners never change
- 4) Most prisoners are victims of circumstances and deserve to be helped
- 5) Prisoners have feelings like the rest of us
- 6) It is not wise to trust a prisoner too far
- 7) I think I would like a lot of prisoners
- 8) Bad prison conditions just make a prisoner more bitter
- 9) Give a prisoner an inch and he will take a mile
- 10) Most prisoners are stupid
- 11) Prisoners need affection and praise just like anybody else
- 12) You should not expect too much from a prisoner
- 13) Trying to rehabilitate prisoners is a waste of time and money
- 14) You never know when a prisoner is telling the truth
- 15) Prisoners are no better or worse than other people
- 16) You have to be constantly on your guard with prisoners
- 17) In general, prisoners think and act alike
- 18) If you give a prisoner respect, he will give you the same
- 19) Prisoners only think about themselves

- 20) There are some prisoners I would trust with my life
- 21) Prisoners will listen to reason
- 22) Most prisoners are too lazy to earn an honest living
- 23) I wouldn't mind living next door to an ex-prisoner
- 24) Prisoners are just plain mean at heart
- 25) Prisoners are always trying to get something out of somebody
- 26) The values of most prisoners are about the same as the rest of us
- 27) I would never want one of my children dating an ex-prisoner
- 28) Most prisoners have the capacity for love
- 29) Prisoners are just plain immoral
- 30) Prisoners should be under strict, harsh discipline
- 31) In general, prisoners are basically bad people
- 32) Most prisoners can be rehabilitated
- 33) Some prisoners are pretty nice people
- 34) I would like associating with some prisoners
- 35) Prisoners respect only brute force
- 36) If a person does well in prison, he should be let out on parole

Perceptions of Inmates - Kropp, Cox, Roesch, & Eaves (1989)

The first 14 items in this scale were taken from Steadman & Coccozza (1978). The additional four items were extracted from Gerstein, Topp, & Correll (1987). These items are rated on a 7-point scale with a high score denoting a positive perception. This scale was used by Kropp et al. to assess the correctional officer's perceptions of mentally disordered offenders, other prisoners, mentally ill patients, and most people.

Study where used: Kropp, Cox, Roesch, & Eaves (1989) - no psychometric properties reported.

This scale is comprised of the following items:

- 1) safe/dangerous
- 2) harmless/harmful
- 3) non-violent/violent
- 4) relaxed/tense
- 5) high control/low control
- 6) good/bad
- 7) predictable/unpredictable
- 8) understandable/mysterious
- 9) intelligent/ignorant
- 10) changeable/unchangeable
- 11) non-aggressive/aggressive
- 12) high sex drive/low sex drive
- 13) strong/weak
- 14) active/passive
- 15) non-manipulative/manipulative
- 16) rational/irrational
- 17) confident/afraid
- 18) moral/immoral

Social Distance - Klofas & Toch (1982)

This scale is a sub-scale of the Professional Orientation Scale designed by the researchers. It measures correctional officers' preference for the degree of social distance from inmates and consists of five statements, which are scored along a four-point, Likert-type scale ranging from Strongly Agree (1) to Strongly Disagree (4). Social distance can be interpreted as the preference by the officer for the amount and quality of social interactions they desire to have with inmates.

This scale has been used in the following studies:

- i) Farkas (1999) - Cronbach's alpha = .75.
- ii) Jackson & Ammen (1996) - no psychometric properties reported.
- iii) Klofas (1986) - Cronbach's alpha exceeds .72.
- iv) Lindquist & Whitehead (1986b) - Cronbach's alpha = .65.
- v) Simourd (1997) - Internal consistency alpha = .75.
- vi) Whitehead & Lindquist (1989) - Cronbach's alpha = .59.
- vii) Whitehead & Lindquist (1992) - Cronbach's alpha = .63.

This scale is comprised of the following items:

- 1) An officer should work hard to earn trust from inmates
- 2) It's important for an officer to have compassion
- 3) The way to get respect from inmates is to take an interest in them
- 4) You get to like the inmates you work with
- 5) Sometimes an officer should be an advocate for an inmate

Social Distance - Hepburn (1984)

This scale reflects the degree to which the relationships of correctional officers with prisoners are detached, impersonal, and contractual (Hepburn, 1985). It is scored along a five-point Likert-type scale with higher scores indicating less social distance from offenders. It is important to note below that Hepburn used the same correctional officer sample in his 1984 and 1985 studies.

This scale was used by Hepburn in the following studies:

- i) Hepburn (1985) - Alpha reliability = .63.
- ii) Hepburn (1984) - Alpha reliability = .628.

This scale is comprised of the following items:

- 1) I often joke around with some of the inmates
- 2) I am willing to go out of my way to help an inmate
- 3) The best way for me to do my job is to keep the amount of time I spend talking with inmates to a minimum
- 4) I've become pretty friendly with a few inmates here
- 5) Inmates are never to be trusted

B. ORIENTATION TO CORRECTIONAL WORK SCALES

Attitudes Toward Correctional Work - Robinson, Porporino & Simourd (1992)

This scale was developed to assess an individual's general interest in the field of corrections. The 12-item scale measures the correctional officers' attitudes about their occupation. More specifically, it assesses the areas of a preference for a career in corrections and offender contact, one's perceptions of the public's view on correctional work, and the challenge of correctional work. The twelve statements, both negative and positive, are used and the respondent rates each item as being either True (1) or False (0).

This scale was used in the following studies:

- i) Robinson, Porporino, & Simourd (1993) - They used a 9-item measure - Cronbach's alpha = .76.
- ii) Robinson, Porporino, & Simourd (1996) - They used a 9-item measure - Cronbach's alpha = .76. The sample from Robinson, Porporino, & Simourd (1993). was used as a subsample in this study.
- iii) Simourd (1997) - Internal consistency alpha = .79.

This scale consists of the following items:

- 1) For good reasons, the type of work we do in corrections has a bad image with the public
- 2) One of the most rewarding elements of correctional work is that it is challenging
- 3) If I had the choice, I'd much prefer to work with non-offenders than with offenders
- 4) If it wasn't for the good pay, I would probably not choose a career in the field of corrections
- 5) While every job has its rewards, offenders are the most interesting and challenging type of people to work with
- 6) In general, there are more good things than bad things about having a career in corrections
- 7) Being involved in the field of corrections gives me a personal sense of pride and accomplishment
- 8) Usually, I am not very proud to tell people that I earn my living working with criminals

- 9) Generally, I would prefer to have a job in a different field than corrections
- 10) What most attracts me to corrections is the type of work I do, and not the pay, fringe benefits, or working conditions.
- 11) I would have to agree that work in corrections is not a very respectable kind of job to have.
- 12) Working in corrections would be OK as long as you didn't have to deal with offenders directly.

Human Service Orientation - Robinson, Porporino, & Simourd, 1992

This scale assesses the degree to which correctional officers are human service orientated. The scale consists of eight items scored dichotomously (True or False). This eight-item scale serves as a general indicator of an individual's preference to work with people and contribute to society. The responses are dichotomized between False = 0 and True = 1 and summed higher scores indicate a greater inclination for a human service approach.

The following studies utilized this scale:

- i) Robinson, Porporino, & Simourd (1996) - Cronbach's alpha = .73.
- ii) Robinson, Porporino, & Simourd (1993) - Cronbach's alpha = .73. This sample was used again as a subsample in Robinson, Porporino, & Simourd (1996).
- iii) Simourd (1997)- Internal consistency alpha = .70.

There are eight True/False statements as follows:

- 1) I prefer a job that gives me the opportunity to help people solve their problems
- 2) I can get a lot of satisfaction from working with people who are less fortunate than I am
- 3) For me, a job that involves talking to people about their problems is more meaningful than a job that involves only casual contact with other people
- 4) Work that allows me to help other people makes me feel like I am really making a difference
- 5) I don't necessarily have to work with people in order to feel like I'm making a contribution
- 6) If I was to start looking for a new career tomorrow, I'd probably look for work in one of the helping professions
- 7) Administrative work is OK, as long as it contributes to solving the major problems in society
- 8) Generally, I tend to get more satisfaction from working with people than from other parts of my job

C. ATTITUDES TOWARDS CORRECTIONS SCALES

Punishment/Control Orientation - Bazemore & Dicker (1994)

This scale was developed to assess the degree to which youth detention workers adhere to a punitive orientation when dealing with young offenders. It is comprised of five statements that are scored along a seven-point Likert-type scale ranging from Strongly Agree (7) to Strongly Disagree (1). Higher scores reflect a preference for a punitive or restrictive orientation toward detainees.

Bazemore & Dicker and their colleagues used this measure in the following articles (which utilize the same sample, and thus report the same reliability coefficient):

- i) Bazemore & Dicker (1994) - Cronbach's Alpha = .71.
- ii) Bazemore, Dicker & Al-Gadheeb (1994)) - Cronbach's Alpha = .71.
- iii) Bazemore, Dicker & Nyhan (1994)) - Cronbach's Alpha = .71.

The scale is as follows:

- 1) Youth in detention should understand that that they are there for punishment
- 2) Youth in detention primarily need firm discipline
- 3) Most youth in detention only respond to physical intervention or the threat of physical intervention
- 4) If detention workers do not teach delinquent youth a lesson, no one will
- 5) Showing them "who is boss" is the most effective method of managing detained youth

Punitiveness Scale - Hepburn & Albonetti (1980)

This scale was designed to measure the extent to which correctional officers believe in a punitive orientation to treating criminals. The four statements use a 5-point Likert-type scale ranging from Strongly Disagree (1) to Strongly Agree (5). Higher scores indicate a less favourable attitude by the correctional officer towards inmates.

Hepburn and colleague used the scale in the following studies:

- i) Hepburn & Albonetti (1980) - Cronbach's alpha = .67.
- ii) Hepburn (1985)) - no psychometric properties were reported.
- iii) Hepburn (1984)) - no psychometric properties were reported.
- iv) Hepburn & Crepin (1984) - no psychometric properties were reported.

The scale consists of the following items:

- 1) Hard prison life will keep men from committing crimes
- 2) A criminal should be punished first, then we can worry about reform
- 3) Inmates have it altogether too easy here
- 4) A criminal will go straight only when he finds that prison life is hard

Punitive Orientation - Klofas & Toch (1982)

Four statements are used in this scale to measure the degree to which correctional officers support a punitive orientation to the treatment of inmates. The same 4-point, Likert-type scale (1 = Strongly Agree and 4 = Strongly Disagree) is employed as a sub-scale found in the studies by Klofas & Toch (1982), Toch and Klofas (1982), and Klofas (1986).

This scale is utilized in the following studies:

- i) Farkas (1999) - Cronbach's alpha = .72.
- ii) Jackson & Ammen (1996) - no psychometric properties reported.
- iii) Klofas (1986) - Cronbach's alpha exceeds .72; termed "Custodial Regime" and was a subscale of Interest in Human Service Roles scale.
- iv) Lindquist & Whitehead (1986b) - Cronbach's alpha = .669.
- v) Simourd (1997) - Internal consistency alpha = .81.
- vi) Whitehead & Lindquist (1989) - Cronbach's alpha = .64.
- vii) Whitehead & Lindquist (1992) - Cronbach's alpha = .63.

The scale consists of the following items:

- 1) There would be much less crime if prisons were uncomfortable
- 2) Improving prisons for inmates makes them worse for officers
- 3) A military regime is the best way of running a prison
- 4) Rehabilitation programs are a waste of time and money

Treatment/Services Orientation - Bazemore & Dicker (1994)

The Treatment/Services Orientation scale was designed to measure the extent to which youth detention workers believe in treating young offenders. It is also scored along the 7-point Likert-type scale (Strongly Agree to Strongly Disagree). This scale is referred to in the following articles:

- i. Bazemore & Dicker (1994) - Cronbach's alpha = .75.
- ii. Bazemore, Dicker & Al-Gadheeb (1994) - Alpha reliability = .80; termed "Rehabilitative Motivation Index" in the study and did not include item four.

The scale consists of the following items:

- 1) Took job out of a desire to help and rehabilitate youth
- 2) Took job in order to provide care and services for youth
- 3) Took job because of a desire to teach youth about the consequences of delinquent behavior
- 4) Youth in detention should receive treatment and rehabilitative services

Custody Orientation Scale - Cullen, Lutze, Link, & Wolfe (1989)

This assessment tool consists of seven statements designed to measure the extent to which a custodial approach towards the treatment of inmates is supported by correctional officers. Items 2, 3, 4, and 5 were drawn from a measure developed by Poole & Regoli (1980), while the remaining statements were added by Cullen, Lutze, Link, & Wolfe (1989). It utilizes a 7-point Likert-type scale, ranging from Very Strongly Agree (1) to Very Strongly Disagree (7) and it has been used in the following studies:

- i) Burton Jr., u, Dunaway, & Wolfe (1991) - Cronbach's alpha = .61.
- ii) Cullen, Lutze, Link, & Wolfe (1989) - Cronbach's alpha = .64.
- iii) Robinson, Porporino, & Simourd (1996) - Cronbach's alpha = .71.
- iv) Simourd (1997) - A 3-point scale was used (agree, uncertain, disagree), and the internal consistency alpha = .74.
- v) Van Voorhis, Cullen, Link, & Wolfe (1991) - Cronbach's alpha = .64.

The scale consists of the following items:

- 1) Keeping the inmates from causing trouble is my major concern while I'm on the job
- 2) Many people don't realize it, but prisons are too soft on the inmates
- 3) An inmate will go straight only when he finds that prison life is hard
- 4) Sleep 'em, feed 'em, and work 'em is the best way to handle inmates
- 5) We would be successful even if all we taught inmates was a little respect for authority
- 6) 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
- 7) 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

Rehabilitation Orientation Scale - Cullen, Lutze, Link, & Wolfe (1989)

This scale was developed by the authors to measure a correctional officer's support for rehabilitating inmates. They use a 7-point scale ranging from Very Strongly Agree (1) to Very Strongly Disagree (7).

This scale has been used in the following studies:

- i) Burton Jr., Ju, Dunaway, & Wolfe (1991) - Cronbach's alpha = .58 .
- ii) Cullen, Lutze, Link, & Wolfe (1989) - Cronbach's alpha = .79. They used a 7-point scale ranging from very strongly agree to very strongly disagree.
- iv) Robinson, Porporino, & Simourd (1996) - Cronbach's alpha = .80 The researchers used a subsample from a previous study by Robinson, Porporino, & Simourd (1992).
- v) Robinson, Porporino, & Simourd (1993) - Cronbach's alpha = .83 ; The researchers used a subsample from a previous study by Robinson, Porporino, & Simourd (1992) .
- vi) Simourd (1997). She used a 3-point scale (agree, uncertain, disagree). Internal consistency alpha = .82.
- iv) Van Voorhis, Cullen, Link, & Wolfe (1991) - Cronbach's alpha = .79.

The scale consists of the following items:

- 1) All rehabilitation programs have done is to allow criminals who deserve to be punished to get off easily
- 2) Rehabilitating a criminal is just as important as making a criminal pay for his or her crime
- 3) The most effective and humane cure to the crime problem in America is to make a strong effort to rehabilitate offenders
- 4) The only way to reduce crime in our society is to punish criminals, not try to rehabilitate them.
- 5) 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
- 6) I would support expanding the rehabilitation programs with criminals that are now being undertaken in our prisons
- 7) 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
- 8) The rehabilitation of adult criminals just does not work
- 9) The rehabilitation of prisoners has proven to be a failure

Counseling Roles - Toch & Klofas (1982)

This three-statement scale measures correctional officer's views on the extent that counseling of inmates plays in their jobs. It is measured on the same 4-point, Likert-type scale that is used to measure Social Distance where responses range from Strongly Agree (1) to Strongly Disagree (4).

The following studies used this scale:

- i) Toch & Klofas (1982) - no psychometric properties reported.
- ii) Farkas (1999) - Cronbach's alpha = .76.
- iii) Jackson & Ammen (1996) - no psychometric properties reported.
- iv) Klofas (1986) - Cronbach's alpha exceeds .72.
- v) Lindquist & Whitehead (1986b) - Cronbach's alpha = .772.
- vi) Simourd (1997) - Internal consistency alpha = .76.
- vii) Whitehead & Lindquist (1989) - Cronbach's alpha = .78.
- viii) Whitehead & Lindquist (1992) - Cronbach's alpha = .71.

The scale consists of the following items:

- 1) Rehabilitation programs should be left to mental health professionals
- 2) Counselling is a job for counsellors, not officers
- 3) If an officer wants to do counselling, he or she should change jobs

Concern with Corruption of Authority- Toch & Klofas (1982)

This scale consists of five statements which are rated by respondents on 4-point Likert-type scale (1 = Strongly Agree to 4 = Strongly Disagree). The scale is designed to measure the correctional officer's concern of contact with inmates potentially leading to their corruption. Higher scores indicate a high degree of concern for being corrupted or manipulated by interacting with inmates.

This scale was used in the following studies:

- i) Toch & Klofas (1982) - no psychometric properties reported.
- ii) Farkas (1999) - Cronbach's alpha = .77.
- iii) Jackson & Ammen (1996) - no psychometric properties reported.
- iv) Klofas (1986) - Cronbach's alpha exceeds .72.
- v) Lindquist & Whitehead (1986b) - Cronbach's alpha = .684.
- vi) Simourd (1997) - Internal consistency alpha = .80.
- vii) Whitehead & Lindquist (1989) - Cronbach's alpha = .65.
- viii) Whitehead & Lindquist (1992) - Cronbach's alpha = .64.

The scale consists of the following items:

- 1) You can't ever completely trust an inmate
- 2) A good principle is not to get "close" to inmates
- 3) A personal relationship with an inmate invites corruption
- 4) You must keep conversations with inmates short and businesslike
- 5) If an officer is lenient with inmates, they will take advantage of him

Beliefs about the Prison, the Prisoners and the Guard's Role - Shamir & Drory (1981)

These 20 items were factor analyzed and three three-item subscales emerged. The first factor is *belief in the supportive role of the prison guard* (represented by items 12, 16, 20). The second factor is *belief in the rehabilitative potential of the prison* (represented by items 11, 13, 14). The third factor is the *belief in the rehabilitative potential of the prisoner* (represented by items 2, 15, 17). The scale consists of the following statements on which the respondents are asked to indicate their degree of agreement with each statement on 7-point scale ranging from Very True to Very Untrue.

Study where used: Shamir & Drory (1981) - no psychometric properties reported.

The scale consists of the following items:

- 1) Most prisoners aren't worse than most other people
- 2) A person who reached prison once will never be a decent man
- 3) It is important to punish the prisoner for every offence he commits
- 4) Prisoners talk to me often about their personal problems
- 5) You shouldn't treat the prisoner with mercy because he takes advantage of it
- 6) In order to get along with prisoners one must often turn a blind eye and not punish them for everything
- 7) I try not to talk with prisoners about their problems outside the prison
- 8) The prisoner deserves to live in prison conditions because he committed a crime and has to be punished for it
- 9) I don't care what the prisoner has done outside the prison, for me he is first of all a human being like any other human being
- 10) Very little can be done in the prison to rehabilitate the prisoner
- 11) Sitting in prison usually teaches the prisoner that crime isn't worthwhile
- 12) It is important that the prison guard listens to the prisoner and hears about his problems
- 13) The prison not only punishes the prisoner but also helps him to stop being a criminal
- 14) The prison only spoils the prisoner and makes him more criminal than before
- 15) Most prisoners are not interested in putting an end to their criminality
- 16) It is part of the guard's role to treat the prisoner like a social worker

- 17) A person that has become a criminal will usually remain a criminal forever
- 18) The treatment given to prisoners in prison is too good and it creates troubles
- 19) Even though most of the prisoners look OK it is dangerous to forget for a moment that they are actually criminals
- 20) In my opinion, the prison guards help the prisoners more than the social workers

Punishment - Leiber & Woodrick (1997)

This 2-item scale was designed to measure youth detention centre workers attitudes towards punishment. The items are scored along a five-point Likert-type scale, ranging from Strongly Disagree (1) and Strongly Agree (5).

Study where used: Leiber & Woodrick (1997) - Cronbach's alpha = .71.

The scale consists of the following items:

1. Is it important for the juvenile justice system to achieve the goal of punishment?
2. Do you believe that courts must see that delinquents are adequately punished?

Deterrence - Cullen, Cullen, & Wozniak, 1988

The Deterrence Scale was adapted as a sub-scale from the Punishment Questionnaire used by the authors. The purpose of the scale is to measure the attitudes of correctional officers towards prisons as a means to deter offenders from committing crimes. It consists of five items answered on a 7-point Likert-type scale ranging from Very Strongly Agree (1) to Very Strongly Disagree (7).

Studies where used: Cullen, Cullen, & Wozniak (1988) - Cronbach's alpha = .80; however this reliability rating relates to the entire Punishment Questionnaire.

The scale consists of the following items:

1. Stiffer jail sentences will help reduce the amount of crime by showing that crime does not pay.
2. Punishing criminals is the only way to stop them from engaging in more crimes in the future.
3. Sending criminals to jail will not stop them from committing crimes.
4. Putting people in prisons does not make much sense since it will only increase crime because prisons are schools of crime.
5. Punishing criminals will reduce crime by setting an example and showing others that crime does not pay.

REFERENCES

- Bazemore, G. and Dicker, T. J. (1994). Explaining detention worker orientation: Individual characteristics, occupational conditions, and organizational environment. *Prison Journal*, 76(1), 297-311.
- Bazemore, G., Dicker, T. J., and Al-Gadheeb, H. (1994). The treatment ideal and detention reality: Demographic, professional/occupational and organizational influences on detention worker punitiveness. *American Journal of Criminal Justice*, 19, 22-41.
- Bazemore, G., Dicker, T. J., and Nyhan, R. (1994). Juvenile justice reform and the difference it makes: An exploratory study of the impact of policy change on detention worker attitudes. *Crime and Delinquency*, 40, 37-53.
- Burton Jr., V. S., Ju, X., Dunaway G. R., and Wolfe, N. T. (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.
- Cullen, F. T., Cullen, J. B., and Wozniak, J. F. (1988). Is rehabilitation dead? The myth of the punitive public. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 16, 303-317.
- Cullen, F. T., Lutze, F. E., Link, B. G., & Wolfe, N. T. (1989). The correctional orientation of prison Guards: Do officers support rehabilitation? *Federal Probation*, 53, 34-41.
- Cullen, F. T., Skovron, S. E., Scott, J. E., and Burton Jr., V. S. (1990). Public support for correctional treatment: The tenacity of rehabilitative ideology. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 17, 6-18.
- Farkas, M. A. (1999). Correctional officer attitudes toward inmates and working with inmates in a "get tough" era. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 27, 495-506.
- Gerstein, L. H., Topp, C. G., and Correll, G. (1987). The role of the environment and person when predicting burnout among correctional personnel. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 14, 352-369.
- Hepburn, J. R. (1984). The erosion of authority and the perceived legitimacy of inmate social protest: A study of prison guards. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 12, 579-590.
- Hepburn, J. R. (1985). The exercise of power in coercive organizations: A study of prison guards. *Criminology*, 23, 145-164.

- Hepburn, J. R., and Albonetti, C. (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 Creppin, A. E. (1984). Relationship strategies in a coercive institution: A study of dependence among prison guards. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 1, 139-157.
- Jackson, J. E., and Ammen, S. (1996). Race and correctional officers' punitive attitudes toward treatment programs for inmates. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 24, 153-166.
- Jurik, N. C., and Halemba, G. J. (1984). Gender, working conditions and the job satisfaction of women in a non-traditional occupation: Female correctional officers in men's prisons. *The Sociological Quarterly*, 25, 551-566.
- Jurik, N. C. (1985). Individual and organizational determinants of correctional officer attitudes toward inmates. *Criminology*, 23, 523-539.
- Jurik, N. C., and Musheno, M. C. (1986). The internal crisis of corrections: Professionalization and the work environment. *Justice Quarterly*, 3(4), 457-480.
- Jurik, N. C., and Winn, R. (1987). Describing correctional-security dropouts and rejects: An individual or organizational profile? *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 14, 5-25.
- Klofas, J. M. (1986). Discretion among correctional officers: The influence of urbanization, age, and race. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 30, 111-124.
- Klofas, J. M., and Toch, H. (1982). The guard subculture myth. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 19, 238-254.
- Kropp, P. R., Cox, D. N., Roesch, R., and Eaves, D. (1989). The perceptions of correctional officers toward mentally disordered offenders. *International Journal of Law and Psychiatry*, 12, 181-188.
- Leiber, M. J., and Woodrick, A. C. (1997). Religious beliefs, attributional styles, and adherence to correctional orientations. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 24, 495-511.
- Lindquist, C. A., and Whitehead, J. T. (1986a). Burnout, job stress, and job satisfaction among southern correctional officers: Perceptions and causal factors. *Journal of Offender Services, Counselling and Rehabilitation*, 10, 5-26.
- Lindquist, C. A., and Whitehead, J. T. (1986b). Correctional officers as parole officers: An examination of a community supervision sanction. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 13, 197-222.

- Melvin, K. B., Gramling, L. K., and Gardner, W. M. (1985). A scale to measure attitudes toward prisoners. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 12, 241-253.
- Robinson, D., Porporino, F. J., and Simourd, L. (1993). The influence of career orientation on support for rehabilitation among correctional staff. *The Prison Journal*, 73, 162-177.
- Robinson, D., Porporino, F. J., and Simourd, L. (1996). Do different occupational groups vary on attitudes and work adjustment in corrections? *Federal Probation*, 60, 45-53.
- Simourd, L. (1997). *Staff attitudes towards inmates and correctional work: An exploration of the attitude-work outcome relationship*. Unpublished document. Carleton University.
- Whitehead, J. T., and Lindquist, C. A. (1989). Determinants of correctional officers' professional orientation. *Justice Quarterly*, 6, 69-87.
- Whitehead, J. T., and Lindquist, C. A. (1992). Determinants of probation and parole officer professional orientation. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 20, 13-24.