

THE CORRECTIONAL ORIENTATION OF JUVENILE FACILITY DIRECTORS

Amy Sifuentes-Hammer, B.A

Thesis Prepared for the Degree of

MASTER OF SCIENCE

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH TEXAS

August 2001

APPROVED:

Tory Caeti, Major Professor

Eric Fritsch, Minor Professor

Peggy Tobolowsky, Committee Member

Robert W. Taylor, Chair of the Department of Criminal
Justice

David W. Hartman, Dean of the School of Community
Service

Neal Tate, Dean, Robert B. Toulouse School of Graduate
Studies

Sifuentes-Hammer, Amy, The Correctional Orientation of Juvenile Facility Directors. Master of Science (Criminal Justice), August 2001, 76 pp., 12 tables, references, 57 titles.

Over the last 30 years, the juvenile justice system and juvenile correctional ideology shifted to become more punitive in nature. However, studies examining this shift are lacking in the literature. The present study will attempt to assess what correctional ideology, rehabilitative or punitive, is dominant within juvenile corrections by conducting a national survey to juvenile facility directors. This study will be based on prior literature, most of which has focused upon line staff in an adult correctional setting. From this prior literature, more specifically from the work of Cullen et al. (1989), scales will be created to determine the correctional orientation of the key administrators in juvenile facilities. This will allow us to assess whether the correctional ideology driving the juvenile system has in fact become punitive. The findings from this study have the opportunity to alter the current status quo in juvenile corrections.

Copyright 2001

by

Amy Sifuentes-Hammer

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES.....	v
Chapter	
1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
2. LITERATURE REVIEW.....	7
Correctional Orientation.....	7
Importation-Differential Experiences Model vs. Work Role-Prisonization Model.....	10
Correlates of Correctional Orientation – Variables from the Importation- Differential Experiences Model.....	11
Correlates of Correctional Orientation – Variables from the Work Role- Prisonization Model.....	14
Review of the Literature.....	16
3. METHODOLOGY.....	19
Overview of Project.....	19
Population Under Study.....	21
Survey Process.....	23
Overview of Measurement.....	25
4. ANALYSIS.....	38
Individual Characteristics of the Population.....	38

Background and Working Conditions.....	39
Specific Characteristics of Institution.....	41
Correctional Orientation of Facility Directors.....	41
Correlates and Predictors of Correctional Orientation.....	48
5. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS.....	53
APPENDIX.....	61
1. National Juvenile Facility Director Survey - 2000	
REFERENCES.....	72

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Independent Variables and Coding	34
2. Individual Characteristics of Juvenile Facility Directors.....	39
3. Background and Working Conditions of Juvenile Facility Directors	40
4. Specific Characteristics of Institution	41
5. Percentages of Ranks by Goals of uvenile Corrections	42
6. Facility Director's Assessment of the Juvenile Population in Their Institution	42
7. Directors attitudes toward Rehabilitation.....	43
8. Directors attitudes toward Punishmen.....	44
9. Emphasis Given to Activities in Day-to-Day Operations of Facility – Rehabilitation Activities	45
10. Emphasis Given to Activities in Day-to-Day Operations of Facility Custody/Institutional Order Activities	46
11. Support for Punitive or Rehabilitative Policies.....	47
12. Table of Correlates	50

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Since its development in the late nineteenth century, the juvenile justice system has evidenced three fundamental philosophical shifts (Fritsch, Hemmens, and Caeti, 1996). The Traditional Model (1899 – 1960’s) assumed that juveniles were not capable of forming the same reasoning or rational as adults and supported the idea of *Parens Patriae*. At the core of the *Parens Patriae* doctrine was the idea that the state shall act as a “kindly parent” by emphasizing what was in the best interest of the juvenile (Cullen et al., 1983). During the second of these philosophical shifts, the Due Process Model (1960’s – 1980’s), the Supreme Court maintained its support of the *Parens Patriae* doctrine, but sought to bring due process rights to those in the juvenile justice system. The most recent shift, one toward a punitive juvenile justice system, can be seen across the United States with many state legislatures modifying the purpose clauses of their juvenile court and/or juvenile correction statutes (Forst and Blomquist, 1992). Thus, the juvenile justice system has begun to move away from the rehabilitative, *parens patriae* doctrine, toward a more punishment oriented juvenile justice system. According to Gardner, “a revolution in substantive theory is presently taking place as one jurisdiction after another expresses disenchantment with the rehabilitative ideal and embraces explicitly punitive sanctions as appropriate for youthful offenders” (Gardner, 1987: 104).

Research has indicated that the general public and both liberal and conservative politicians support the shift from rehabilitation to punishment in juvenile correctional policy, namely due to the perceived failure of the rehabilitative ideal (Cullen and Gilbert, 1982; Gardner, 1987; Forst and Blomquist, 1992; McCorkle, 1993; Schwartz, Guo and Kerbs, 1993; Schiraldi and Soler, 1998; Moon et al., 2000). As mentioned previously, the initial goal of the juvenile justice system was the protection of the child. Youthful offenders were assumed to be less responsible for their actions, less likely to benefit from punishment and more suitable to rehabilitative approaches (Cullen and Golden, 1983). At the very heart of the juvenile system was the overwhelming belief that juvenile offenders could be rehabilitated and released back into society (Moon et al., 2000). However, that focus seems to have shifted to the protection of society. The reasoning for this shift includes several factors. First, there are of course the perceived shortcomings of the rehabilitative ideal. However, its perceived failure is not the sole cause of the pendulum shift. The general public is increasingly supporting legislation that holds offenders accountable for their actions thus placing emphasis on retribution rather than the rehabilitation of the offender. This is not to say that rehabilitation has been an utter failure, but rather the wants of the public have changed.

For example, several studies have indicated that the majority of the American public supports “get tough” measures, even when dealing with juvenile offenders (Gardner, 1987; McCorkle, 1993; Shannon, 1995; Moon et al., 2000). Furthermore, beginning in the 1960’s, liberals and conservatives joined forces to attack the rehabilitative ideology, although for vastly different reasons. Liberals disputed the idea

that the state could be trusted to do good for juvenile offenders. The Civil Rights Movement and other tumultuous events such as Vietnam, Kent State and Watergate reminded liberals that the government would willingly use its power to suppress dissent. Liberals thus came to the conclusion that efforts should be undertaken to limit the ability of the state to intervene in the lives of the poor, ill, criminal and delinquent; this attempt at reform manifested itself in the Court's decision to bring due process rights into the juvenile justice system.

Conservatives on the other hand, argued that the child-saving goals of the juvenile justice system had led to the victimization of the public, not of the juveniles as the liberals contended. Many serious and violent offenders were passing through the system "untouched and unsaved." As a consequence, conservatives proposed to implement "get tough" measures when dealing with juvenile offenders. (Cullen and Gilbert, 1982; Cullen and Golden, 1983). Though for different reasons, conservatives and liberals nonetheless joined together to revamp the juvenile system into what came to be known as the "justice model." This model was marked by an increase in determinate sentencing, mandatory institutionalization and an increase in juvenile waivers to adult court (Merlo, Benekos and Cook, 1996; Caeti, Hemmens, Burton and Cullen, 1997).

Research studies have indicated that the public and system actors support this punitive shift (Norman and Burbidge, 1991; Benekos et al., 1995). However, despite this support for a punitive system, several studies indicate that both the public and actors within the system continue to support rehabilitation as a goal of the juvenile justice system (Cullen and Golden, 1983; Applegate, Cullen and Fisher, 1997; Cullen et al.,

1998; Cullen, Wright and Chamlin, 1999; Moon et al., 2000). Thus, it is clear that there are two competing ideas of what the system is intended to do: rehabilitate or punish.

These differing ideologies have led to the current research. The present study examines the correctional orientation of juvenile facility directors. Correctional orientation is defined as the beliefs and attitudes of line staff and administrators about the goals of the correctional system. While there is a large amount of literature on the topic of correctional orientation, the majority has primarily focused on line staff within adult prisons. Studies involving juvenile facility directors are lacking and yet their role cannot be underestimated. While the current research is not seeking to disregard the attitudes of the public or line staff in juvenile corrections, the hypothesis here is that attitudes and beliefs of key administrators directly affect the environment in which they are in (Bazemore, 1997; Caeti, 2001). That being said, if administrators of juvenile facilities are no longer supportive of rehabilitative measures for juveniles, then the logical conclusion will be that we need to examine the management of those institutions.

In addition to determining the correctional orientation of juvenile facility directors, the predictors of correctional orientation will be identified based on prior literature. Results from the present research could have major implications upon juvenile justice policy and answer, at least from the facility directors' point of view, the question, "Is child saving dead?" That is, is rehabilitation still a feasible goal within our juvenile justice system? Or has the recent trend toward punitiveness in the adult correctional system also manifested into the administration of juvenile correctional facilities.

Chapter Two will outline the current research on correctional orientation. As mentioned previously, most of the studies have focused on the line staff in adult prisons. However, they are the only studies we have to base our argument on about the predictors of correctional orientation. Again, this lack of juvenile facility directors in the literature emphasizes the importance of this study.

In Chapter Three, the methodology used for the present study will be described in detail. Chapter Three will describe the population under study and how the list of the juvenile facility directors was attained and finalized. Also included are the various problems the research team encountered with compiling the facility list. The construction of the survey instrument will be outlined, and the mailing timeline provided.

The results from the bivariate analysis and findings from the study will be provided in Chapter Four. First, the general demographic characteristics of the population will be provided (i.e. average age, race and gender). Then, the background and working conditions of respondents will be discussed. Finally, the correctional orientation of the facility directors is analyzed using several items from the survey instrument. These items will be provided in table format.

Finally, Chapter Five will discuss the findings of the current research to that of findings of previous research. Chapter Five will also discuss the major implications of the study upon juvenile justice. Further, the importance of future research will be stressed, based upon findings from the present study.

To reiterate again, the question at hand in the present study is to determine the correctional orientation of juvenile facility directors. In addition, we hope to determine

the predictors and correlates of that correctional orientation. The importance of this study cannot be underestimated. Once completed, it will join the small amount of literature that currently exists on the correctional orientation of key administrators, whether it is at the adult or juvenile level.

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

Literature researching correctional orientation has steadily increased in recent years. The literature varies and contains not only support for rehabilitation, but also support for the punitive ideal and the independent correlates of beliefs and attitudes. However, it is important to note that empirical research on correctional orientation has primarily focused on line staff in adult prisons. This only proves to reiterate the importance of the present research. The literature lacks empirical research on key administrators of juvenile correctional facilities. Again, the purpose of this study is to determine the correctional orientation of juvenile facility directors and the predictors of correctional orientation. Where available, studies focusing on administrators were utilized, although most included correctional line staff.

CORRECTIONAL ORIENTATION

Correctional orientation refers to the beliefs and attitudes of line staff and administrators toward the goals of the correctional system. The two major correctional orientations are rehabilitation and punishment. Rehabilitation emphasizes the treatment of offenders so as to change their criminal behavior. Punishment, on the other hand, emphasizes the retribution of offenders and accountability for their crimes.

Previous studies have measured correctional orientation among prison wardens (Cullen, Latessa, Burton and Lombardo, 1993), prison correctional staff (Crouch and

Alpert, 1980; Jurik, 1985; Cullen, Lutze, Link and Wolfe, 1989; Whitehead and Lindquist, 1989; Burton, Ju, Dunaway and Wolfe, 1991; Arthur, 1994), juvenile detention workers (Bazemore and Dicker, 1994; Bazemore, Dicker and Nyhan, 1994) and probation and parole officers (Whitehead and Lindquist, 1992). Findings from these studies are varied.

Cullen et al, (1993) found that while most prison wardens' place custodial/prison order concerns at the top of their priority list, rehabilitation was still considered as an important function of their institution. Furthermore, wardens indicated that they believed that only one fourth of their inmates would be rehabilitated, but still rejected harsher conditions in their facilities. Thus, it is evident that while the research indicated that prison wardens' place their main emphasis on custodial order, they are not yet willing to abandon rehabilitation as a fundamental goal of their institution.

This same support for both philosophies, that is rehabilitation and punishment, can be found among the general public as well. In a survey of the general public, lawyers, circuit judges, correctional administrators and members of the Illinois legislature, Cullen et al. (1983) found that 81.6 percent of the total sample felt that it would be "irresponsible to stop trying to rehabilitate delinquents." Similarly, 76.4 percent of the respondents revealed that they supported the rehabilitation of juveniles, especially when compared to adult offenders. In summation, Cullen et al. (1983) argue that "child saving" is not dead despite the recent shift away from rehabilitation in the juvenile system, and that the future of juvenile justice will likely involve a mixture of both philosophies. According to Cullen et al. (1983), this "creates a special set of complications for those formulating juvenile

law and implementing these policies.” Additional studies report similar findings that the public is not yet prepared to abandon rehabilitation as a correctional goal (Cullen et al., 1988; Cullen et al., 1989; Cullen et al., 1990; Norman and Burbidge, 1991; Schwartz, Guo and Kerbs, 1993; McCorkle, 1993; Cullen et al. 1993; Benekos et al., 1995; Applegate, Cullen and Fisher, 1997). Further, the public has expressed a need for more early intervention programs as opposed to harsher penalties for juvenile offenders (Schiraldi and Soler, 1998; Cullen et al., 1998; Moon et al., 2000).

After administering 250 questionnaires to the line staff of a southern correctional facility, Cullen et al. (1989) found that while guards see maintaining order within the facility as a key component of their role and harbor negative feelings towards the inmate population, they also define themselves more as *correctional* officers than as *prison guards* and believe that prison programs have the potential to rehabilitate prison inmates. Thus, the level of support for rehabilitation among prison guards was remarkably high. Burton et al. (1991) utilized the correctional orientation measures used by Cullen et al. (1989) and surveyed all Bermuda prison guards (n=49) and found similar results, with the Bermuda prison guards exhibiting even more support for rehabilitation than their American counterparts.

Drawing from Cullen et al. (1993), Caeti et al. (1995) administered a nationwide survey to juvenile facility directors. In this survey, when asked to rank in order of importance, the goals of the juvenile correctional system, 61.2% ranked rehabilitation as the number one goal. Further, only 1.9% of the directors ranked rehabilitation as 4th and

only .4% ranked retribution 1st. This leads us to assume that overall, juvenile facility directors are rehabilitative in their ideals.

IMPORTATION-DIFFERENTIAL EXPERIENCES MODEL vs. WORK ROLE PRISONIZATION MODEL

There are two models that dominate thinking concerning the variables that determine correctional attitudes and beliefs. The Importation-Differential Experiences Model holds that correctional orientation, job attitudes and reactions to work are the result of the different types of experiences brought to the work environment by people of different social backgrounds and statuses (Van Voorhis et al., 1991). In this model, it is assumed that individual characteristics such as age, race, gender and education affect work perceptions and experiences because individuals bring different orientations and statuses into the work environment that in turn influences their work experiences. For example, women and minorities have often been described, in prior studies, as more nurturing and less punitive in a correctional environment. Under the Importation-Differential Experiences Model, this behavior would be attributed to the gender and race of the individual.

The Work Role-Prisonization Model holds that attitudes are shaped not by individual characteristics and experiences, but by the nature of the work role (Van Voorhis et al., 1991). This model maintains that an individual's attitudes are a result of organizational factors such as working conditions, position within the organization, job-related stress, role conflict and structure. This model explores those variables and their relationship to occupational behavior. The Importation-Differential Experiences Model

and the Work Role-Prisonization Model underlie much of the research on the correctional orientation of officers.

Correlates of Correctional Orientation – Variables from the Importation-Differential

Experiences Model

Five variables that fall under the realm of the Importation-Differential Experiences Model will be discussed in this literature review. These include race, gender, education, chronological age and correctional entry age. It has been found, in prior literature, that these variables are related to the attitudes of line staff of correctional institutions. In addition, several work-related variables will be discussed. These include occupational conditions, job satisfaction, and job stress and role stress.

Race

Several studies have examined the impact of race on the attitudes of correctional personnel. Jurik (1985) found that minority officers had more favorable attitudes toward inmates and were more supportive of rehabilitation. Cullen et al. (1989) and Van Voorhis et al. (1991) found similar support. Whitehead and Lindquist (1989) found that African-American correctional officers expressed less preference for harsh conditions than did white correctional officers. Arthur (1994) examined the attitudes of African-American correctional officers toward rehabilitation, retribution and deterrence and found they supported all three philosophies. Despite this finding, his research also indicated that approximately 70 percent of the black correctional officers examined thought the courts were too punitive. On the other hand, some studies have found no significant relationship

between race and correctional attitudes (Jacobs and Kraft, 1978; Crouch and Alpert, 1982; Farkas, 1999).

Gender

With regards to gender, women have been found to be more positive toward offenders than are men (Whitehead and Lindquist, 1992) and more interested in human service work and supportive of rehabilitation (Jurik and Halemba, 1984). Crouch and Alpert (1982) found that female correctional officers develop less punitive attitudes toward inmates than do their male counterparts. In addition, Crouch and Alpert (1982) found that males are more punitive than females during the first six months on the job. Also, female correctional officers tend to possess a calming or soothing effect on inmate behavior (Kissell and Katasampes, 1980). In her 1999 study of correctional officer attitudes toward inmates, Farkas found that female officers expressed a preference for counseling roles and a preference for punitiveness. This finding is interesting because it seems contradicting. Women preferred counseling roles, an activity that is purely rehabilitative in nature, more so than their male counterparts. Yet they still maintained a punitive ideology. However, other studies found that gender has no significant impact on correctional attitudes (Jurik and Halemba, 1984; Jurik, 1985; Cullen et al., 1989; Whitehead and Lindquist, 1989; Stohr et al., 1997).

Education

Some studies indicate that level of education is related to support for rehabilitation (Poole and Regoli, 1980; Cullen et al., 1983; Burton et al., 1991; Robinson et al., 1997) and more positive attitudes toward inmates (Kassebaum et al., 1980; Poole

and Regoli, 1980). Poole and Regoli (1980) also contend that higher education may result in a de-emphasis on punishment and custody and promote flexibility in the way officers approach their duties. Others have suggested that like women, educated officers are more likely to support human services (Jurik, 1985; Robinson et al., 1997). While other studies do not dispute that officers with higher education will have more tolerance with inmates, they have not found a significant relationship between education and orientation (Jurik, 1985; Cullen et al., 1993; Bazemore and Dicker, 1994; Farkas, 1999).

Chronological Age and Correctional Entry Age

A small amount of research has found that support for rehabilitation declines with age (Cullen et al., 1983; Crouch and Alpert, 1980). This assumption is based on the idea that the longer an individual continues in the field of corrections, the more disenchanted they become with the system in its failure to accomplish its rehabilitative goals, and thus the less likely they will be supportive of rehabilitative measures. However, in their 1982 study, Klofas and Toch found the opposite to be true. They reported that young officers were more custody-oriented, while older officers held significantly more favorable attitudes toward inmates (Jacobs and Kraft, 1978; Jurik, 1985). In addition, Farkas (1999) found that older officers were less punitive and more interested in a counseling role with inmates. In terms of correctional entry age, Cullen et al. (1989) found that officers entering the field at a later age are more likely to support rehabilitation, while Farkas (1999) found the opposite to be true. The contradictory findings suggest that age may not have a clear relationship to correctional orientation.

Correlates of Correctional Orientation – Variables from the Work Role-Prisonization

Model

Previous studies have looked at a variety of work-related variables that affect correctional orientation. The variables that have been examined the most include job satisfaction, job stress and role stress. Very little attention has been given to specific occupational conditions or other work-related variables such as salary, tenure and overtime; these are typically covered in broader studies on overall job satisfaction.

As previously noted, studies have found that both individual and organizational conditions affect officers' correctional orientation (Jurik, 1985; Cullen et al., 1989; Whitehead and Lindquist, 1989; Cullen et al., 1993). For example, working with a young inmate population (Kassebaum et al., 1964) and having frequent contact with inmates (Lombardo, 1981) have both been found to increase punitiveness among officers. Research conducted by Bazemore and Dicker (1994) suggests that improvements in the organizational climate (i.e. policies and procedures) could result in officers having less punitive attitudes toward inmates. Other occupational conditions such as salary and tenure also influence orientation. For example, Burton et al. (1991) found that the higher the salary, the higher the support for rehabilitation. Shamir and Drory (1981) found that the higher the tenure and rank of the correctional officer, the less likely he or she is to support treatment. Thus, Shamir and Drory (19981) conclude that the longer a guard remains in his or her position, and the higher his or her rank in the correctional setting, the less he or she will support rehabilitation. Cullen et al. (1989) found a similar relationship, contending that an officer's tenure at a facility may result in a decrease of

his or her support for the rehabilitative ideal and increase the punitive ideal. However, Bazemore and Dicker (1994) found a weak, yet significant relationship between tenure and support for rehabilitation.

Job Satisfaction

Like many relationships in criminal justice, it is almost impossible to determine whether job satisfaction determines correctional orientation, or whether support of a particular ideology determines or affects job satisfaction. Regardless of the direction of the correlation, research has indicated that there is indeed a significant relationship between job satisfaction and correctional ideology. For example, Shamir and Drory (1981) found that job satisfaction is slightly related to the beliefs of correctional officers, particularly with their belief in the rehabilitative potential of inmates. Bazemore and Dicker (1994) reported similar findings. Arthur (1994) concluded that the strongest correlation with rehabilitation was job satisfaction suggesting that officers who are more satisfied with their jobs are more likely to support rehabilitation as a correctional ideology. On the other hand, Flanagan et al. (1996) reported that measures of correctional ideology were unrelated to job satisfaction.

Job Stress and Role Stress

Philliber (1987) argues that correctional work is extremely stressful. In their 1980 study, Poole and Regoli identified two types of stress. Job stress is defined as an individual's feelings of job-related anxiety and pressure. Role stress is defined as occurring as a result of ambiguousness and conflict in terms of a person's role in their job. It can logically be assumed that both job stress and role stress may influence

correctional orientation. Poole and Regoli (1980) found that role stress was often resolved by an intensified commitment to a custody orientation and that job stress was positively related to treatment orientation. Cullen et al. (1985) found that officers who were higher in treatment orientation and lower in punitiveness toward inmates experienced less job stress. However in 1989, Cullen et al. found no significant relationship between job-related stress or role-related stress and support for rehabilitation or punishment. Whitehead and Lindquist (1989) reported similar findings. In a study of detention care workers, Liou (1995) found that role stress was correlated positively with a punitive orientation. In addition, Liou (1995) concluded that job stress was correlated positively with a rehabilitative orientation. Caeti et al. (1995; 2001) found that juvenile facility directors are exposed to a high level of stress, from both external and internal forces. These internal and external forces include line staff, the juveniles themselves, parents of the juveniles, courts and the general public. In addition, Caeti et al. (1995) also found that directors considered staff problems a major source of stress. As previous studies have found that job-related stress leads to an increase in support for punishment, it will be vital to examine the relationship of internal and external forces that affect facility directors.

Review of the Literature

Obviously, all the aforementioned variables have the possibility of affecting and predicting correctional orientation. Philliber (1987) examined the previous literature on correctional officers and came to several conclusions. First, Philliber contends that simple changes in the demographic characteristics of correctional officers (i.e. race or gender)

will not solve everything. In fact, she notes that there are inconsistent findings regarding the relationship of race and gender to punitiveness and other attitudes toward inmates. In addition, Philliber found that education is a characteristic of correctional orientation that defies clear findings. According to Philliber, this inconsistency is unfortunate because it has led many researchers to recommend increased education for correctional officers as a remedy for several problems within corrections.

As Philliber (1987) noted, the literature regarding the orientation attitudes of correctional officers has varied findings and clearly does not point to one clear predictor of correctional orientation. The most evident and overwhelming problem in the literature is its lack of inclusion of studies on the juvenile justice system. Yet the importance of such studies cannot be underestimated. Of course, assumptions about juvenile correctional personnel can be made. For example, it can be logically assumed that rehabilitation is more strongly supported in the juvenile correctional system than it is in the adult system. While it is clear that the punitive model of criminal justice has gained increasing support over the last few decades, the studies examined here have indicated that the rehabilitative ideal continues to receive support as a core goal of our correctional system. If support for the rehabilitative ideal can be found in adult corrections, then we can anticipate that juvenile facility directors will also be likely to support rehabilitation. Clearly more research is warranted not only in the area of adult corrections, but also juvenile corrections. The purpose of this study is to assess the attitudes and beliefs of juvenile facility directors in hopes of filling the void that currently exists in the literature. The present study has the opportunity to have significant implications on juvenile justice

policy and to determine whether rehabilitation continues to be a feasible goal within our juvenile justice system, or whether the system has all but abandoned the rehabilitative ideal for a punitive system of justice.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Overview of Project

This research is a replication of a study of juvenile facility directors conducted in 1995 (Caeti, 1995). The survey instrument and procedures are adopted from this original study. The purpose of this study is to enhance our understanding of the attitudes and beliefs of juvenile facility directors. Further, this study will enable us to determine the correctional orientation of juvenile facility directors and to identify the predictors of correctional orientation. Correctional orientation refers to the beliefs and attitudes that line staff and administrators hold toward the goals of the correctional system. According to Cullen et al. (1989), the “fabric of life within the correctional system is shaped intimately, and daily, by the system’s employees.” To gain an adequate understanding of how these key employees view the nature and purpose of their work is extremely vital to understanding the system itself. The correctional orientation of a key administrator will determine what ideology will govern their institution. The two correctional orientations we are concerned with in the present study are rehabilitation and punishment. Rehabilitation emphasizes treatment for offenders with the hope of preventing future criminal behavior. Punishment emphasizes the retribution of offenders so as to hold them

accountable for their crimes and to prevent them from inflicting further harm upon society.

Several individual and work-related variables were identified in the prior literature which have been found to affect or predict correctional orientation, including but not limited to: age, race, education, job satisfaction and stress. This research will test the degree to which these variables affect or predict the correctional orientation of juvenile facility directors.

Broad Research Questions:

- 1) What is the correctional orientation of juvenile facility directors?
- 2) What are the predictors/correlates of correctional orientation?

Again, by determining the correctional orientation of the facility directors, this study will be able to gauge the current state of the juvenile correctional system. At the same time, it is important to determine which variables predict or affect an individual director's correctional orientation. Thus, this study will also examine key variables, drawn from prior literature, and their affect or relationship to correctional orientation.

Specific Hypotheses:

- 1) Individual characteristics (i.e. age, race, gender) are not related to correctional orientation.
- 2) Organizational/work-related variables (i.e. job satisfaction, stress) are not related to correctional orientation.

Population Under Study

The population under study is all juvenile facility directors in the United States. The title facility director is used to describe individuals who operate correctional facilities housing convicted juvenile offenders. Facility directors are criminal justice professionals who should be highly educated and have an interest in the results of this research. This conclusion should result in a higher than average response rate to this research. The directors of these facilities are in a unique position to affect the goals and objectives of the institution. For this study, a juvenile correctional facility was defined a secure institution reserved for post-adjudicated youth sentenced by the court. A juvenile institution's mission is to incarcerate, care for, and rehabilitate juvenile delinquents. Juvenile detention facilities, drug treatment centers, and community based group homes were excluded, because the purpose of this study was intended to assess the beliefs and attitudes of those directors who are administering long-term care to delinquent youth.

A year 2000, complete listing of juvenile correctional facilities in the United States was obtained from the American Correctional Association (ACA). This list contained 475 names of juvenile correctional facilities in the United States. While the ACA maintains that the list is exhaustive, the list was cross-referenced with state websites, where available. This method of verification posed several problems.

First, not all states had available websites listing juvenile facilities. While many were well organized and provided us with sufficient information, other states either lacked websites all together or had very poorly organized websites. If state website's did not provide the information, the state's department of corrections was contacted to

determine what division handled its juveniles. Most states cooperated and were glad to refer us to the appropriate department. The second major problem that arose was the issue of the definition juvenile *correctional* facility. The research team had made the assumption that other states would have similar systems to that of Texas, where there is a clear distinction between detention centers and correctional facilities. Detention centers, at least in the state of Texas, are reserved for the holding of juveniles for either short periods of time or for holding juveniles waiting for trial. Correctional facilities, on the other hand, are state sanctioned facilities for juveniles convicted, typically for more than a year. Furthermore, in Texas there is a separate correctional system for juveniles, whereas in some other states, juveniles are processed in the adult correctional system.

The problems with the state website verification led to a second step in checking the accuracy of the ACA list. Each facility on the list was contacted via phone by one of the members of the research team. This allowed the research team to inform the facility director of the upcoming national survey that was to be mailed in the weeks ahead. If the director of the facility was unavailable to inform, then the information was left with the administrative assistant or other appropriate person. It also provided time for directors to ask any questions regarding the survey. While on the phone, the name of the current director, phone number and address as well as the type of facility was verified. Information was also gathered about the type of juvenile system within their particular state, as well as whether there were any additional facilities that we were unaware of. This phone call process was helpful because many of the names of directors or even

addresses had changed since the ACA had printed their list. This initial list contained 525 juvenile correctional facilities, thus adding 50 facilities to the ACA list.

After the verification of the ACA list, another attempt was made to increase the reliability of the list. After the second wave of surveys was sent to the population, those facility directors who had not responded to the original mail out were contacted by phone. This second phone verification found several problems with the corrected ACA list. First, a few of the facilities that did not fit the profile of a juvenile correctional facility had been included in the initial list. Further, some of the director names had changed or addresses and facility information were not recorded correctly by the research team in the initial phone call. This final verification excluded 131 of the facilities from the initial list and decreased the final list of juvenile facility directors to 394. These steps at verification have resulted in an extremely accurate list of juvenile correctional facilities, more so than the one initially provided by the ACA.

Survey Process

Data was collected using a self-administered instrument drawn from the 1995 Juvenile Facility Director Survey. Scales and items used in the 1995 survey were used in similar form here, although with some modifications to ensure the reliability of the results. First, the original survey consisted of several open-ended questions, which resulted in a large number of responses for each question. This in turn made it difficult to compare the responses of respondents and make generalizations. To alleviate this problem, all open-ended questions in the original survey were identified and responses were collapsed to create closed-ended questions. The collapsed variables included:

- Please specify the three activities that take up most of your time.
- If you were going to hire a director to run your institution, list the three most important qualities you would look for in a potential candidate.
- What are three things about being a facility director that you most like?
- What are three things about being a facility director that you most dislike?
- What are the three most important conditions or factors that limit your ability to be an effective juvenile facility director?
- Describe three characteristics of high quality institutions.

After the open-ended questions were formatted into closed-ended questions, the survey was checked for readability. The demographic information was moved to the end of the 2000 survey, whereas it was at the beginning of the 1995 survey. The purpose of this was to get the respondent interested in the study before having to provide this information. Further, the layout of the survey was altered so as to make it more consistent. Likert style, multiple-choice responses were utilized for all of the questions except those which required demographic information.

The first mailing of surveys occurred three weeks after contacting the facility director via phone for the first time. This first wave of surveys produced a response rate of 29.7%. Due to the problems that arose with the initial list, and the time that was necessary to clean it, the second mailing was delayed. The second mailing was sent out four months later to those directors that had not responded to the initial mailing. The second mailing produced a response rate of 47.68%. After this second mailing, the research team made a third phone call to all non-respondents to inquire as to whether they

had received the questionnaires and if so, why they had not responded. The primary reason cited by those directors who refused to participate was lack of time. The majority of the others had simply forgot about or misplaced the questionnaire. In those cases, those who indicated they would respond were mailed another survey. This third mailing was utilized to gain the largest number of responses possible. For the present analysis, a cutoff date was issued, whereby no additional responses were included in the data set.

Of the 394 facility directors in the population, 184 returned usable questionnaires resulting in a 47.55% response rate. The surveys were coded and entered into the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) by the research team. All members of the research team checked surveys prior to data entry. Data was also reviewed after entry to eliminate coding error.

Overview of Measurement

As mentioned, the data for this study was collected using a self-administered questionnaire. The dependent variable to be addressed is the correctional orientation of juvenile facility directors. This was measured using Likert scales designed to elicit respondents' attitudes toward rehabilitation and punishment. Based upon prior literature, the hypothesis here is that work-related variables such as job satisfaction, previous work experience and job-related stress will affect correctional orientation. Further, individual variables such as age, gender, years of education and military experience will alter an individual's orientation. Therefore, these were all used as the independent variables.

The scales used in the present study were adapted from the original survey (Caeti, 1995), which were drawn from Cullen et al. (1993). The research conducted by Cullen et

al. (1993) focused on the correctional orientation of prison wardens to assess if the rehabilitative ideal continues to receive support. Of the current research, it is the most similar to the present study.

The research by Cullen et al. (1993) is the basis for the present study. It is the only study in the present literature that focuses on the key administrators of the prison system (i.e. prison wardens), as we are focusing our attention to juvenile facility directors. Because of this distinct similarity, we chose to draw our scales from the Cullen et al. (1993) study. Below is a summary of the scales collected for the present study:

Rehabilitative Ideal Scale

Drawing from Cullen et al. (1993), a six-item scale was used to measure the respondent's personal belief in the rehabilitative ideal. A reliability coefficient was conducted for this scale with an alpha of .6612 and a standardized item alpha of .6638. The scale was scored so that a high score indicates greater support for rehabilitation. The response categories included: "Very Strongly Disagree," "Strongly Disagree," "Disagree," "Neutral," "Agree," "Strongly Agree," and "Very Strongly Agree". Scores could range from 1, indicating low support for rehabilitation, to 7, indicating high support for rehabilitation. The average score for this scale was 4.91 and scores ranged from a low of 2.29 to a high of 7. The facility directors responded to the following items:

- 1) Rehabilitation programs have an important place in my institution
- 2) The best way to stop juveniles from engaging in crime is to rehabilitate them; not punish them.

- 3) It would be irresponsible for us to stop trying to rehabilitate juveniles and thus save them from a life of crime.
- 4) While I believe that adult criminals know what they are doing and deserve to be punished, I still support the emphasis on rehabilitation of juveniles.
- 5) The rehabilitation of juveniles just does not work in the present system.
- 6) The rehabilitation of juveniles has proven to be a failure.

Punitive Ideal Scale

Again drawing from Cullen et al. (1993), a four-item scale was used to measure respondent's belief in the punitive ideal. Reliability analysis revealed a standardized item alpha of .7374 and an alpha score of .7345. The response categories included: "Very Strongly Disagree," "Strongly Disagree," "Disagree," "Neutral," "Agree," "Strongly Agree," and "Very Strongly Agree". The scale was scored so that a high score indicates greater support for a punitive ideal. Possible scores on the scale could range from 1, indicating low support for punishment, to 7, indicating high support for punishment. The average score for facility directors was 3.22, with scores ranging from 1 to 6.6. The facility directors responded to the following items:

- 1) Conditions at my institution should be harsher to deter juveniles from future crime.
- 2) Juveniles are treated too leniently by our court system.
- 3) Most juveniles who commit crimes know full well what they are doing and thus deserve to be punished for their offenses.

- 4) All juveniles who commit violent crimes should be tried as adults and given adult penalties.

Custody Orientation Scale

Recall from the literature review that Cullen et al. (1993) found prison wardens to maintain support for rehabilitative policies while placing a high degree of emphasis on custodial order. In order to see if this held true for facility directors, an eight-item scale was utilized. This scaled measured the degree of emphasis facility directors place on custody and security issues. An alpha level of .8579 was found for this scale, with a standardized item alpha of .8620. Directors responded to such items as:

- 1) The degree of emphasis on creating conditions that prevent juvenile escapes.
- 2) The degree of emphasis on creating conditions which protect juveniles from one another.
- 3) The emphasis on ensuring that institutional rules are followed by juveniles.
- 4) The emphasis of ensuring rules and procedures are followed by facility staff.
- 5) The emphasis of ensuring that juveniles follow behavioral expectations.
- 6) The emphasis of ensuring security and maintaining order.
- 7) The emphasis of preventing the flow of contraband into the facility
- 8) The emphasis of preventing the flow of contraband within the facility.

The scale was scored so that a high score indicates a higher degree of emphasis (10 = very great emphasis) on custody and security issues. Possible scores could range from 1, indicating no emphasis, to 10, indicating a very high emphasis. The average score of facility directors was 8.31 and scores ranged from a low of 1 to a high of 10.

Job Satisfaction Scale

The level of facility directors' job satisfaction was measured using a five-item scale. The reliability analysis produced an alpha of .7324 and a standardized item alpha of .7550. Respondents were asked:

- 1) All in all, how satisfied would you say you are with your job?
- 2) With regard to the kind of job you'd most like to have: if you were free to go into any kind of job you wanted, what would be your choice?
- 3) 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?
- 4) In general, how well would you say that your job measures up to the sort of job you wanted when you took it?
- 5) If a good friend of yours told you that he or she was interested in working in a job like yours for your employer, what would you tell him or her?

With the possibility of scores ranging from 1 to 4 and 1 to 3, items were scored so that a low score indicates a low level of job satisfaction and a high score indicates a high level of job satisfaction. The average score for facility directors was 2.58, with scores ranging from 1.2 to 3.

In Chapter Two, job-related stress was identified as related to correctional orientation. Recall, that the majority of studies found that the lower an individual's job-related stress level, the more apt they are to support rehabilitative policies. Job stress can be measured in multiple ways, but for the purposes of this study, it was operationalized very specifically given the population. After review, it was determined that most of the

stressors related to the correctional staff, not the director. Therefore, these identified stressors did not apply to the facility directors themselves. However, specific stressors from both inside and outside the facility were found to influence facility directors. Hence, an Internal Influences Index and External Influences Index were created to measure the amount of influence these stressors had upon the day-to-day activities of the facility directors. Specifically, the internal stressors were identified as staff, juveniles, administration, and the directors themselves. The external stressors were identified as the courts, parents and the general public.

In addition to the internal and external influences that serve as stressors to facility directors, Caeti et al. (1995) found that many directors cited staff problems as creating stress for them. Therefore, several staff indexes were created in order to assess the influence staff problems have upon facility directors.

Internal Influences Index

A 4 item-index was created to assess the amount of influence that individuals within the organization have on the facility director. The specific variables included to create the index were the degree of influence exerted on the day-to-day operation of the institution by the director themselves, the staff, the juveniles and top administration. These variables were taken together to form a general index of internal influences. The alpha level for this index is .6931 and a standardized item alpha of .7055. Higher scores on the index indicated that internal factors constitute a high degree of influence in the directors' institution. Scores on the internal influences index ranged from 2.5 to 10, with an average score of 7.8.

External Influences Index

A three-item index was utilized to determine the amount of influence that individuals outside the facility have on the director. The specific variables included to form the index were the degree of influence exerted on the day-to-day operations of the institution by courts, parents and the general public. These variables were taken together to form a general index of external influences. Reliability analysis revealed an alpha level of .6514 for this scale and a standardized item alpha of .6796. Higher scores on the index indicated that external factors constitute a high degree of influence in the directors' institution. Scores on the index ranged from 1 to 9.33, with an average score of 4.21.

Staff Perception Scale

Included below is a detailed description of the four indexes used to develop the staff perception scale. This scale is intended to measure the perception a director has of his or her staff on various issues. Reliability analysis indicated an alpha score of .8240 and a standardized item alpha level of .8294. The response categories for all indexes were like those used for the Rehabilitative, Punitive and Job Satisfaction scales (i.e. Very Strongly Agree = 7; Very Strongly Disagree = 1). Scores on the scale ranged from 3.88 to 5.79, with an average score of 4.66.

- 1) Staff Performance Index - A four-item index was created to assess the directors' attitudes towards the activities of his or her staff members. The specific variables included to form the index were the following statements:
 - a) I can generally trust my staff to handle matters when I am away from the institution

- b) The staff are the most valuable resource in my institution.
- c) Most staff have a positive outlook on doing their jobs.
- d) Staff do a good job communicating with juveniles.

The scores on this index ranged from 4 to 7, and the average score was 5.65

2) Staff Creativity Index – A two-item index was calculated to assess the directors' attitudes towards the creativity of their employees. The two variables used included the following statements:

- a) Staff are encouraged to problem-solve on their own
- b) Staff are rewarded for being creative in this organization

The scores on the Staff Creativity Index ranged from 3.67 to 7, with a mean score of 5.37.

3) Staff Problems Index – A four-item index was created to determine a director's attitude toward staff problems within their institution. The following statements were included in the index:

- a) It is difficult to get staff to change the way they do things in my institution.
- b) Many staff would rather cover up a mistake than attempt to correct it.
- c) Many staff try to look good rather than communicate freely with management.
- d) No matter how explicit I make my directives, staff always.

The average score on this scale was 3.53, with scores ranging from 1 to 5.75.

4) Organizational Communication Index – A three-item scale was developed to measure the amount of communication within a director’s correctional facility.

The following items were used to create the index:

- a) In general, management could do a better job of communicating with staff.
- b) Communication between management and staff is excellent.
- c) I want my staff to be more sensitive to providing for juveniles daily needs than they are now.

The scores on the Organizational Communication Index ranged from 1.67 to 7, and the average score was 3.63.

Staff Employment Index

In order to assess the issues related to staff employment a two-item index was formulated. Questions dealing with the hiring and retaining of staff were used in the development of this index. High scores on the index indicated that directors believed that this was a problem in their facility. Scores on the index ranged from 1 to 7, with an average score of 4.37. The following items were used:

- a) My institution has a problem in retaining qualified staff.
- b) I find it difficult to hire qualified staff.

Staff Empowerment Index

Two items were used to create an index, which measured the extent to which directors valued empowering their staff. Questions regarding the amount of influence staff should have in determining procedures and offering suggestions for change within the institution were used to compile this index. High scores showed a director’s

willingness to empower his or her staff members. Scores on the index ranged from 3 to 7, with an average score of 5.34. The following items were included in the index:

- a) Staff should have a say in determining procedures designed to implement institutional policy.
- b) Staff should have more opportunities to give me input into the design of institutional procedures.

Demographic Variables

The demographic variables that were collected as independent variables, based upon prior literature, are as follows:

Table 1: Independent Variables and Coding

Age	#
Race	0=White, 1=Black, 2=Hispanic, 3=Asian, 4=Other
Gender	0=Male, 1=Female
Total Years of Education	12=High School, 16=Bachelors, 18=Masters, 22=Doctoral
College Graduate	1=Yes, 0=No
Military Experience	1=Yes, 0=No
Total Years Working in Juvenile Corrections	#
Total Years as a Director	#
Average Hours in a Workday	#
Daily Population of Institution	#
Salary	#
Previous employment as Security Staff at Juvenile Institution	1=Yes, 0=No
Previous employment as a Director at Juvenile Institution	1=Yes, 0=No
Previous employment as a Counselor/Psychologist at Juvenile Institution	1=Yes, 0=No

In addition to the scales and demographic variables, specific questions aimed at determining the respondents’ opinion toward several topics in juvenile justice were included. These questions allowed us to look at the facility directors’ opinions and

perceptions of the juvenile correctional system. For example, respondents were asked to rank order what they believed the goals of the juvenile system should be. Possible scores could range from 1 to 4, with 1 indicating the most important goal, and 4 indicating the least important goal. The four goals included:

- 1) Retribution – to pay juvenile offenders back or punish them for the harm they have caused society
- 2) Deterrence – to teach juveniles, as well as other people contemplating the commission of a crime, that in America crime does not pay.
- 3) Rehabilitation – to reform juvenile offenders so that they will return to society in a constructive rather than destructive way.
- 4) Incapacitation – to protect society by locking up juveniles so they cannot victimize again.

By asking respondents about their views of the juvenile correctional system and the views of their institution, which was measured by the degree of emphasis their facility placed on certain objectives, assumptions can be made about the their correctional orientation. If facility directors exhibit an overwhelming support for rehabilitative policies, then it can be logically assumed that their correctional ideology is predominately rehabilitative. However, if this study finds that facility directors have a higher support for punitive policies, then there will be statistical support that the juvenile justice system has witnessed a shift from rehabilitation to retribution, based upon the attitudes and beliefs of key administrators.

Directors were also asked to assess the juveniles in their care. This was measured by asking respondents various questions such as, “what percentage of juveniles in your institution do you believe will be rehabilitated because of participation in treatment?” The perception that facility directors had of their juvenile population will be important when assessing their correctional orientation. If they consider the majority of the juveniles in their care as violent and dangerous, will they then continue to support rehabilitative policies?

The emphasis that directors place on rehabilitative activities and custodial/institutional order activities was also measured. The assumption, based on the prior literature, is that if directors support rehabilitative policies, such as increasing education programs aimed at teaching juveniles new skills, then they will likely maintain a rehabilitative ideology. On the other hand, if facility directors place a higher degree of emphasis on custodial activities, such as ensuring that juveniles follow institutional rules and procedures, they will likely consider themselves more punitive in nature.

Finally, the facility directors level of support for various juvenile justice policies was measured. The items used are included in Table 11 in Chapter Four. The responses to these items will be key in assessing the correctional orientation of the facility directors. It will be especially interesting to see if those directors who claim to support rehabilitation, also support punitive policies, such as the death penalty for juveniles.

The present study clearly has its share of shortcomings. Ideally, the research team could have waited for the third wave of surveys before conducting the bivariate and multivariate analysis. This could have altered the results, and possibly caused other

variables to be statistically significant. Furthermore, it could have possibly resulted in the discovery of predictors of correctional orientation.

With regards to the survey instrument used, the research team ultimately found that several of the questions were ambiguous. This often resulted in a misinterpretation of the questions by the respondents. Of those questions that were misinterpreted by the respondents, only years of education was used in the analysis. Total years of education should have been broken down for respondents into Bachelors Degree, Masters Degree, and Doctoral Degree. The reasoning for this is that the years of education widely varied for respondents (i.e. it takes people different time periods to finish a Bachelors degree, yet they will still have the same 'level of education').

To summarize, the current research is intended to determine the correctional orientation of juvenile facility directors. In addition, the predictors of their correctional orientation will be identified. The specific hypotheses to be tested are as follows:

- 1) Individual characteristics (i.e. age, race, gender) are not related to correctional orientation.
- 2) Organizational/work-related variables (i.e. job satisfaction, stress) are not related to correctional orientation.

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS

This chapter reports the various findings from the present study in detail. Overall, the findings from the study were expected. For example, the individual characteristics were not surprising and were similar to those of Caeti et al. (1995). In addition, the assumption that facility directors continue to support rehabilitation as a goal of juvenile corrections was supported in the findings. This is an interesting finding when considering that directors believed that nearly 40% of their juvenile population would recidivate after treatment. Essentially this means that while directors understand that juveniles will not likely “be saved,” they continue to support rehabilitation over punishment as the core ideology of juvenile corrections.

Individual Characteristics

Table 2 depicts the individual characteristics of the juvenile facility directors in the population. The mean age of the facility directors was 47.69 with respondent’s ages ranging from 27 to 65. The majority of facility directors in the population were white (77.10%). The minority breakdown is as follows; 16.20 % were Black, 3.9% were Hispanic, 1.1% were Asian and 1.7% of the population considered themselves “Other”. The entire population of juvenile facility directors consisted of 22.9% minorities. In addition, 82.5% of the respondents were male.

Table 2: Individual Characteristics of Juvenile Facility Directors

	Mean	Percentage
Age		
Mean age of Juvenile Facility Directors	47.69	-
Race		
White	-	77.1%
Black	-	16.2%
Hispanic	-	3.9%
Asian	-	1.1%
Other	-	1.7%
Total Minority	-	22.9%
Gender		
Male	-	82.5%
Female	-	17.5%

Background and Working Conditions

With respect to background and working conditions, the variables of education, military experience, experience in adult corrections, experience as part of a treatment staff, experience as a director at another facility and experience as a counselor or psychologist in a juvenile facility were also collected (Table 3). The data indicate that 97.8% of the population attended college, with 94.9% receiving a degree. The total years of education ranged from 12 to 22 years with a mean education of 17.31 years. Twelve years of education indicated completion of high school or equivalent. For each year thereafter, education increased by 1 with 16 indicating a bachelors degree, 18 a Masters degree and 22 a Doctoral degree.

Approximately one-third of the juvenile facility directors in the population served in the military with 71.7% serving in the Army followed by 18.9% in the Air Force, 5.7% in the Navy and 3.8% in the Marines.

For the most part, facility directors had previous experience within the field of corrections, both at the adult and juvenile levels. One-third of the population had previous adult correctional experience. Directors were asked if they had served in security staff positions or as a counselor/staff psychologist in a juvenile setting; 41.4% responded that they had worked in a security staff position and 63% indicated experience as a counselor/psychologist in a juvenile correctional setting. Almost half of the juvenile facility directors had been previously employed as a director at another correctional facility.

The salary of the juvenile facility directors varied, with incomes ranging from \$21,600 to \$102,000 per year. The average salary for this population was \$58,716.79 per year.

Table 3: Background and Working Conditions of Juvenile Facility Directors

	<u>Range</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
Education			
Attended College	-	-	97.8%
College Graduate	-	-	94.9%
Total Years of Education	12 - 22 yrs.	17.31	-
Military Experience			
Served	-	-	29.8%
Branch Served			
Army	-	-	71.7%
Navy	-	-	5.7%
Air Force	-	-	18.9%
Marines	-	-	3.8%
Adult Corrections Experience	-	-	30.5%
Juvenile Corrections Experience			
Security Staff	-	-	41.4%
Counselor/Psychologist	-	-	63%
Previously employment as a Director?	-	-	47.5%
Salary	\$21,600 - \$102,000	\$58,716.79	

Specific Characteristics of Institution

The specific variables related to the type, size and population of their respective juvenile facilities are provided in Table 4. The data indicate that all facilities were classified as a juvenile correctional facility. All of the aforementioned facilities meet the requirements of a juvenile correctional facility as defined by the research.

The mean daily population of the facilities was 131, with facilities daily population ranging from 6 to 1240. The average maximum capacity of the facilities surveyed was 137, with maximum capacity ranging from 8 to 1240. Respondents were asked the maximum capacity of their institution as well as the average daily population; this information indicated that the majority of facilities are running at or above capacity.

Table 4: Specific Characteristics of Institution

Size of Facility	Range	Mean
Maximum Capacity	8 – 1240	137
Average Daily Population	6 – 1240	131

Correctional Orientation of Facility Directors

Several items from the survey were used to determine the correctional orientation of facility directors. First, we asked them to rank the four goals of corrections (rehabilitation, deterrence, incapacitation and retribution) in order of importance to them. Responses ranged from 1 (being the most important goal) to 4 (being the least important goal). Table 5 reports on the responses of facility directors regarding the goals of juvenile corrections. Nearly 71% of directors ranked rehabilitation as being the most important goal in juvenile corrections, followed by deterrence, incapacitation and retribution. It is

important to note that only 2.8% of facility directors ranked rehabilitation as their fourth goal, and only 2.8% ranked retribution as their first goal.

Table 5: Percentages of Ranks by Goals of Juvenile Corrections

Ranking	Rehabilitation	Deterrence	Incapacitation	Retribution
1	70.20%	17.70%	12.70%	2.80%
2	24.30%	48.60%	20.40%	6.10%
3	2.80%	30.40%	38.70%	26.30%
4	2.80%	3.30%	28.20%	64.80%

*With 1 indicating the most important goal, and 4 being the least important goal

In addition, facility directors were asked to assess the juveniles they had in their care on a variety of items. Table 6 depicts the mean estimated percentages reported by the facility directors. Directors indicated that they felt nearly 52% of their juvenile population would be rehabilitated due to their participation in treatment programs. Interestingly, directors also felt that 39.53% of juveniles in their institutions would recidivate after release. The results are consistent with a more rehabilitative attitude, however the results also exhibited wide variation on several items.

Table 6: Facility Director’s Assessment of the Juvenile Population in Their Institution

Item	Mean Percentage	Median
What percentage of juveniles in your institution do you believe are dangerously violent and should not be released?	8%	5.00
What percentage of juveniles in your institution do you believe will be rehabilitated because of participation in treatment?	51.9%	50.00
What percentage of juveniles in your institution do you believe will be deterred by their institutional experience?	17.1%	10.00
What percentage of juveniles in your institution do you believe will recidivate?	39.5%	35.00
What percentage of juveniles in your institution are predators and victimize other juveniles in the facility?	10.1%	5.00
What percentage of juveniles in your institution need to be protected from other juveniles in the institution?	13.2%	10.00

What percentage of juveniles in your institution might be called chronic trouble-makers?	20.9%	10.00
--	-------	-------

Directors were asked questions regarding their attitudes toward rehabilitation in their own institution, as well as the success of rehabilitation in juvenile corrections in general. Table 7 depicts the directors' responses. Responses indicated that directors had a high degree of support for the rehabilitative ideal. Nearly 46% of facility directors indicated that they "very strongly agreed" to the statement, "rehabilitation programs have an important place in my institution." Further, 54% supported the statement "it would be irresponsible for us to stop trying to rehabilitate juveniles." Other statements, such as "the rehabilitation of juveniles just does not work in the present system" and "the rehabilitation of juveniles has proven to be a failure" received a general disagreement by directors.

Table 7: Directors attitudes toward Rehabilitation

	Very Strongly Disagree	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	Very Strongly Agree
Rehabilitation programs have an important place in my institution.	-	2.2%	3.3%	2.7%	11.0%	35.2%	45.6%
The best way to stop juveniles from engaging in crime is to rehabilitate them, not punish them.	1.1%	0.5%	3.8%	6.6%	22.5%	30.8%	34.6%
It would be irresponsible for us to stop trying to rehabilitate juveniles.	3.8%	1.6%	-	2.7%	14.3%	23.1%	54.4%

I believe that adult criminals deserve to be punished for their crimes, but still support rehabilitation of juveniles.	-	2.2%	2.2%	5.0%	24.3%	27.6%	38.7%
The rehabilitation of juveniles just does not work in the present system.	11.0%	24.3%	39.8%	9.4%	10.5%	3.3%	1.7%
The rehabilitation of juveniles has proven to be a failure.	19.3%	27.6%	40.3%	7.7%	2.8%	1.1%	1.1%

The directors' level of punitiveness was measured using the four items that made up the punitive scale. Responses, depicted in Table 8, indicated that directors had a low level of support for punishment. Nearly one-third (31.3%) of directors strongly disagreed with the statement, "conditions at my institutions should be harsher to deter juveniles from future crime." The statement, "all juveniles who commit violent crimes should be tried as adults and given adult penalties" received low support from the directors, with 38.7% of them disagreeing with the statement. While directors believe that juveniles need to be punished, generally they did not view punishment as a major goal of the juvenile correctional system.

Table 8: Directors attitudes toward punishment

	Very Strongly Disagree	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	Very Strongly Agree
Conditions at my institution should be harsher to deter juveniles from future crime.	31.3%	26.4%	29.1%	3.8%	6.6%	1.6%	1.1%
Juveniles are treated too leniently by our court system.	8.7%	12%	37.2%	22.4%	12.6%	4.9%	2.2%

Most juveniles who commit crimes know what they are doing and deserve to be punished.	1.7%	9.4%	27.2%	22.8%	30%	3.9%	5%
All juveniles who commit violent crimes should be tried as adults and given adult penalties.	19.3	19.9%	38.7%	12.2%	5.5%	2.2%	2.2%

Directors were also asked to indicate the emphasis they placed on day-to-day activities within their facilities. Tables 9 and 10 depict the mean ranking (on a scale of 1 to 10, with 10 = strong emphasis) the directors reported on several different rehabilitation items and custody/institutional order items. Directors indicated the degree of emphasis placed on activities such as, “ensuring security and maintaining order,” and “involving juveniles in rehabilitative treatment programs.” Interestingly, directors had indicated that they placed a high degree of emphasis on both custodial and rehabilitative activities. For example, 39% of directors placed a “very great emphasis” on involving juveniles in rehabilitative treatment plans and 40.7% placed the same amount of emphasis on providing programs to help juveniles learn new skills. However, directors reported a high degree of emphasis on items such as “creating conditions which protect juveniles from one another” (47.8%) and “creating conditions that prevent juvenile escapes” (43.9%).

Table 9: Emphasis Given to Activities in Day-to-Day Operation of Facility – Rehabilitation Activities.

	Mean	Median	Mode	Std. Deviation
The emphasis of providing programs to help juveniles learn new skills	8.7088	9.0000	10.00	1.5006
The emphasis of providing adequate space and needed services to juveniles	7.5193	8.0000	10.00	2.1540
The emphasis of ensuring that juveniles	7.7500	8.0000	8.00	1.9715

follow their treatment plan				
The emphasis of involving juveniles in rehabilitative treatment programs	8.5278	9.0000	10.00	1.8594
The emphasis of providing activities to keep the juveniles busy	8.0112	8.0000	10.00	1.8843

Table 10: Emphasis Given to Activities in Day-to-Day Operation of Facility – Custody/Institutional Order Activities.

	Mean	Median	Mode	Std. Deviation
The emphasis of ensuring that institutional rules are followed by juveniles	8.1547	8.0000	8.00	1.7186
The emphasis of ensuring rules and procedures are followed by facility staff	8.6519	9.0000	10.00	1.5185
The emphasis of ensuring that juveniles follow behavioral expectations	8.2944	8.0000	10.00	1.7132
The emphasis of creating conditions which protect juveniles from one another	8.7611	9.0000	10.00	1.6456
The emphasis of creating conditions that prevent juvenile escape	7.9389	9.0000	10.00	2.5548
The emphasis of ensuring security and maintaining order	8.8603	9.0000	10.00	1.5425
The emphasis of preventing the flow of contraband into the facility	7.7598	9.0000	10.00	2.4617
The emphasis of preventing the flow of contraband within the facility	7.5307	8.0000	10.00	2.5754

Finally, the degree to which directors supported or opposed punitive and rehabilitative policies was measured. Directors responded to items such as, “I support the death penalty for certain juveniles convicted of murder,” and “I support expanding psychological counseling programs.” Scores ranged from 1 (Oppose a great deal) to 4 (Favor a great deal). Results are depicted in Table 11. As evident by the table, directors’ overwhelmingly opposed the death penalty for juvenile offenders convicted of murder.

Furthermore, directors “favored a great deal” the elimination of the death penalty for juveniles. Results also indicated that 59.3% of the directors strongly opposed eliminating parole and indeterminate sentencing. Expanding educational and vocational training programs for juvenile offenders received high support from directors as well as expanding psychological counseling programs.

Table 11: Support for Punitive or Rehabilitative Policies

	Mean	Median	Mode	Std. Deviation
Level of support for the death penalty for juveniles convicted of murder	1.8889	1.0000	1.00	1.0877
Level of support for the transfer of juveniles accused of serious crimes to adult court	3.0281	3.0000	3.00	.9109
Level of support for incarceration past age 21 for juveniles convicted of serious crime	3.1389	3.0000	4.00	.9261
Level of support for fingerprinting and photographing juveniles for tracking purposes	3.4033	4.0000	4.00	.7054
Level of support for juvenile records being kept and allowed into evidence in adult court	2.9944	3.0000	3.00	.9365
Level of support for an increase in the use of fixed length (determinate) sentences	2.2682	2.0000	2.00	1.0143
Level of support for an increase in the use of indeterminate sentences for juveniles	2.9162	3.0000	3.00	.9354
What is your view on eliminating parole and the indeterminate sentence?	1.5480	1.0000	1.00	.7607
What is your view on expanding educational and vocational training programs for juvenile offenders?	3.8889	4.0000	4.00	.3151
What is your view on expanding psychological counseling programs?	3.7278	4.0000	4.00	.5267
What is your view on mandatory life sentences for habitual juvenile offenders?	1.5922	1.0000	1.00	.8184
What is your view on elimination of the death penalty for juveniles	2.9775	3.0000	4.00	1.0890

Correlates and Predictors of Correctional Orientation

Several bivariate analyses were conducted with cross-tabulations using Pearson's Chi-square and Spearman's Rho. Pearson's Chi-square is a measure of linear association between two variables. The values of this correlation coefficient can range from -1 to 1. The sign is indicative of the direction of the relationship, and the absolute value indicates the strength. Larger absolute values indicate stronger relationships. Spearman's Rho is based on the ranks of data rather than their actual values. Values of this correlation coefficient range from -1 to 1. The sign of the coefficient indicates the direction of the relationship; the absolute value shows the strength with larger absolute values indicating stronger relationships.

In order to conduct bivariate analysis both the punitive scale and the rehabilitative scales were collapsed in dichotomous variables. The rehabilitation scale was collapsed into the categories of low to moderate support for rehabilitation (scores ranging from 0 to 4.99) and high support for rehabilitation (scores ranging from 5 to 7). The punitive scale was collapsed into low support for punishment (scores ranging from 0 to 3) and moderate to high support for punishment (scores ranging from 3.1 to 7).

The bivariate correlations were conducted on the following variables: age, race (collapsed into non-minority and minority), gender, total years of education, previous military experience, years in juvenile corrections, years as a director, hours in workday, average daily population of institution, salary, previous employment history, job satisfaction scale, internal influences index, external influence index, state/local office

influence, custody scale, staff employment issues index, staff empowerment index and the staff perceptions scale. Only significant correlations will be reported in the analysis.

A Pearson's correlation was conducted on the dichotomous rehabilitation scale. The only significant correlation ($p = .199$) was found between the dichotomous rehabilitation scale and previous employment as a counselor/psychologist. This relationship was positive and strong correlation. This finding leads us to assume that individuals who have previous experience as a counselor/psychologist, a position that is rehabilitative in nature, will be more supportive of rehabilitation. Recall from Table 3, that 63% of facility directors reported that they had previous employment experience as a counselor or psychologist. Thus, it can be argued that individuals who work in juvenile corrections as a counselor or psychologist and then continue on as a director, will likely adopt a rehabilitative ideology.

While only one independent variable was significantly correlated to the rehabilitative scale, a Pearson's correlation was performed on the dichotomous punitive scale and found several significant correlations. More specifically, five independent variables were found to be significant with this scale: age, total years of education, total years in juvenile corrections, total years as a director, and salary.

First, there was a significant correlation between age and punishment ($p = -.165$). The relationship between the two variables was negative and weak. This means that as individuals grow older, they are slightly less likely to support punishment.

Total years of education had significant correlation ($p = -.154$) with the dichotomous punitive scale. The direction and strength of this correlation was a weak, negative relationship which indicates that the more education a facility director has, the less likely he or she will support the punitive ideal.

The total number of years that a facility director had spent working in juvenile corrections was related to their support of the punitive ideal ($p = -.251$). The correlation was a strong, negative relationship, which indicates that the longer an individual remains in juvenile corrections, the less likely they will support punishment as a goal of juvenile corrections.

In addition, the total number of years that respondents had spent as a director was negatively related to the dichotomous punitive scale ($p = -.160$). This indicates that the longer respondents remained in their current position as a facility director, the lower their support for punishment will be.

Finally, a facility director's salary and support for the punitive ideal had a correlation coefficient of $-.223$. Thus, as salary increases, support for punishment will likely decrease.

Table 12: Table of Correlates

VARIABLES	REHABILITATION	PUNISHMENT
Age		-.165 *
Race		
Gender		
Total years of education		-.154 *

College Graduate		
Did you serve in the armed forces?		
Total years working in Juvenile Corrections		-.251 *
Total years as a director		-.160 *
How many hours in your average workday?		
Average daily population of your institution		
Salary Recode		-.205 *
Have you ever been employed as security staff at a juvenile facility?		
Have you ever been employed as a director at another facility?		
Have you ever been employed as a counselor/psychologist in a juvenile facility?	.199 **	
Job Satisfaction Scale		
Internal Influences Index		
External Influences Index		
Punitive Scale		
Custody Scale		
Staff Employment Issues Index		
Staff Empowerment Index		
Dichotomous punishment scale		
Dichotomous satisfaction scale		
Staff Perceptions Scale		

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

A multivariate model was run on both the punitive scale and the rehabilitative scale. However, after running the model, none of the independent variables significantly

predicted correctional orientation. The analysis of variance, or ANOVA, produced an insignificant score of .884 for the rehabilitative scale, and .086 for the punitive scale.

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

Prior literature has found that both the public and politicians support “get tough” measures for adults as well as juveniles. Over the last decade, the adult correctional system has become increasingly more punitive in nature. The purpose of this study was to determine whether this punitive shift has occurred at the juvenile level as well. To determine this, the present study examined the attitudes and beliefs of those individuals who affect the juvenile correctional setting most: the facility directors. Juvenile facility directors have the ability to affect the direction of juvenile corrections, more so than any legislature or other outside attempts. By assessing their correctional beliefs and attitudes, we could arguably determine whether the majority of facility directors supported rehabilitation or punishment as the goal of juvenile corrections. If, in fact, facility directors no longer consider rehabilitation as the key goal of juvenile corrections, then examination of the management of those institutions will be necessary.

Descriptive and bivariate analyses indicated that juvenile facility directors have a continued support for the rehabilitative ideal. This affirmed our initial belief that juvenile facility directors would be rehabilitative in nature, not punitive. For example, when asked to rank, in their opinion, what the goals of the juvenile correctional system should be, nearly 71% of facility directors ranked rehabilitation as the number one goal. On the other hand, only 2.8% ranked punishment as the number one goal of juvenile corrections and only 2.8% ranked rehabilitation as a fourth and final goal. The strong support

exhibited for rehabilitation by facility directors clearly indicates that facility directors believe, in their opinion, that rehabilitation should be the key goal of juvenile corrections.

In Chapter Two, the two models that dominate research concerning the variables that determine correctional attitudes and beliefs were introduced. The Importation-Differential Experiences Model contends that correctional orientation is the result of the different types of experiences brought to the work environment by different types of people. On the other hand, the Work-Role Prisonization Model holds that correctional orientation is not affected by individual characteristics or experiences but rather the nature of the work role. The present study found that both individual characteristics and work-related variables affected correctional orientation. This finding is supported by previous research, which points to several determinants of correctional orientation.

The support for rehabilitation among facility directors is supported by prior research, mostly conducted by Cullen et al. (1983). In a survey of the general public, lawyers, judges and correctional administrators, Cullen et al. found that 82% of respondents felt that it would be irresponsible to stop trying to rehabilitate juveniles. Further, nearly 77% of respondents indicated that they supported rehabilitation of juveniles, especially when compared to adult offenders. Cullen et al. (1989) study of prison wardens also found a high support for rehabilitation.

Previous research has also found that race, gender, education and age are all related to correctional orientation. For the most part, this prior research indicated that these variables have a positive relationship with support for rehabilitation. However, this study only found that previous employment as a counselor/psychologist was significantly

related to the rehabilitative ideal. It could be that race, gender, age and education all influence orientation in the adult correctional setting, but not in a juvenile setting. Here, those individuals that had experience as a counselor or psychologist indicated a higher support for rehabilitation. Again, 63% of the facility directors had such experience. This may mean that those individuals are more likely to be interested in employment as a director of a juvenile facility. Once in that position, they of course bring their preference for counseling roles rather than placing an emphasis on custody and/or punishment.

Prior research also found that several work-related variables affect correctional orientation. For example, Burton et al. (1991) found that high salary is positively related to support for rehabilitation. The present study found similar results; as a director's salary increases, support for punishment will likely decrease. In addition, total number of years as a director was negatively related to support for punishment in our study. Thus, the longer directors' remain in their current position, the lower their support for punishment will be. This was also true for the total number of years that a director had spent working in juvenile corrections. These findings contradict previous research, which indicated that higher rank (i.e., director in this case) and tenure tends to decrease an individual's support for rehabilitation. What is important to note about this contradicting finding is that the prior research has reported on prison wardens in adult correctional settings. The discrepancy can be linked, quite possibly, to the fact that individuals who seek employment as a director and remain in that position believe that there is still hope for rehabilitating youth, a characteristic that may not be prevalent in adult prison wardens. Or, another explanation could be occupational maturation. That is, the longer the facility

directors remain in their position, the more opportunity they have to “come into their own person” and learn what the system is supposed to offer the juvenile offender. As opposed to their possible perception upon entry to the juvenile correctional system, that juveniles were only there to be punished for what crime they had committed. These are only suggestions for the contradiction and cannot be supported with relevant studies.

A significant relationship between the rehabilitative scale and education did not appear on the correlation matrix, however, education was found to be negatively related to the punitive ideal. That is, the more education a facility director has, the less likely he or she will be punitive. This finding is supported by previous studies, particularly by Poole and Regoli (1980) who found that higher education may result in a de-emphasis on punishment and custody.

Finally, bivariate analysis indicated that as directors grow older, the less likely they are to support punishment. This finding is supported by Farkas (1999) who found that older officers were less punitive and more interested in a counseling role with inmates. Considering the average age of the facility directors in the present study and their support for rehabilitation, this finding is not surprising. Recall that the average age of a facility director was nearly 48 years old, with ages ranging from 27 to 65 and that 70% of them considered rehabilitation as the number one goal of juvenile corrections. Does this mean that as we grow older we adopt more nurturing roles? Also, it can sometimes be assumed that the older an individual is the longer their tenure at the institution is. Does this mean that tenure can possibly predict support for rehabilitation?

This seems to be the case in the present study. Further research should focus on these relationships to determine whether this holds true over time.

While the External Influences Index, the Internal Influences Index and the staff issue scale and indexes were not significant in the bivariate analysis, it is important to discuss their possible influence on the facility directors. Realize that their non-significance could be just as important as their significance. That being said, it goes without saying that the directors undergo an extreme amount of stress from inside and outside the facility. Furthermore, it is important to note that the amount of literature on stress, with the exception of Caeti et al. (1995), has been limited to line staff. The type of stress felt by line staff is fundamentally different than that of facility directors or prison wardens experience. Hence, the internal and external influences indexes were formulated in order to assess how specific stressors such as the courts, top administration and juveniles have upon the facility directors.

The average score on the Internal Influences Index was 7.8. Scores on the index could range from 1 to 10 (1 = No influence; 10 = Very great influence), with higher scores indicating that internal stressors constitute a high degree of influence in the director's institutions. Hence, based upon the average score, it can be concluded that directors feel that internal forces such as their staff, top administration, the juveniles, and even themselves, exert a great amount of influence or pressure upon their day-to-day operation of their facilities.

The average score on the External Influences Index was not as high as the Internal index, gaining an average score of 4.21. The scores on the items were identical to the

Internal index (1 = No influence; 10 = Very great influence). The average score indicates that facility directors are not as influenced by external forces such as the courts, parents or the general public. Thus, it seems that a director's level of stress is most affected by internal forces, not external forces as many may assume.

In addition, the staff indexes, again drawn from the work of Caeti et al. (1995), were used to determine what influence staff issues have upon facility director's ability to successfully run their institutions. Caeti et al. (1995) found that directors often cited staff problems as a major stressor. This finding was supported in the present study. The Staff Employment Index, a two-item index, measured issues related to staff employment. Scores on the index ranged from 1 to 7, with higher scores indicating that directors believed employment issues were a problem in their facility. The average score on the index was 4.37. This indicates that directors somewhat feel that employment issues, such as hiring and retaining qualified staff, are a problem in their facility. This is important to acknowledge when examining the stress level of facility directors since job-related stress has been found to affect correctional orientation.

At the same time, interestingly, directors indicated that they were willing to empower their staff. The Staff Empowerment Index measured the extent to which directors were willing to empower their staff. Scores on the index could range from 1 to 7, with a high score indicating a director's willingness to empower his or her staff. The average score was 5.34, which means that while facility directors feel that their institutions have employment issues, they are still willing to give staff the room they need to give input into the day-to-day activities of the institution.

The Staff Perception Scale, recall, measured the perception a director has of his or her staff. Scores on this scale ranged from 3.88 to 5.79, with an average score of 4.66. This average score indicates that, in general, directors feel that their staff could be better qualified and/or trained and that communication between management and staff could be improved. This finding is consistent with that of Caeti et al. (1995) and only strengthens our argument that staff issues affect the stress level of facility directors. The assumption here is that this stress will ultimately affect the facility directors' attitudes as well.

The results of this research clearly indicate that facility directors continue to support rehabilitation as the key goal of juvenile corrections. Thus, it is evident from this finding that the increasing support for more punitive measures for juveniles has not manifested within the institutions. The reasoning behind this can be attributed to the fact that the key administrators of these institutions continue to support rehabilitation over punishment. Future research should test whether this will hold true over time.

The present study, though it had its share of shortcomings, has indicated the importance of assessing the beliefs of the key administrators in juvenile corrections. Clearly, additional research is warranted in order to fill the large gap that currently exists in the literature. While the study of correctional orientation is increasing in the realm of adult corrections, researchers continue to neglect juvenile corrections. This oversight is not limited to correctional orientation, but several issues in corrections such as job satisfaction, role conflict and job-related stress. While the body of literature is growing, research in the area of juvenile corrections has a long way to go to catch up to its adult counterpart. The present study indicated that juvenile facility directors overwhelmingly

support rehabilitation over punishment. While there were no significant predictors of correctional orientation identified in this present research, there were in fact interesting correlations that were supported by prior research and which need further examination.

APPENDIX A
SURVEY INSTRUMENT

**National Juvenile Facility Director Survey
2000**

**Dr. Tory J. Caeti, Ph.D.
Project Director**

**University of North Texas
Department of Criminal Justice
(940) 565-4591**

Instructions: Please fill out the entire survey (questions are printed on both sides of the pages) and return the survey in the enclosed pre-addressed, postage paid envelope. Thank you for your time and your input.

Check three (3) things about being a facility director that you most dislike?

Please or X your response.

<input type="checkbox"/>	Administrative and managerial duties.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Accountability and decision-making (being held responsible, being the bad guy, justifying decisions, deadlines).
<input type="checkbox"/>	Budget, funding, cost issues, lack of equipment or resources.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Constraints (barriers to progress, barriers to change, limitations on the job).
<input type="checkbox"/>	Crisis intervention and management.
<input type="checkbox"/>	External attitudes—influences and pressures (community, parents, other agencies).
<input type="checkbox"/>	Facility design and conditions.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Job itself (salary, hours, workload).
<input type="checkbox"/>	Juvenile issues (dealing with repeat offenders, violence, disturbances).
<input type="checkbox"/>	Lack of contact or communication with staff/youth.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Lack of support—lack of empowerment, lack of control, lack of respect.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Legal constraints (policies and procedures, lawsuits, federal regulations).
<input type="checkbox"/>	Overcrowding.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Paperwork and reports, meetings, audits, red tape, accreditation, bureaucracy.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Political and upper-administrative problems (public relations, court involvement, dealing with the media, dealing with central office, lack of coordination or disorganization, etc).
<input type="checkbox"/>	Programmatic issues (program failure, client failure, disciplinary process, etc).
<input type="checkbox"/>	Staff issues (disputes, evaluation, disciplining, motivating, training, turnover, unions, etc).
<input type="checkbox"/>	Stress, frustration, anxiety.

Check three (3) things about being a facility director that you most like?

Please or X your response.

<input type="checkbox"/>	Ability to affect and change lives—helping others, impacting juveniles, implementing change.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Accepted as expert, putting expertise to work.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Accomplishments.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Atmosphere.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Challenge.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Control, being in charge.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Creativity and innovation, being visionary.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Diversity and variety of job.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Exciting.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Flexibility and freedom.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Independence.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Job-itself—job security, benefits, autonomy, hours, salary.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Leadership and administrative responsibilities—decision-making, problem solving, authority, supervising, planning/directing, organizing.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Location of facility.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Policy and program development—improving program, ability to develop plans, setting goals and the agenda.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Public relations.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Respect, credibility, prestige.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Results and success, effective facility.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Sense of satisfaction—value and worth, sense of appreciation.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Working with juveniles—caring for, counseling, teaching, being a role model, inspiring.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Working with staff—training, supervising, coordinating, teamwork, motivating, evaluation and feedback.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Working with the community—public relations, coordinating volunteers, community projects.

If you were going to hire a director to run your institution, check the three (3) most important qualities you would look for in a potential candidate.

Please or X your response.

	Ability to work with juveniles		Fair, consistent, credible, sincere
	Ability to work with, develop, and train staff		Financial and budgeting skills
	Administration, leadership, and management skills		Hard working, perseverance, positive outlook
	Care, concern, empathy, commitment to juveniles		Interpersonal skills, team builder, motivator, role model
	Communication skills (verbal and written), ability to listen		Knowledge or experience in the juvenile system
	Counseling and clinical treatment skills		Organization and planning skills
	Creativity		Patience and tolerance
	Dependable, reliable, trustworthy		Problem-solving, crisis and stress management skills
	Discipline, firmness		Public relations skills
	Education		Sense of humor
	Ethics and values, integrity and honesty		Vision, intelligence, intuition, common sense

What are the three (3) most important factors that limit your ability to be an effective facility director?

Please or X your response.

	Admission restrictions and guidelines	Effectiveness not always defined	Maintaining experienced / professional staff
	Aftercare options	Inadequate funding	Personal characteristics
	Budget process and constraints	Inadequate training	Policies and procedures
	Bureaucracy	Inexperience	Political environment
	Civil service system	Lack of interagency cooperation	Size of facility and youth population
	Community attitude and support	Lack of partnership with union	Time constraints
	Continual change	Lack of resources	Treatment and placement issues
	Court system and regulations	Limited decision making authority	Workload

Identify two juvenile correctional institutions, either in your state or nationally, that you consider to be high quality institutions.

Institution Name

Location

1. _____
2. _____

Check the three (3) characteristics of these high quality institutions you value most.

Please or X your response.

	Qualities		Qualities
	Accredited		Outstanding leadership and administration
	Clean and well maintained		Outstanding staff
	Clear standards and goals—the focus / primary emphasis		Positive atmosphere
	Community based services, community involvement		Professionalism
	Communication between administration, staff, and juveniles		Proper aftercare
	Consistency		Safe and secure environment
	Facility itself—size, location, number of		Variety of services

	juveniles, etc.	
	Highly structured	Well funded and supported
	Institutional programming—the goals, design, implementation, etc of the treatment program	Other _____ _____

On a scale of one to ten, with ten being the rating for the high quality institutions named above, what grade would you give your institution?

MY INSTITUTION'S SCORE _____

On a scale of one to ten (1 = no influence; 10 = very great influence), indicate what degree of influence each of the following exert on the day-to-day operations of your institution.

Please or X your response over the number.

Courts	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
State or Local Central Office	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Director (Yourself)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Top Institution Administrators (Excluding Director)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Correctional Staff	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Juvenile Clients	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Parents of Juvenile Clients	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
General Public	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

On a scale of one to ten (1 = no emphasis; 10 = very great emphasis), indicate the degree of emphasis you give to each of the following activities in the day-to-day operation of your institution.

Please or X your response over the number.

Providing programs to help juveniles learn new skills	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Creating conditions which protect juveniles from one another	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Providing activities to keep juveniles busy	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Creating conditions that prevent juvenile escapes	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Providing adequate space and needed services to juveniles	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Ensuring that institutional rules are followed by juveniles	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Ensuring rules and procedures are followed by facility staff	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Ensuring that juveniles follow their treatment plan	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Ensuring that juveniles follow behavioral expectations	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Ensuring security and maintaining order	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Preventing the flow of contraband into the facility	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Preventing the flow of contraband within the facility	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Involving juveniles in rehabilitative treatment programs	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

On a scale of one to ten (1= not successful at all; 10 = totally or completely successful), rank the success of your institution in achieving the following goals.

Please or X your response over the number.

Preventing escapes	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Preventing flow of contraband into the facility	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Preventing flow of contraband within the facility	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Help juveniles to learn new skills	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Protecting younger juveniles from older juveniles	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Following legally mandated procedures	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Punishing juveniles for crimes that caused their incarceration	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Providing juveniles with activities that occupy their time	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Helping juveniles cope with the conditions of confinement	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

Teaching juveniles how to behave appropriately	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Rehabilitating juveniles through their treatment plan	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Deterring juveniles from committing crimes in the future	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

Distribute 100 points among the following options in a way that reflects the relative importance you believe each goal or activity should receive in the day-to-day operation of the ideal juvenile institution:

<i>Points you would assign (totaling 100)</i>	<i>Goal or Activity</i>
	Preventing escapes
	Maintaining order within the juvenile facility
	Involving juveniles in rehabilitation programs (counseling, educational programs)
	Keeping juveniles busy by having them work
	Punishing juveniles for the crimes they committed
	Other (please specify) _____

On a scale one to seven (1=Very Strongly Disagree; 7=Very Strongly Agree), respond to each of the following items.
Please or X your response over the number.

	Very Strongly Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	Very Strongly Agree
I often felt that the control of my institution is slipping out of my hands.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
The problems of my institutions are accurately portrayed in the local media.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Conditions at my institution should be harsher to deter juveniles from future crime	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Volunteers from the community play an important part in programming at my institution.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
There are few people outside of the institution with whom I can talk about my job.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Rehabilitation programs have an important place in my institution	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Juveniles are treated too leniently by our court system.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Juveniles need a clear message concerning what is and what is not appropriate behavior	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
The location of my facility makes it easy for family members to visit juveniles	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Generally speaking, juveniles do not have enough say in determining institutional policy	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

	Very Strongly Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	Very Strongly Agree
Local newspaper coverage of the activities at institutions such as mine should be encouraged	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Control of correctional institutions should be left to institutional administrators and not the courts.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
We need to provide more activities to occupy the juveniles' time	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Juveniles do not have enough opportunities to give me their ideas about institutional problems	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Carefully providing for the rights of juveniles in disciplinary matters has a negative impact on discipline at my institution	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

The conditions at my institution are accurately portrayed in the local media	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I am often invited to speak at local civic groups about activities at the institution	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Conditions at my institutions are such that when juveniles leave, they have a positive outlook on their lives	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
The best way to stop juveniles from engaging in crime is to rehabilitate them, not punish them.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
It would be irresponsible for us to stop trying to rehabilitate juveniles and thus save them from a life of crime	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
While I believe that adult criminals know what they are doing and deserve to be punished, I still support the emphasis on rehabilitation of juveniles.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Most juveniles who commit crimes know full well what they are doing and thus deserve to be punished for their offenses	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
All juveniles who commit violent crimes should be tried as adults and given adult penalties	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Juveniles are treated too leniently by our criminal justice court system.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
The rehabilitation of juveniles just does not work in the present system	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
The rehabilitation of adult criminals just does not work.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
The rehabilitation of juveniles has proven to be a failure.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

We would like to know what you think the goals of the juvenile correctional system should be. Please rank each of the following statements in order of importance. Rank the most important goal as 1, the next most important goal as 2, and so on. Use each rank only once!

Rank You Would Assign, 1 – 4	Juvenile Correctional Goals
	Retribution—to pay juvenile offenders back or punish them for the harm they caused society.
	Deterrence—to teach juveniles, as well as other people contemplating the commission of a crime, that in America crime does not pay.
	Rehabilitation—to reform juvenile offenders so that they will return to society in a constructive rather than a destructive way.
	Incapacitation—to protect society by locking up juveniles so they cannot victimize again.

Please indicate your degree of support for the following juvenile justice policies.
Please or X your response over the number.

	Oppose a great deal	Oppose a little	Favor a little	Favor a great deal
I support the death penalty for certain juveniles convicted of murder	1	2	3	4
I support the transfer of juveniles accused of serious crime to adult court	1	2	3	4
I favor incarceration past age 21 for juveniles convicted of serious crime	1	2	3	4
I favor fingerprinting and photographing of juveniles for tracking purposes	1	2	3	4
Juvenile records should be kept and allowed into evidence in adult court	1	2	3	4
I support an increase in the use of fixed length (determinate) sentences	1	2	3	4
I support and increase in the use of indeterminate sentences for juveniles	1	2	3	4

In a number of states, juvenile facility crowding is a severe problem. Which of the following solutions to facility crowding would you favor or oppose?

Please or X your response over the number.

	Oppose a great deal	Oppose a little	Favor a little	Favor a great deal
Diversion of more offenders into community corrections programs	1	2	3	4
Shortening sentence lengths	1	2	3	4
Increasing the ability of a parole authority to release low risk offenders	1	2	3	4
Raising taxes to build more institutions	1	2	3	4
Using private companies to build and run institutions	1	2	3	4

The issue of privatization has received a great deal of attention in recent times. We should like to know which of the following you would favor or oppose.

Please or X your response over the number.

	Oppose a great deal	Oppose a little	Favor a little	Favor a great deal
Having private vendors supply specific support services like food service or medical care.	1	2	3	4
Having private vendors supply rehabilitation services, like educational programs or psychological counseling.	1	2	3	4
Having private businesses set up facility industries that pay juveniles a normal wage for their work.	1	2	3	4
Having private companies help finance facility construction.	1	2	3	4
Having private companies build and operate facilities.	1	2	3	4

Now we would like to know your views on several correctional issues. Please state to what extent you favor or oppose each of the following policies.

Please or X your response over the number.

	Oppose a great deal	Oppose a little	Favor a little	Favor a great deal
Eliminating parole and the indeterminate sentence.	1	2	3	4
Expanding educational and vocational training programs for juvenile offenders.	1	2	3	4
Expanding psychological counseling programs.	1	2	3	4
Mandatory life sentences for habitual juvenile offenders.	1	2	3	4
Elimination of the death penalty for juveniles	1	2	3	4

The juvenile population is comprised on a variety of offenders. We would like to know your assessment of the juvenile population in your institution. Please indicate the percentage for each question.

	Percentage (can range from 0% – 100% for each question)
What percentage of juveniles in your institution do you believe are dangerously violent and should not be released into society?	
What percentage of juveniles in your institution do you believe will be rehabilitated (will not return to crime) because of the participation in institutional treatment programs (e.g., counseling, work training, education)?	
What percentage of juveniles in your institution do you believe will be deterred or scared straight by their institutional experience?	
What percentage of juveniles in your institution do you believe will recidivate and be back in the criminal justice system?	
What percentage of the juveniles in your institution are predators and victimize the other juveniles in the facility.	
What percentage of the juveniles in your institution need to be protected from other juveniles in the institution?	
What percentage of the juveniles in your institution might be called chronic trouble-makers?	

We would like to ask you a few questions about your staff and organization.

Please circle or X your response over the number.

	Very Strongly Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	Very Strongly Agree
In general, management could do a better job of communicating with staff.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Communication between management and staff is excellent.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
There are many people on my staff with whom I can openly discuss the problems of my job	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Generally speaking, staff should have a say in determining procedures designed to implement institutional policy	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Staff should have more opportunities to give me input into the design of institutional procedures	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
No matter how explicit I make my directives, staff always find a way to get around them.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I can generally trust my staff to handle matters when I am away from the institution.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Staff are encouraged to be creative in performing their jobs.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Many staff would rather cover up a mistake than attempt to correct it.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Many staff try to look good rather than communicate freely with management	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Staff are encouraged to problem solve on their own and implement solutions.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Staff are rewarded for being creative and problem solving in this organization.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Most staff have a positive outlook on doing their jobs.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Staff do a good job of communicating with the juveniles	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
It is difficult to get the staff to change the way they do things in my institution	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I find it difficult to hire qualified staff	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
My institution has a problem in retaining qualified staff	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
The staff are the most valuable resource in my institution	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I find I spend more time handling staff problems than I do juvenile problems	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I want staff at my institution to be more sensitive to providing for juveniles' daily needs than they are now.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Please tell us about yourself

1. Age _____ 2. Place of Birth _____
 3. Race White Black Hispanic Asian Other _____ 4. Gender male female
 5. Total Years of Education _____ 6. State graduated from high school _____
 7. Did you attend college? YES NO (if no, skip to question 12) 8. State attended college _____
 9. College Graduate? YES NO 10. If yes, what year did you graduate? _____

11. **College major:** Please or your response.

Juvenile Justice or Juvenile Corrections	Corrections	Criminal Justice, Criminology, Administration of Justice
Social Work	Education / Special Ed	Rehab, Counseling, Nursing, Vocational Rehab
Business, Human Resources, Communications	Psychology / Psychiatry	Sociology
Natural Sciences—Science, Biology, Chemistry	Arts and Humanities—English, Liberal Arts, Music, Journalism	Social Sciences—Political Science, Public Admin, Anthropology, Economics, History

12. **Did you serve in the Armed Forces?** YES NO (if no, skip to question 15)

13. **Branch** Army Navy Air Force Marines Coast Guard 14. **Years served** _____ to _____

15. **Total years working in juvenile corrections** _____ 16. **Total years as a Director** _____

Note: THE TERM STAFF THROUGHOUT THE QUESTIONNAIRE REFERS TO THE WORKERS WHO ARE DIRECTLY RESPONSIBLE FOR THE SUPERVISION AND TREATMENT OF THE JUVENILES, NOT SOMEONE SUCH AS A KITCHEN STAFF OR OUTSIDE SUPPORT.

17. **Do you have meetings with representatives of a formally recognized staff organization?** YES NO
If yes, how frequently As Needed Daily Bi -Weekly Weekly Bi -Monthly Monthly Quarterly Bi -Annually Annually

18. **Do you have meetings with a formally recognized group of juveniles?** YES NO
If yes, how frequently As Needed Daily Bi -Weekly Weekly Bi -Monthly Monthly Quarterly Bi -Annually Annually

19. **How many hours in your average workday?** _____

Check three activities that take up most of your day and specify the hours you spend on that activity.
Please or your response and indicate the hours next to your mark (mark only 3).

hour s	Activity	hour s	Activity	hour s	Activity
	General office work / paperwork		Education		Physical facility problems
	Budgeting and finance		Grievances		Problem solving / crisis manage
	Case management / Counseling		Intake, assessment, screening		Public relations / tours and inspections
	Dealing with families		Management & leadership tasks		Staff issues and staff training
	Dealing with state office		Meetings		Supervision and monitoring / dealing with juveniles

We would like to ask you a few questions about your feelings toward your job of facility director and about your background.
Please or your response.

	Response			
	Very satisfied	Somewhat satisfied	Not too satisfied	Not satisfied at all
All in all, how satisfied would you say you are with your job				
With regard to the kind of job you'd most like to have: If you were free to go into any kind of job you wanted, what would your choice be?	I would keep the job I have now	I would want to retire and not work at all	I would prefer some other job to the job I have now	
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?	I would decide without hesitation to take the same job	I would have second thoughts about taking the same job	I would decide definitely not to take the same job	
In general, how well would you say that your job measures up to the sort of job you wanted when you took it?	My job is very much like the job I wanted	My job is somewhat like the job I wanted	My job is not very much like the job I wanted	

If a good friend of yours told you that he or she was interested in working in a job like yours for your employer, what would you tell him or her?	I would strongly recommend the job	I would have my doubts about recommending this job	I would advise my friend against taking this job
--	------------------------------------	--	--

How long have you been at your present facility? from (mo/yr): _____ to (mo/yr): _____

Name of your Institution: _____ **State where institution is located:** _____

Maximum capacity of your institution? _____ **Average daily population of your institution?** _____

What is your current salary? _____

Type of Facility: JUVENILE CORRECTIONAL FACILITY JUVENILE DETENTION FACILITY JUVENILE GROUP HOME
 JUVENILE DAY TREATMENT FACILITY JUVENILE RANCH OR CAMP ADULT FACILITY

Have you ever been employed:
 As security staff in a juvenile facility YES NO As a counselor / psychologist in a juvenile facility YES NO
 As a director at another facility YES NO In adult corrections in any capacity YES NO

I would like a copy of the 2000 Juvenile Facility Director's Survey Results sent to me. YES NO

**Thank you for participating in the survey.
 Please feel free to add any additional comments you might have**

Don't forget to mail this survey back in the enclosed postage-paid envelope provided!

REFERENCES

- Arthur, J.A. 1994. "Correctional Orientation of Black Correctional Officers." Federal Probation 58:57-66.
- 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.
- Bazemore, G., T.J. Dicker, and R. Nyhan. 1994a. "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.
- _____. 1994b. "Explaining Detention Worker Orientation: Individual Characteristics, Occupational Conditions, and Organizational Environment." Journal of Criminal Justice 22:297-312.
- Bazemore, G., and L. Feder. 1997a. "Judges in the Punitive Juvenile Court: Organizational, Career and Ideological Influences on Sanctioning Orientation." Justice Quarterly 14:87-114.
- _____. 1997b. "Rehabilitation in the New Juvenile Court Do Judges Support the Treatment Ethic." American Journal of Criminal Justice 21:181-212.
- Benekos, P.J., and A.V. Merlo. 1995. "Attitudes Toward Delinquents and Juvenile Justice: A Comparison of Student And Practitioner Responses."
- Burton, 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.
- Caeti, T.J., C. Hemmens, and V.S. Burton. 1994. "Rehabilitate or Punish? Results from the 1994 Juvenile Facility Director Survey." Paper presented at the Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences meeting.
- Caeti, T.J., C. Hemmens, V.S. Burton, and F.T. Cullen. 1997. "Role Conflict in Juvenile Correctional Facilities." Paper presented at the American Society of Criminology meeting.

- _____. 2001. "Management of Juvenile Correctional Facilities." Corrections Management Quarterly 1:
- Crouch, B. and Alpert, G. 1980. "Prison Guards' Attitudes Toward Components of the Criminal Justice System." Criminology 18:227-236.
- _____. 1982. "Sex and Occupational Socialization Among Prison Guards: A Longitudinal Study." Criminal Justice and Behavior 9:159-176.
- Cullen, F.T., K.E. Gilbert, and J.B. Cullen. 1982. "Implementing Determinate Sentencing in Illinois: Conscience and Convenience." Criminal Justice Review: 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., 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., J.B. Cullen, and J.F. Wozniak. 1988. "Is Rehabilitation Dead? The Myth of the Punitive Public." Journal of Criminal Justice 16:303-317.
- Cullen, F.T., F.E. 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., S.E. Skovron, J.E. Scott, and V.S. Burton. 1990. "Public Support for Correctional Treatment: The Tenacity of Rehabilitative Ideology." Criminal Justice and Behavior 17:6-18.
- Cullen, F.T., E.J. Latessa, V.S. Burton, and L.X. Lombardo. 1993. "The Correctional Orientation of Prison Wardens: Is the Rehabilitative Ideal Supported?" Criminology 31:69-92.
- Cullen, F.T., J.P. Wright, S. Brown, M.M. Moon, M.B. Blankenship B.K. Applegate. 1998. "Public Support for Early Intervention Programs: Implications for a Progressive Policy Agenda." Crime and Delinquency 44:187-204.

- Cullen, F.T., J.P. Wright, and M.B. Chamlin. 1999. "Social Support and Social Reform: A Progressive Crime Control Agenda." Crime and Delinquency 45:188-207.
- DiIulio, J.J. 1987. "Governing Prisons: A Comparative Study of Correctional Management." New York: New York Free Press.
- Farkas, A. 1999. "Correctional Officer Attitudes Toward Inmates and Working with Inmates in a Get Tough Era." Journal of Criminal Justice 27, 6:495-506.
- Farmer, R. 1977. "Cynicism: A Factor in Corrections Work." Journal of Criminal Justice 5:237-246.
- Feld, B.C. 1980. "Juvenile Court Legislative Reform and the Serious Young Offender: Dismantling the Rehabilitative Ideal." Minnesota Law Review 65:167-242.
- Feld, B.C. 1988. "*In re Gault* Revisited: A Cross-State Comparison of the Right to Counsel in Juvenile Court." Crime and Delinquency 34:393-424.
- Feld, B. 1991. "Justice by Geography: Urban, Suburban and Rural Variations in Juvenile Justice Administration." The Journal Of Criminal Law and Criminology 82:156-210.
- Flanagan, T.J., W.W. Johnson, and K. Bennett. 1996. "Job Satisfaction Among Correctional Executives: A Contemporary Portrait of Wardens of State Prisons for Adults." The Prison Journal 76, 4: 385-397.
- Forst, M.L., M.E. Blomquist. 1992. "Punishment, Accountability and the New Juvenile Justice." Juvenile and Family Court Journal 1-9.
- Fritsch, E.J., T.J. Caeti, and C. Hemmens. "Juvenile Justice In Texas: An Analysis of Changing Policy Assumptions." Unpublished manuscript, Department of Criminal Justice, University of North Texas.
- Gardner, M.R. 1987. "Punitive Juvenile Justice: Some Observations on a Recent Trend." International Journal Of Law and Psychiatry 10:129-151.
- Grusky, O. 1959. "Role Conflict in Organization: A Study of Prison Camp Officials." Administration Science Quarterly 3, March: 452-472.
- Hepburn, J.R. and C. Albonetti. 1980. "Role Conflict in Correctional Institutions." Criminology 17, 4: 445-459.

- Jacobs, J.B and Kraft, L.J. 1978. "Integrating the Keepers: A Comparison of Black and White Prison Guards in Illinois." Social Problems 25:304-318.
- Jurik, N. and Halemba, G. 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. 1985. "Individual and Organizational Determinants of Correctional Officer Attitudes Toward Inmates." Criminology 23, 3:523-539.
- Kassebaum, G., D.A. Ward, and D.M. Wilner. 1964. "Some Correlates of Staff Ideology in the Prison." Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency 1:96-109.
- Kissell, P.J., and Katasampes, P. 1980. "The Impact of Women Corrections Officers on the Functioning of Institutions Housing Male Inmates. Journal of Offender Counseling Services and Rehabilitation 4:313-331.
- Klofas J. and H. Toch. 1982. "The Guard Subculture Myth" Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency 19:238-254.
- Liou, K.T. 1995. "Role Stress and Job Stress Among Detention Care Workers." Criminal Justice and Behavior 22, 4: 425-436.
- Lombardo, L.X. 1981. "Guards Imprisoned." New York: Elsevier.
- Merlo, A.V., P. Benekos, and W. Cook. 1997. Waiver and Juvenile Reform: Widening the Punitive Net." CJPR 8:145-168.
- McCorkle, R.C. 1993. "Research Note: Punish or Rehabilitate? Public Attitudes Toward Six Common Crimes." Crime and Delinquency 39:240-252.
- 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 17,2:333-357.
- Moon, M.M., J. Sundt, F.T. Cullen, and J.P. Wright. 2000. "Is Child Saving Dead? Public Support for Juvenile Rehabilitation." Crime and Delinquency 46: 38-60.
- Norman, M.D., and G.S. Burbidge. 1991. "Attitudes of Youth Corrections Professionals Toward Juvenile Justice Reform And Policy Alternatives – A Utah Survey." Journal of Criminal Justice 19:81-91.

- Philliber, S. 1987. "Thy Brothers Keeper: A Review of the Literature on Correctional Officers." Justice Quarterly 4,1:9-37.
- Poole, E. and Regoli, R. 1980. "Role Stress, Custody Orientation and Disciplinary Actions: A Study of Prison Guards." Criminology 18, 2:215-226.
- Schiraldi, V., and M. Soler. 1998. "The Will of the People? The Public's Opinion of the Violent and Repeat Offender Act of 1997." Crime and Delinquency 44:590-601.
- Schwartz, I.M., S. Guo, and J.J. Kerbs. 1993. "The Impact of Demographic Variables on Public Opinion Regarding Juvenile Justice: Implications for Public Policy." Crime and Delinquency 39:5-28.
- Shamir, B. and A. Drory. 1981. "Some Correlates of Prison Guards' Beliefs." Criminal Justice and Behavior 8, 2:233-249.
- Stohr, M.K., N.P. Lovrich, and G.L. Mays. 1997. "Service versus security focus in training assessments: Testing gender differences among women's jail correctional officers." Women and Criminal Justice 6, 1: 65-85.
- 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.
- Whitehead, J.T., and C.A. Lindquist. 1989. "Determinants of Correctional Officers' Professional Orientation." Justice Quarterly 6:69-87.
- _____. 1992. "Determinants of Probation and Parole Officer Professional Orientation." Journal of Criminal Justice 20:13-24.