Criminal Justice Textbook Publishing: An Insider Offers Guidance
Frank Schmalleger 9

An Evaluation of the Effects of a Street Crime Unit on Citizens’ Fear of Crime
Sandra L. Rutherford, Kristie R. Blevins, and Vivian B. Lord 21

The Issue of Trust in Shaping the Job Stress, Job Satisfaction, and Organizational Commitment of Correctional Staff
Eric G. Lambert, Shanhe Jiang, and Nancy L. Hogan 37

Attitudes Toward Punishment Among Criminal Justice Undergraduates
Youngyol Yim 65

An Analysis of State-Level Correctional Policies for Emergency Releases for Deathbed Visits and Funeral Attendance
Terrence Alladin, Sherrise Truesdale-Moore, and Shaun L. Gabbidon 83

Assessing the Congruency Between Line Officers and Supervisors in Expectations of Change
Mark E. Correia and David A. Jenks 107

ISSN 1932-1368

Volume 3 Number 4
# Contents

**Highlights of Volume 3, Number 4**

**Criminal Justice Textbook Publishing: An Insider Offers Guidance**
Frank Schmalleger

**An Evaluation of the Effects of a Street Crime Unit on Citizens' Fear of Crime**
Sandra L. Rutherford, Kristie R. Blevins, and Vivian B. Lord

**The Issue of Trust in Shaping the Job Stress, Job Satisfaction, and Organizational Commitment of Correctional Staff**
Eric G. Lambert, Shanhe Jiang, and Nancy L. Hogan

**Attitudes Toward Punishment Among Criminal Justice Undergraduates**
Youngyol Yim

**An Analysis of State-Level Correctional Policies for Emergency Releases for Deathbed Visits and Funeral Attendance**
Terrence Alladin, Sherrise Truesdale-Moore, and Shaun L. Gabbidon

**Assessing the Congruency Between Line Officers and Supervisors in Expectations of Change**
Mark E. Correia and David A. Jenks

**Index**

i-127
Reviewers

Jose F. Anderson
The University of Baltimore

Katherine Jean Bennett
Armstrong Atlantic State University

Anita Neuberger Blowers
University of North Carolina at Charlotte

Stephen A. Cernkovich
Bowling Green State University

Mitchell Bart Chamlin
University of Cincinnati

Adrian Derral Cheatwood
The Ohio State University

John K. Cochran
University of South Florida

Gordon Arthur Crews
Washburn University

Walter S. DeKeseredy
University of Ontario, Institute of Technology

Mary Dodge
University of Colorado at Denver

William G. Doerner
Florida State University

William Evans
University of Nevada, Reno

David James Farabee
University of California, Los Angeles

Randy R. Gaines
Old Dominion University

Jill A. Gordon
Virginia Commonwealth University

Michael K. Hooper
California Commission on Peace Officer Standards & Training

Sung Joon Jang
Louisiana State University

Paul Jesilow
University of California, Irvine

Wesley W. Johnson
University of Southern Mississippi

Paula M. Kautt
University of Cambridge

William R. King
Bowling Green State University

Jodi Lane
University of Florida

Edward J. Latessa
University of Cincinnati

Alan J. Lizotte
The University at Albany

Daniel Mabrey
Sam Houston State University

Cheryl Lee Maxson
University of California, Irvine

David C. May
Eastern Kentucky University

J. Mitchell Miller
University of Texas at San Antonio

Kevin I. Minor
Eastern Kentucky University

Scott M. Mire
University of Louisiana at Lafayette

Godpower O. Okereke
Texas A&M University-Texarkana

John L. Padgett
Capella University

Susan E. Pease
Central Connecticut State University

Mary E. Pelz
University of Houston-Downtown

Jeffrey Ian Ross
University of Baltimore

Professional Issues in Criminal Justice Vol 3(4), 2008 iii
Reviewers

Eric L. Sevigny
University of Pittsburgh

Frank Shanty
The Cobra Institute

Kathleen Marie Littwin Simon
Appalachian State University

Barbara A. Sims
Penn State Harrisburg

Risdon Nichols Slate
Florida Southern College

Stephen G. Tibbetts
California State University, San Bernardino

Sam Torres
California State University, Long Beach

John E. Wade
Southeast Missouri State University

Lorenn Walker
University of Hawaii
School of Business

Julia F. Weber
Judicial Council of California

John L. Worrall
California State University, San Bernardino

Jane A. Younglove
California State University, Stanislaus

Marvin Zalman
Wayne State University
Highlights of Volume 3, Number 4

The lead article for Issue Number 4 is a special article and the only article that was not peer reviewed. In “Criminal Justice Textbook Publishing: An Insider Offers Guidance,” Distinguished Professor Emeritus Frank Schmalleger discusses how he develops a textbook. This first-person narrative written by a successful criminal justice textbook author outlines the steps that would-be and up-and-coming textbook authors might consider in developing materials for publication. The article also describes the business environment characteristic of today’s major publishers and contrasts it with the academic environment in which scholarly activity tends to take precedence over financial concerns. Dr. Schmalleger answers the questions 1) Why should I write? 2) What should I write? 3) How should I write? and 4) When can I expect to get my writing published? While the examples in this article focus on the criminal justice area, they are applicable to other areas of textbook authoring.

In the second article, “An Evaluation of the Effects of a Street Crime Unit on Citizens’ Fear of Crime,” authors Sandra L. Rutherford, Kristie R. Blevins, and Vivian B. Lord point out that reducing fear of crime has been recognized as a valid police concern since the advent of community policing, with current research substantiating fear reduction as a legitimate police goal even when crime statistics do not support fear levels. Special police initiatives that target specific crimes or geographic areas are a common police tactic believed to reduce both crime rates and citizen fear. These initiatives often rely on high police visibility. Increased officer presence is expected to deter crime or increase the probability of apprehending offenders and has been found in several studies to reduce citizens’ fear of crime successfully. This study tested the effect of special initiatives on fear of crime by measuring citizens’ levels of fear after deployment of a specialized police unit into their neighborhoods. The authors administered a survey that measured perceived changes in police presence, perceived criminal activity, and levels of fear to business owners in the assigned neighborhoods. In support of the literature, test results revealed an inverse relationship between perceived increases in police presence and fear levels. In addition, a significant relationship between initial fear levels and perceptions of crime rate was found.

In “The Issue of Trust in Shaping the Job Stress, Job Satisfaction, and Organizational Commitment of Correctional Staff, Eric G. Lambert, Shanhe Jiang, and Nancy Hogan investigate the effects of supervision trust and management trust on the job stress, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment of employees at a midwestern private correctional facility by means of Ordinary Least Squares regression. They found both supervision trust and management trust significantly related to lower job stress and higher job satisfaction and organizational commitment after controlling for gender, race, age, tenure, educational level, and custody position. Management trust had a greater effect than supervision trust.
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Next, Youngyol Yim discusses “Attitudes Toward Punishment Among Criminal Justice Undergraduates.” Professor Yim collected data from 256 undergraduates majoring in law enforcement and criminal justice studies at an urban university in the midwestern United States. The study used a 15-item punitiveness scale designed by Mackey and Courtright to measure the students’ punitive attitudes. The study also examined several demographic and social variables, such as gender, race, career goals, and year in college to measure students’ attitudes on punishment and found these variables to be significantly related to students’ punitive attitudes.

“An Analysis of State-Level Correctional Policies for Emergency Releases for Deathbed Visits and Funeral Attendance” by doctoral student Terrence Alladin and professors Sherrise Truesdale-Moore and Shaun L. Gabbidon examines state-level correctional policies for emergency releases. Emergency releases represent those short-term releases in which inmates are allowed to visit either an immediate family member who is terminally ill or to attend his or her funeral. The authors surveyed state-level departments of corrections to determine the nature of each state’s policies regarding emergency releases and found that most states do allow for such releases. However, the policies consistently restrict the type of inmates who are eligible for such releases, and most policies place the financial burden of the releases on inmates and their families. The authors argue that such releases should remain an option for eligible inmates.

In the final article, “Assessing the Congruency Between Line Officers and Supervisors in Expectations of Change,” Mark E. Correia and David Jenks discuss that while much effort has been put forth to understand the ongoing transformation of police agencies, few researchers have looked at those mechanisms involved in the change. Drawing upon data collected from an innovative agency, their study assessed the levels of congruency between sergeants’ and beat officers’ expectations and understanding of a newly implemented geographical beat system.
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Criminal Justice Textbook Publishing: An Insider Offers Guidance

Frank Schmalleger

This article is a first-person narrative written by a successful criminal justice textbook author. It outlines the steps that would-be and up-and-coming textbook authors may want to consider in developing materials for publication. The article also describes the business environment characteristic of today’s major publishers and contrasts it with the academic environment in which scholarly activity tends to take precedence over financial concerns. The author addresses the following questions: 1) Why should I write? 2) What should I write? 3) How should I write? and 4) When can I expect to get my writing published? While the examples this article contains focus on the criminal justice area, they are applicable to other areas of textbook authoring.

This article differs from others in this journal in that it tells the personal story of one criminal justice textbook author. As such, it uses an informal writing style and makes use of personal pronouns more often than is commonly the case in scholarly publications. In particular, this essay uses the first person in describing this author’s own experiences and in communicating insights gained over thirty years of textbook authoring.

The purpose of this article is to offer advice and guidance to others seeking to enter the world of textbook publishing or, for those already there, to provide some suggestions for enhancing their work.

Background

I started writing books in the criminal justice field almost 40 years ago. My early works were monographs on specialized topics, followed by edited volumes that were occasionally assembled with the help of coeditors. At one point, I even crafted an encyclopedia of crime and justice that made use of solicited contributions from hundreds of experts in the field (and which was published by Greenwood Publishing Group).

Today I am the author of eight rather large texts in the criminal justice field—the kind that students (or perhaps their parents) complain about having to lug around in their backpacks. They include such widely used titles as Criminal Justice Today (now in its 10th edition), Criminal Justice: A Brief Introduction (now entering an eighth edition), and Criminology Today: An

Frank Schmalleger is Distinguished Professor Emeritus at the University of North Carolina at Pembroke and the author of several significant textbooks in the criminal justice field.
Schmalleger

Integrative Introduction (now in a fifth edition). My publishers include McGraw-Hill, Prentice-Hall, and Allyn and Bacon. Prentice-Hall and Allyn and Bacon are owned by the same company, Pearson Education, and have recently merged their criminal justice lists and now publish under the Prentice Hall/Pearson imprint. The first large textbook I ever wrote, Criminal Justice Today, has become (from what the marketing folks at Prentice-Hall tell me) the most widely used textbook ever published in the field of criminal justice. But that’s enough about me. Anyone interested in knowing more about my textbooks can visit www.prenhall.com/schmalleger, or www.schmalleger.com.

Writing Textbooks

I’ve always felt that writing books, whether scholarly books intended for library shelves or textbooks for classroom use, is fundamentally a service to the profession. In fact, in my early days of writing, I was naïve enough not to realize that successful writers could accrue substantial royalties. Like many other textbook authors, I have never written with royalties in mind but instead have always worked to address some type of felt need—whether it be the need to shine light on some relatively obscure aspect of the criminal justice system or the need that I believed students sometimes had for more useful learning tools to help them interpret the conceptual framework that constitutes contemporary criminal justice.

It is important to understand that textbook writing is very different from the writing of scholarly articles. Successful textbook writing requires an author to write for the marketplace, and an author must remember that publishing companies are profit-minded businesses. They operate much differently from not-for-profit educational institutions. Of course, some educational institutions are for-profit businesses, but the experiences that many academicians have within the university setting—even at those institutions—are based largely on traditional scholarly values and involve lifestyles that are generally shielded from the more practical demands of the business world. Consequently, professors writing for the textbook market must sometimes undergo a cognitive shift away from an egalitarian ideal where knowledge is pursued and shared for its own sake toward a highly competitive framework in which the potential profitability of intellectual products becomes a central concern.

Because of their focus on profitability, most textbook publishers are not highly motivated to publish manuscripts that lay out some novel theory or make what may be an especially valuable scholarly contribution to the field. They seek, instead, to identify and publish salable manuscripts—those that will enhance their bottom line. This doesn’t mean that college textbooks can’t make valuable scholarly contributions to the subject matter, as some decidedly have. It does mean, however, that any writer wanting to sign a
textbook contract and wishing to present his or her work through the medium of a textbook must keep the interests of the publisher in mind.

Unlike scholarly works that might propose new theories or offer focused critiques of particular subjects such as the death penalty, textbook authorship requires the writer to present a balanced perspective. That requirement can be attributed largely to the liberal arts tradition in American colleges and universities, which mandates an open-minded and inquisitive approach to academic subject matter. University administrators generally expect classrooms to reflect such a balanced approach, and individual professors often seek to use teaching materials that mirror that perspective. So, for example, any discussion of capital punishment in a textbook today can be expected to offer equal coverage of both the so-called “pros and cons” of the death penalty. A textbook author who thinks that he or she must make a personal statement about a particular issue such as capital punishment, and who believes that textbook authorship provides a forum for personal opinion, will likely find few of the larger commercial publishers interested in his or her work. Such writing, however, might find a home within a university press or a niche publisher, who are more likely to recognize the worth of focused value-rich discourse.

The job of a contemporary textbook author writing for a mainstream publisher today, quite simply, is to provide a balanced perspective on a field’s existing subject matter. The author generally accomplishes that by providing a comprehensive review of the work of researchers and other developers of original knowledge. Consequently, the job of a successful textbook author is not to espouse a particular opinion or viewpoint at the expense of others but to present a fair and evenly considered perspective on criminal justice topics.

As any experienced textbook writer can tell you, writing objectively is not as easy as it may sound. That’s because our personal viewpoints tend to crop up in our writing even when we make strong efforts to avoid it. A writer’s unconscious use of certain words or phrases, or even his or her sentence structure, can give away the writer’s personal beliefs. Hence, it is advisable to have others read and review written material, even that which doesn’t initially appear to be controversial. Publishers often ask copyeditors or reviewers to read through textbook manuscripts with an eye to identifying personal viewpoints that seem inappropriate. If you’re a writer who fears that you may have this kind of issue, then it would be advisable for you to have your publisher task your copyeditor and manuscript reviewers to do just that.

As a textbook author with established titles, I am often asked a number of questions by new and beginning authors. Those questions include: 1) why should I start writing? 2) what should I write? 3) how should I go about writing? and 4) when can I expect to get my writing published?
While the answers to these questions are often specific to the person asking them, I’d like to offer a few generic observations that address these four common concerns.

**Why Should I Write?**

I sometimes meet people who ask me why they should write. Anyone who asks a question like this is probably already thinking about becoming a writer. All they’re really looking for is a bit of a nudge to help them get started. In that case, I like to point out that writing can be very rewarding along a number of dimensions.

First, writing is a creative activity. While writing textbooks is not the same as writing novels or works of fiction, textbook writing still requires quite a bit of creative involvement—everything from choosing the topics to cover, to ordering and presenting those topics in a meaningful fashion and ensuring thorough coverage of the subject matter. A textbook author can express creativity in his or her writing style, the choice and presentation of subject matter, and even in such activities as photo selection and graphic arts development and design.

One of the areas I enjoy the most in my own work is selecting photos and helping to create illustrations that represent the ideas and themes that I want to communicate. I am fortunate in having developed a number of lasting relationships with photo researchers, graphic artists, and even individual photographers who work on projects in which I’m involved. Even if you don’t have a significant budget, or you’re working on a small book for a specialized market, you can still let your creative juices flow—sometimes to the point of being your own illustrator and photographer. If you’re in the justice field, you may already have your own personal photographic image collection featuring police officers, correctional facilities, building facades, courthouses, crime scenes, and memorials to crime victims. If you don’t have such a collection, you might want to consider starting one. But keep in mind that if you plan on photographing recognizable individuals, you will need to obtain signed model release forms before you can reprint those images in your text. Model release forms are available from most publishers, and generic forms applicable to most situations are available on the Internet. I like to take my camera with me when I go on trips and vacations, and I always carry a few spare model release forms in my briefcase. At the very least, shooting your own photos can save you from having to pay royalties for the use of someone else’s pictures. While most publishing companies have state of the art software for reproducing and enhancing photos, you might consult your publisher for any recommendations on photo quality and resolution.

Beyond the immense satisfaction that comes from creative involvement, textbook authors often believe that writing is a service to the profession. When you write a textbook, you provide a service not only to those instructors who choose to use it in the classroom or
online but to the end-user—the students—who will depend on your text as a guide to the subject matter their course covers. Satisfaction comes from knowing that you’ve helped students gain an understanding of materials that will serve them well later in life and in future careers. When you write a textbook, you have the opportunity to reach far more students than you do teaching in the classroom or even on the Internet. If you’re excited about your subject matter, that excitement is likely to show through in your writing even when you strive to offer objective and balanced coverage of a topic.

Of course, writing a textbook can be rewarding in any number of other ways. A well-written textbook will be appreciated by instructors who choose to use it and may enhance the author’s esteem among his or her colleagues. Textbook writing can also be rewarding financially, although I have always felt that financial motivation should not be the determining factor in writing a book. There are many other ways to earn a living or to supplement one’s income, and for those who do not enjoy writing, probably almost any one of them is preferable to spending long hours sitting in front of a computer and organizing volumes of research literature in an effort to integrate it for others to use.

**What Should I Write?**

Sometimes I am asked what to write. Those who ask me this question have often already made some initial efforts to understand which topics are relevant both in the classroom and to publishers seeking to bring new titles to life. Realistically, a textbook can have a difficult time finding a home unless it fits well within established and generally accepted curricula. So a book about prisons, for example, is likely to find a home within courses on corrections. If, however, you choose to focus on a specialized topic—say the prevalence of sexually transmitted diseases within jails—then finding a course that might serve as a home for your book will be a greater challenge. That’s not to say, of course, that such a book has no value. It certainly does, but more so as a research volume that is more likely to find its home in university libraries than in the classroom.

If, as in our previous example, an author were to choose to write a book about prisons, he or she would have to consider what topics to include. For those wanting to see their books used in the classroom, a good guide to appropriate content are the syllabi for existing courses in which the book might be used. In the case of our prisons text, a survey of those syllabi would likely reveal that courses on corrections—especially those that provide an overview of the field—cover much more than prisons. Jails, probation, parole, sentencing, alternative sentences, various forms of community corrections, restorative justice, mediation, capital punishment, and international practice might all offer suitable content areas. You can use the Internet to survey syllabi on courses of interest, as many professors post their syllabi online for students to view. Posted syllabi might also provide
you with ideas for supplemental materials, including student activities, PowerPoint present-
ations, Web-based discussion boards, and the like.

How Should I Write?

Sometimes people ask me how to write. What they really want to know is how I write—that is, whether I can share with them any special tricks or techniques that I use to stay focused and to structure my writing projects or my daily routine. Textbook writing can be very time consuming, and there is no denying that it requires a personal sacrifice of energy and time—something that not everyone can afford unless, perhaps, they are at the right stage in their career or in their personal life.

When I began writing what was to become my first large textbook, I did not fully appreciate the demands that writing would make on my time. At that point in my life, I was chairing a large department that offered majors in three different areas as well as some graduate courses. My activities as chair—which included a lot of time spent in meetings and in preparing and submitting reports—required plenty of attention, as did the three classes I taught every semester. I had a wife and two children. To pay the bills I found myself teaching extra classes in the evening and in the summers for additional income. Still, I was able to draw upon the energies and fortitude (some might say naïveté) that come with youth and produce what was essentially a 700-page introductory textbook in three years. Looking back on that time, I now realize that my writing took every spare moment of my life. Since then, I have made adjustments in my work schedule, and I have learned to choose new projects selectively—with an eye to the time each will require.

Only you know the kinds of sacrifices that you are willing or able to make as an author. A lot depends, of course, on just how much you feel the pull of writing. If you can, you might consider asking for a sabbatical, or taking a summer (or semester) off, to plan your writing project and get it firmly off the ground.

As with any other task that is worth doing, textbook authoring requires personal dedication. In my case, I write every day—meaning seven days a week. That’s not to say that I don’t take time off for other things. I do; but I’m careful to recognize the importance of writing in my everyday life. If you have to force yourself to write every time you sit down at the keyboard, then you should question whether writing is really for you. But if you enjoy writing, you might still find that you will have to force yourself to write some of the time. I’m referring here to what has been referred to as “writer’s block.” No one can expect to write with exceptional lucidity and creativity hour after hour and day after day, no matter how much in love with their subject matter they may be.

Writer’s blocks, or difficult periods, are to be expected. When I feel stuck, I change to a different topic, returning only later to the subject that I found difficult to complete. If, as in
my case, you often find yourself working on more than one writing project at a time, you can change the subject matter in an effort to get your creative juices flowing again.

Writing style is another topic of interest. Each of us has his or her own style, and it is usually counterproductive to stray too far from your own style or to try and imitate the style of others. An editor of mine used to say (mostly to new authors who wanted to write introductory textbooks in criminal justice) that “you can't out-Schmallegger Schmallegger.”

Regardless of how that might sound, I can assure you that he was not bragging about me or my writing skills, nor was he promoting my books (although he frequently did that). Instead, he was saying, “When you write, be yourself. Don’t try and imitate someone else. That’s when your best writing will come through.”

The fact of the matter is that no one else writes quite like you. No one else can write the way you do. Your writing and your thinking abilities are unique to you.

So, when you write, don’t try to mimic someone else’s style, and—if you are authoring a competing work—don’t follow the outlines the competition used. Write to your strengths. Write about what you know best and about what you love the most.

Beyond that, I advise people to write well—and here I am referring to grammatical accuracy and consistency of “voice.” As a former journal editor, I long ago learned that holding a graduate degree is no guarantee of writing ability. If you think that you would like to write, but you don’t have confidence in your writing abilities, then you are not alone. If that’s the case, you might want to improve your skills by reading the works of some of the great writers of our time. I’m talking here about popular literature, to include books by Ernest Hemingway, James Michener, and John Milton and even more contemporary writers such as Tom Clancy, Stephen King, and Dan Brown. These authors have a good grasp not only of writing technique but of how to write clearly and how to hold a reader’s attention. The best way to learn how to write well, I think, is to read texts that are well written—and let the author’s style rub off on you.

I also tell writers to be thorough. Textbook writing is scholarly writing in that it requires frequent and accurate citation of source materials. Never overlook the importance of citations or your work will appear to be less than scholarly—even when based on impeccable sources.

Have a contemporary focus. It’s the focus you need to get and hold student interest. Students today tend to be very much aware of what’s going on around them and in the wider culture—although personal interests may steer them toward certain topics and cause them to avoid others. They are quick to know, however, when textbook subject matter is out of date as opposed to when it is something they can relate to.

In the criminal justice area, for example, terrorism tends to be a topic of great contemporary interest. But any author writing for undergraduate students today should
remember that 9/11 happened eight years ago, and today’s freshmen may have been only eight or nine years old at the time. Similarly, events of the 1990s seems so “last century” to the majority of today’s students. In short, engage your readers. Tell stories, and make the events of the past—even of the recent past—relevant to today’s readers.

When Can I Expect to Get My Writing Published?

You can publish your work many different ways. The traditional fashion, of course, has been to attract the attention of a publisher who is interested in what you’ve written, sign a contract, and produce a printed text. But times have changed, and other paths are available to authors. Some contemporary authors have chosen to publish their texts, for example, in electronic format, entirely foregoing the traditional use of ink and paper. If your goal is primarily one of sharing your work with others, then the electronic route might be for you. Keep in mind, however, that electronic textbooks have yet to come into their own. There seems to be something about ink on paper texts that gives them staying power, even well into the age of the Internet. Some people say that it’s the warm and fuzzy feeling that comes from being able to carry around a book, crack it open at a moment’s notice, and snuggle up with it in a cozy spot. While that may be true, I suspect that another reason for the continued prevalence of traditional textbooks is inertia—or the inability of our huge educational establishment to make quick turns (at least without a lot of planning) and to dramatically change the way things have “always” been done.

While all the larger textbook publishers have experimented in the electronic area, and many of them do offer electronic versions of at least some of their texts, large publishers have also been slow to change. But if you want to go the electronic route, plenty of options are available to you. Many of them even allow for self-publishing, and you can permit those who purchase your books to download them or to have them printed and bound by a third party service and shipped to the buyer. Such printing and binding services are frequently available for as few as one printed copy at a time, and often cost no more than what you would pay for a traditional textbook—although books printed in color can quickly run up in price.

What you sacrifice with self-publishing and most electronic publishing services are marketing resources that can help ensure the wider success of your book. All the large textbook publishers field their own virtual army of sales representatives who make the rounds of college campuses nationwide. They also employ phone representatives who call upon individual professors at smaller campuses, and they make use of fulfillment services, which ensure that adopters receive the ancillaries and the personal attention that they desire.
Assuming you wish to sign a contract with a traditional publisher, then you may already have the personal contact you need to begin the process. I'm speaking here of the publisher’s representative who visits your office and suggests books for adoption. Publishers’ representatives are trained to keep an eye out for possible new manuscripts, and they often ask professors with whom they visit, “What are you working on now?”

If you have a writing project in mind, explain it to your publisher’s representative the next time you see him or her, and ask the rep to communicate your ideas to the company’s acquisitions editor. Because sales representatives are usually offered a finders fee for any contracts that are signed, you can bet they will pass your ideas along.

After that, you’re likely to receive a call or an e-mail from an editor. He or she will ask you to describe your project in greater detail, and if it fits with what the editor is looking for, the editor will ask you to submit a book proposal. Proposals usually consist of 1) a few pages describing the planned textbook, 2) a planned table of contents, 3) a review of competing books (identifying their strengths and weaknesses), and 4) (possibly) a sample of the author’s writing style. Book proposals are pretty much standard procedure in the publishing business. An acquisitions editor needs a proposal to take to the person above him—typically a senior executive editor, a publisher, or company vice president—who must sign off on any contract the company might offer you.

Standard contracts offer authors between 10% and 15% of net sales (the number of copies sold at wholesale, minus returns from bookstores). That percentage is your royalty rate, which may be lower for the first few thousand copies sold but will tend to go higher for any new books that you sign as your track record of successful titles grows.

When negotiating a contract, it is in your best interests to ask the publisher to pay for items such as photo permissions, text permissions (which may be required for some cited materials), and the preparation of indices and supplements (such as instructors’ manuals). In the case of these last two items, some publishers may expect you either to prepare them or to pay for their independent preparation through a deduction from your royalties.

You might also ask that monies be made available for photo research and permissions fees to reprint materials from other sources. Keep in mind, however, that if you are a beginning author, your publisher is likely to expect you to take on most of these tasks—or to pay for them if you insist on hiring others to take them on.

You can also ask your publisher for an advance, of course. But advances in textbook writing tend not to be large. An advance of a few thousand dollars is likely doable for most textbooks, and some publishers are willing to tack on small grants to allow writers to purchase special equipment that they might need to complete the writing task. Because grants don’t count against royalties, it is always a good idea to get one if you can.
It is important to point out that most books that make it into contract never see the light of day. The primary reason for this is that many would-be authors find themselves too busy to complete their planned writing projects. All contracts contain an anticipated submission date for the complete manuscript. Once that date has passed, the contract allows the publisher to disband the project and to ask the author to return any advances that have been paid.

Although most editors would like to see every book that they sign make it into print, they know that not all of them will. Editors are committed to publishing cycles and are answerable to budgetary considerations. If you are having trouble meeting your deadlines, the best path is to let your editor know as soon as possible and not to surprise him or her when your final submission date passes without a manuscript.

Assuming your book has made it into production—that is, has been passed along by the acquisitions editor to copyeditors and designers—you’ll soon find yourself working with a production coordinator, a copyeditor, a graphics artist, and (perhaps) a manuscript developer. You should remember that reviewers and copyeditors are your friends. By this I mean that you should be open to criticism. Good criticism that is well-meaning is a writer’s best friend, and those who offer it are there to help you produce a better book. Well-intentioned criticism should never be seen as a personal attack but accepted, instead, in the spirit in which it is offered—to help you and your production team make a great textbook.

During the production stage, all the aspects of your book come together into a finished product. Because the production team is tasked with maintaining quality while meeting strict deadlines, you’ll likely find yourself quite busy throughout the production process. You must review copyedited chapters, answer questions from copyeditors, and give prompt attention to typeset book pages. The production process moves pretty fast, and you’ll need to answer any queries that arise within the timeframe the production team establishes.

Once pages have been reviewed and finalized, your book is ready to be sent to the printer. Publishers tend to outsource the actual printing of textbooks, and your book may end up being printed in a location far removed from the publisher’s offices. In any case, it should be a happy day when the first printed copies of the textbook you’ve written arrive at your doorstep.

**Conclusion**

As I mentioned at the start of this article, the overview of textbook publishing provided here is that of an experienced author. I have tried to answer a number of questions that have often been put to me, including those from people who want to know why they
should consider writing textbooks, what they should write, how they should approach the writing process, and how they should go about getting their manuscripts published.

Anyone who seriously considers entering the world of textbook authorship should give some thought to joining the Textbook and Academic Authors Association (TAA), which provides an organized voice for textbook and academic authors. TAA is the only nonprofit membership association in the United States dedicated solely to assisting textbook and academic authors. In the words of the organization, “TAA’s overall mission is to enhance the quality of textbooks and other academic materials, such as journal articles, monographs, and scholarly books in all fields and disciplines, by providing its textbook and academic author members with educational and networking opportunities” (TAA, 2008). TAA offers a written position statement on the academic value of textbooks, a Code of Ethics for Authors, and a guide for authors in negotiating contracts with publishers. The TAA Web site is at http://www.taaonline.net.

I hope that you will find the information this article contains useful. If you are considering entering the world of textbook writing—or if you are already there—and have comments that you wish to share, please drop me a note at schmall@cjtoday.com.
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An Evaluation of the Effects of a Street Crime Unit on Citizens’ Fear of Crime
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Reducing fear of crime has been recognized as a valid police concern since the advent of community policing, with current research substantiating fear reduction as a legitimate police goal even when fear levels are not supported by crime statistics. Special police initiatives that target specific crimes or geographic areas are a common police tactic believed to reduce both crime rates and citizen fear. These initiatives often rely on high police visibility. Increased officer presence is expected to deter crime or increase the probability of apprehending offenders and has been found in several studies to reduce citizens’ fear of crime successfully. This study tested the effect of special initiatives on fear of crime by measuring citizens’ levels of fear after deployment of a specialized police unit into their neighborhoods. The authors administered a survey that measured perceived changes in police presence, perceived criminal activity, and levels of fear to business owners in the assigned neighborhoods. In support of the literature, test results revealed an inverse relationship between perceived increases in police presence and fear levels. In addition, a significant relationship between initial fear levels and perceptions of crime rate was found.
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Police departments sometimes respond to increases in crime and disorder by creating special initiatives that target specific crimes or geographic areas. Increasing police visibility is a common tactic used in these initiatives with the expectation that higher visibility will deter crime or increase the probability of apprehending offenders (Koper, 1995). Several studies have also found that increased police visibility successfully reduces citizens’ fear of crime. Since the advent of community policing, the effect of fear of crime has become more evident to police officials, with current research substantiating the reduction of fear as a valid police objective even when crime statistics do not necessarily support the levels of fear citizens report (Scheider, Rowell, & Bezdikian, 2003).

The current study surveyed business owners after the deployment of a street crime unit in areas identified as robbery hot spots. The street crimes officers sought to reduce

Sandra L. Rutherford is a graduate of the master’s program in criminal justice at the University of North Carolina at Charlotte with ten years of experience in the field of criminal justice. Kristie R. Blevins is an assistant professor of criminal justice at the University of North Carolina at Charlotte. Vivian B. Lord is professor and chair of the Department of Criminal Justice at the University of North Carolina at Charlotte.
Rutherford, Blevins, and Lord

robberies and other serious crimes in these hot spots by maintaining a high police visibility, conducting field interviews of subjects in the areas, serving warrants, increasing arrests, conducting traffic stops, and, when possible, stopping robberies in progress. The purpose of this study was to examine the following two research questions:

1. Did local business owners observe increased police presence after implementation of the street crime unit?
2. Did the street crime unit affect local business owners’ fear of crime?

Literature Review

The police literature covers fear of crime extensively, and several existing studies examine the effect of various specialized police units on crime rates. However, little has been published concerning the effects of specialized police units on fear of crime among residents or business owners.

Fear of Crime

According to Herman Goldstein, one of the leading authorities on policing, one of the primary objectives of the police is to “create and maintain a feeling of security in the community” (Scott, 2000, p. 27). Although crime statistics the Federal Bureau of Investigation gathered show a decrease in crime rates during the past decade, Americans have reported an increase in fear for their safety. One possible explanation is that fear of crime is a result of perception of circumstances rather than actual criminal activity (Ferguson & Mindel, 2007). Noziger and Williams (2005) examined the influence of citizens’ perceptions of police on their feelings of safety and found that citizens who reported higher levels of confidence in police also reported feeling safer. Results of a citizen survey showed that positive contact with police correlated with higher levels of confidence in police as well as perceptions of safety. Citizens who perceived a reduction in crime also reported higher levels of confidence in police, thus, increased feelings of safety.

The implementation of community oriented policing in departments nationwide has been considered a possible contributor to the reported drop in crime rates. After passage of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994, the U.S. Department of Justice created the Office of Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS) to administer grants designed to increase the number of officers engaged in community policing activities and aid in crime fighting programs. A study examining the effects of COPS funding on crime rates found that hiring more officers resulted in a significant decrease of both violent and property crimes in cities with populations greater than 10,000, though crime rates actually increased in smaller cities. A possible explanation for the increase in crime may be that increased officer
presence in smaller communities allowed for the detection of more crime or encouraged citizens to report more crime. Innovative grants that targeted specific crime problems or jurisdictions were found to be significantly related to decreases in violent and property crimes in the overall sample (Zhao, Scheider, & Thurman, 2002).

Community policing proponents have argued that increased police presence in neighborhoods also results in a reduction of levels of fear among residents (Ferguson & Mindel, 2007). Because officers adopt a proactive approach to addressing problems instead of simply reacting to crimes already committed, increased officer presence is expected to have a positive effect on social stability and citizen relationships, thus improving quality of life in the neighborhood and reducing residents' perceptions of crime and the resulting fear (Roh & Oliver, 2005; Ferguson & Mindel, 2007).

Agencies practicing community policing use such methods as “storefront police stations,” foot patrols, and community crime watches. Storefront stations are designed to put officers directly in the community and provide an environment that is more welcoming to a citizen in need of police services. These stations are believed to help reduce fear of crime by having officers visible to the community. Foot patrols have been found to result in increased citizen satisfaction with police and reduced levels of fear. Crime watches that involve citizens observing their own neighborhoods without police presence have not been found to reduce crime or fear significantly (Eck & Spelman, 1987).

Studies have generally found that community policing as a whole does reduce fear of crime, although a simple increase in police presence was found to be less effective than other proactive community policing approaches (Scheider et al., 2003). Adams, Rohe, and Arcury (2005) compared the effects of community oriented policing activities and police visibility on fear of crime by interviewing citizens in five small cities about their perceptions of police activity in their neighborhoods. They found that citizen awareness of community oriented policing efforts in their neighborhoods was associated with lower levels of fear while high levels of police visibility did not found have any relationship with fear of crime. However, both community policing and high police visibility were found to affect citizen perceptions of police-community relationships.

In general, evidence is mixed concerning the relationship between increased officer presence, perceptions, and fear of crime. For example, Uchida, Forst, and Annan (1992) studied two large U.S. cities in which three neighborhoods received additional police presence, direct contact from police, or both, respectively. Results revealed that citizens in the areas that received extra police presence perceived a decrease in drug crimes, residents in areas that received direct police contact reported higher satisfaction with police performance, and residents in all three areas reported feeling safer.
In contrast, Ferguson and Mindel (2007) analyzed multiple factors to test fear of crime that included police presence and “collective efficacy” (defined as community involvement to solve local problems). They found high police presence to influence collective efficacy, but there was no direct correlation between police presence and perceived risk of crime or fear of crime.

Roh and Oliver (2005) found that as the perception of community policing in the neighborhood increased, the perception of disorder decreased, and respondents reported being more satisfied with their quality of life. The researchers found a correlation between perceived community policing and lowered levels of fear; however, when controlling for perceived disorder or dissatisfaction with quality of life, the relationship between community policing and lowered fear diminished. Community policing therefore appeared to have an indirect effect on fear through the strategies designed to address social maladies and quality of life issues.

Scheider et al. (2003) also studied the relationship between community policing and fear by using data from 12 large U.S. cities. They measured community policing as citizen perceptions of police activity in their neighborhoods. They compared community policing measures with measures of citizen involvement in crime prevention activities, satisfaction with police, and levels of fear. Overall, they found community policing to have a positive relationship with satisfaction with police but no significant relationship with fear of crime. Community policing was associated most strongly with increased citizen involvement in crime prevention, but results were mixed regarding fear of crime.

Overall, the literature suggests that citizens’ fear of crime is a valid concern for police and will continue to be the focus of police initiatives as agencies move from response-driven behaviors to proactive problem-solving approaches. Empirical results are mixed in regard to activities that put officers in the neighborhoods and make them more visible to residents.

Police Tactics
There has been a trend among police departments across the United States to create specialized units to address specific crimes or law enforcement issues. These units are often created in an effort to focus resources on particular community problems, and they demonstrate to the community that the police are serious in addressing these problems. Some police departments have stated that specialized units allow them to consolidate work so they can assign it more efficiently and allow officers to develop specialized skills through training and experience while assigned to the special unit. Consequently, specialized units should allow police agencies to be better organized in the approaches they take to address various issues (Katz, 2001).
In lieu of a specialized unit, departments sometimes create special initiatives, sometimes referred to as crackdowns, to address an increase in a particular type of offense or to address an increase of crime and disorder in a specific geographic area. Although crackdowns may be small-scale initiatives with little planning or guidance, many crackdowns are large-scale, coordinated, and focused on a specific goal. These initiatives typically involve higher police visibility, increased severity of sanctions, and publicity. Special police initiatives have been used to address issues such as drunk-driving and prostitution and traffic issues such as speeding. They have also been used to crack down on crimes such as robbery, burglary, or gun-related crimes. Drug dealers and gang members can also be targets of these initiatives (Scott, 2004).

Police visibility is an important aspect of these initiatives, and some crackdowns may emphasize only visibility rather than also increasing enforcement. Enforcement actions include tactics such as effecting arrests in situations where officers would otherwise have simply issued a citation, conducting field interviews, or setting up license checkpoints. Officers also serve warrants proactively rather than serving warrants only when they come upon wanted subjects, or they may contact citizens to provide or obtain information. Although research has generally shown that an increase in police presence alone does not provide a significant deterrent effect, heightened patrol in areas identified as “hot spots” has been found to reduce crime in those areas (Scott, 2004).

Law enforcement initiatives may be directed toward a particular offense, or they may target a particular geographic area. The area could be as small as a single housing development, or it may encompass a complete police district or even entire jurisdictions. To be effective, the initiative must provide a sufficient increase in police response and it must be of adequate duration. If the initiative is of sufficient intensity, it is expected to deter crime by increasing the certainty that offenders will be caught or possibly increase the offenders’ perception that they are more likely to be caught. The initiative may also be successful by removing repeat offenders from the streets (Scott, 2004).

In his review of numerous studies regarding various police approaches for crime prevention, Sherman (1997) points out that the Kansas City Preventive Patrol Experiment conducted in 1974 has generally been interpreted as demonstrating that increasing random patrols in large cities fails to provide any deterrent effect to crime, though some criminologists have criticized the experiment’s methods. Still, other studies have found that directed patrols that focused on specific high crime areas or time periods did result in crime reduction (Sherman, 1997). Specifically, a directed patrol in Pittsburgh targeting illegal gun possession was found to have reduced gun-related injuries by 71% (Cohen & Ludwig, 2003), and robbery rates were reduced as a result of directed patrol in a test precinct in New York City (Sherman, 1997).
In a 1988 experiment in Minneapolis, police increased patrol during peak crime periods at specified hot spots. Researchers observed the patrol and crime activity at each of these hot spots and found that the longer police were in the area of the hot spot, the longer the time between criminal or disorderly activities in the areas. This was true for police presence up to 15 minutes; however, if officers remained in the area longer than 15 minutes, the relationship between police presence and crime reduction began to reverse. Based on this reversal, known as “the Koper curve,” researchers concluded that the optimal time for patrol to remain in an area is 15 minutes (Sherman, 1997).

Similar to the research supporting directed patrols, research has also found support for targeting repeat offenders or specific offenses. Two separate projects having goals to increase incarceration times for high-level offenders were successful, although there were no statistics to indicate how much crime may have been prevented by targeting those offenders. A 1996 study of the Indianapolis Police Department found that an increase of traffic enforcement in areas with high robbery rates resulted in a reduced number of robberies (Sherman, 1997). A Detroit Police Department task force successfully reduced the rate of carjackings in the city; high police visibility was considered key in deterring carjackers, increasing arrests, and improving community relationships (Williams, 1993).

In another approach, studies have found a reduction in serious crimes when police focus on street activities, such as loitering on street corners. Although methods for addressing such activities vary, field interviews are a common tactic. Curfews offer police more opportunities to search juveniles for weapons; however, curfews are typically not used for this purpose, and there is no evidence indicating curfews help reduce crime. Another tactic, the use of massive arrests for minor crimes, typically has only a short-term effect and could result in poor police-citizen relationships (Sherman, 1997).

In 1992, Kansas City Police had one beat in which homicide rates were 20 times higher than the national average. They conducted an experiment in which they focused on weapons violations in identified hot spots, expecting that increased gun seizures would reduce gun crimes. They increased patrol by four officers per night, riding in teams of two, for six-hour shifts for a total of 176 nights. Two officers worked an additional 24 nights for a total of 200 nights of extra patrol during the course of the experiment. These officers did not respond to calls for service and focused strictly on gun detection. Officers detected guns by looking into vehicles for guns in plain view or signs of a gun beneath a pedestrian’s clothing. Officers also conducted searches incident to arrest, for safety reasons during traffic stops, or when given consent. Traffic stops were found to be the most successful method of detecting guns. The additional officers in the hot spots increased gun seizures by 65% in the targeted area and resulted in a 49% decrease in gun crimes. There were significant decreases in both drive-by shootings and homicides in the target beat. The
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control beat showed no significant difference in gun seizures or gun crimes during the experiment period. There was also no evidence of displacement of gun crimes to areas surrounding the target beat (Sherman, Shaw, & Rogan, 1995).

In sum, focused police approaches are found to be successful in reducing or preventing crime. Increased police visibility in hot spots has been shown to have a deterrent effect, and targeting specific offenses such as robbery can result in reductions of those offenses as long as the increase of police response is sufficient and of adequate duration. Experiments have also demonstrated that it is possible to reduce crime in hot spots without substantial displacement to nearby areas.

Operations and Procedures of CMPD’s Street Crimes Division

In 2005, the Charlotte-Mecklenburg Police Department (CMPD) in Charlotte, North Carolina, noted a disturbing 30% increase in robberies across its response areas. In an effort to combat these rising robbery rates and address other serious crime concerns, CMPD created a task force with the goal of targeting identified robbery hot spots.

Before the creation of the task force, CMPD had approximately five or six officers per district assigned to street-drug interdiction teams. In 2006, these same officers were centralized and reassigned to the newly created Street Crimes Task Force. The former street-drug interdiction officers stopped focusing on drug crimes and concentrated on robberies and other serious crimes in the department’s jurisdiction. Research Planning and Analysis Division (RPD) analysts plotted robberies across the service areas and identified “hot spots,” or areas of heavily concentrated robbery occurrences. The 60 officers that composed the task force would “wolfpack,” or move from one hot spot to another together.

An internal evaluation indicated that the Street Crimes Task Force was successful in its mission to reduce robberies and other violent crimes in the hot spots to which the task force officers were assigned. CMPD officials made the task force a permanent unit in 2007 and renamed it the Street Crimes Division, or SCD. While the goals of the SCD mirrored those of the Street Crimes Task Force, the method of attacking the hot spots as a group changed. Specifically, the SCD officers were divided into squads with each squad assigned to one hot spot in which they would stay for the duration of the assignment period, which was typically two weeks. At the end of the two-week period, command staff would meet with RPD analysts to decide whether officers should remain in the hot spots or move to new areas.

At the time of this study, SCD was divided into four squads consisting of ten officers each and also had a traffic coordinator who performed functions similar to CMPD’s Highway Interdiction Traffic Safety (HITS) Unit. In addition to a captain, SCD had five sergeants—one for each of the four squads and an administrative sergeant.
Three squads consisted of five two-man teams that patrolled the assigned hot spots in marked units. These squads worked four 10-hour shifts, 4:00 pm to 2:00 am, with two squads working Wednesday through Saturday, while the third squad worked Monday through Thursday. These days and hours were chosen based on the level of activity in the assigned areas. Due to staffing constraints, these squads worked only two hot spots at a time. Two squads were assigned to one hot spot each, and the third squad acted as a “ floater,” covering for a squad on its days off or adding manpower if a squad was short-handed.

The traffic coordinator was not assigned to either of these squads but instead followed a squad into a hot spot to provide added back-up. This officer was trained to give breathalyzers and was called upon by any SCD officer making a Driving While Impaired (DWI) arrest. When not backing-up an SCD team, the traffic officer spent much of his time searching for expired or missing license plates or watching for other traffic offenses. This officer also coordinated license checks or other traffic-related special projects.

The remaining 10 officers were assigned to the Violent Criminal Apprehension Team (VCAT), which was responsible primarily for serving robbery and other violent crime warrants. These officers would sometimes set up stakeouts or work on other projects. Rather than working a set schedule, VCAT officers worked hours as required by the project to which they were currently assigned.

Every two weeks, CMPD command staff met to discuss the areas to which SCD should be assigned. An analyst with RPD also attended these deployment meetings and projected on a large screen maps showing concentrations of robberies for command staff to review. Each captain or sergeant in attendance discussed current issues affecting his or her service area, and the RPD analyst responded to questions regarding crime trends, numbers of arrests, citations, traffic stops, and other pertinent data. Hot spots were chosen based on a combination of the information received from command staff and the data the analyst presented. Although crimes such as auto theft were taken into consideration when discussing SCD deployment, only robberies were used to determine hot spots because other crimes tended to be more spread out across the areas.

With the establishment of the permanent SCD unit, the number of hot spots worked every two weeks was reduced from three to two, and each squad was limited to remaining in a single assigned hot spot. According to one SCD officer, they were now dubbed the “jump-out boys” by patrol because their activities were reduced to “jumping out” of their patrol cars to talk to subjects on the streets or awaiting a violent crime call in their assigned hot spot. Occasionally, the officers would find themselves so short-handed that they could not even get out of their cars to approach subjects on the street because no back-up was available if the subject ran. SCD officers began to see their primary function as increased officer presence in these troubled areas, a perception confirmed by the SCD
captain; however, this was not viewed as a problem because the increased police presence was believed to deter criminal activity in these areas.

The current evaluation was conducted six months after the permanent SCD unit was established. Because reducing fear of crime has been found to be an important goal for police agencies (Scheider et al., 2003), this study focused on the ability of the specialized unit to reduce fear in neighborhoods CMPD identified as high crime areas, or hot spots.

**Methods**

Based on existing literature, the researchers developed a survey to measure respondents’ levels of fear of crime and perceived police presence. Business owners were asked to read 10 statements and rank their level of agreement on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from Strongly Agree to Strongly Disagree. Although the conventional means of measuring fear has been to assess levels of fear in a specific area through a pre-test, introduce a treatment, and then measure fear a second time through a post-test (Dietz, 1997), most of the business owners had been exposed to SCD patrols before the administration of the survey. Consequently, respondents were asked to rate their pre- and post-treatment levels of fear during a single interview. Given that the SCD officers had been in the hot spots for a minimum of two weeks but possibly as long as four weeks at the time the surveys were administered, respondents were asked to consider events that had occurred within the last two to four weeks when responding to the statements.

Due to safety concerns, SCD officers distributed the surveys to business owners throughout the second two-week evaluation period, and then forwarded the completed surveys to the researchers for analysis after the evaluation period ended. Based on data retrieved from their mapping software, RPD analysts determined that a minimum of 32 surveys would be required for a statistically valid representation of businesses in the hot spots; SCD officers were able to survey a total of 33.

**Results**

*Comparison of Offense Statistics Pre- and Post-SCD*

SCD officers were deployed in three areas during the four-week evaluation period. Offense data from the two-week period before the evaluation period was obtained from RPD analysts and compared with data collected during the evaluation period. Table 1 displays a list of the offenses that were measured during the analysis of “serious offenses” that occurred in the hot spots; Table 2 reports the analysis results. T-tests revealed no significant differences in the average number of offenses reported during each week of the two-week comparison period and the two two-week
study periods. Nor was any change detected in the number of serious crimes in general or robberies specifically (Table 2).

Table 1. Serious Offense Totals in Evaluated Hot Spots

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Robbery/Strong arm</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggravated assault</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assault with a gun</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assault with a knife</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auto theft</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Comparison of Means for Pre-SCD Offenses and Study Period Offenses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offenses</th>
<th>Pre-SCD</th>
<th>Eval 1</th>
<th>T-Score</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>T-Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total offenses</td>
<td>149.0</td>
<td>143.0</td>
<td>.285</td>
<td>148.0</td>
<td>.048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serious offenses</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>-.759</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>1.640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robberies</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>-.074</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>.328</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Because robberies were a specific concern of the SCD, they were included in the serious offenses category and were also examined separately.

Citizen Survey Results

Results from the 10-item survey of business owners in the hot spots appear in Table 3. Agree and Strongly Agree responses were combined to calculate the percentages of respondents agreeing with statements; Disagree and Strongly Disagree responses were combined to calculate the percentages of those who disagreed. Neutral responses were coded as missing to allow a true comparison of agreeable and disagreeable responses. Neutral responses may have been given because the respondent was not concerned enough about a particular statement to provide a true opinion, or the individual completing the survey may not have thought he or she had enough knowledge to answer the question. Removing neutral responses from the analyses ensured the similarities and differences between the two groups were not skewed by responses from those having no opinion.

As Table 3 shows, almost 85% of respondents agreed that their business had experienced a problem with loitering, while about 44% reported that someone at their business had been threatened or harmed by someone possessing a weapon. Respondents appeared to be unsure whether many of the individuals who frequented their businesses carried weapons, but almost half believed their neighborhood had serious crime issues.
### Table 3. Citizen Survey Questions and Associated Responses (Percentages Reported)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Citizen Survey Questions</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>My business has experienced a problem with unwanted individuals loitering at or near my business.</td>
<td>84.85</td>
<td>12.12</td>
<td>3.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>A person at my business (employee/customer/visitor) has been threatened and/or harmed by someone possessing a weapon of any type (gun, knife, etc.).</td>
<td>43.75</td>
<td>40.63</td>
<td>15.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I or my employees am/are fearful while working here because of violent crimes (robberies, assaults, murders, etc.) that have occurred at or near my business.</td>
<td>51.52</td>
<td>21.21</td>
<td>27.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Many of the people who hang out in the area surrounding my business carry guns or other weapons.</td>
<td>39.39</td>
<td>9.09</td>
<td>51.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>I am not aware of any serious crime issues in the area surrounding my business.</td>
<td>27.27</td>
<td>48.48</td>
<td>24.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>I have noticed a reduction in the number of violent crimes that have occurred at or near my business.</td>
<td>36.40</td>
<td>33.30</td>
<td>30.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>I have noticed an increase in police patrolling the area surrounding my business.</td>
<td>57.58</td>
<td>27.27</td>
<td>15.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>I feel that having more police patrolling the area surrounding my business would help reduce crime.</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>I or my employees am/are less fearful while working here now than we were several weeks ago.</td>
<td>48.48</td>
<td>21.21</td>
<td>30.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>I would be less fearful if we had more police patrolling the area surrounding my business.</td>
<td>93.93</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>6.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*N = 33*

The majority of respondents reported noticing an increase in police presence, and 100% of respondents agreed that increased police would reduce crime. Additionally, 94% agreed they would be less fearful if more police were patrolling their neighborhoods.

To analyze the relationship between business owners’ fear of crime and perceptions of police presence, the researchers conducted chi-square analyses between survey items seven (noticed increase in police) and nine (am less fearful now than several weeks ago). Because no significant changes in actual offense rates were observed after the deployment of SCD officers into the hotspots, researchers examined changes in levels of fear as analyzed against perceived changes in crime rates in addition to perceived changes in...
police presence. They found a statistically significant negative relationship between respondents perceiving an increase in police during the evaluation period and lowered levels of fear. Conversely, they found no significant relationship between the perception of lowered crime rates and fear levels (see Table 4).

Table 4. Correlations Between Resulting Fear and Citizen Perceptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Less Fear</th>
<th>No Less Fear</th>
<th>Chi-square</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perceived more police</td>
<td>76.5%</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
<td>.049*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not perceive more police</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived less crime</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>.629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not perceive less crime</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(N = 33\)
\(*p < .05*

The researchers also performed a chi-square analysis to determine whether there was any correlation between the perception of increased police (Item 7) and the perception of lowered violent crime rates (Item 6). This relationship was not significant; respondents noticing more police did not necessarily notice any reduction in crime, despite the fact that all respondents believed more police would result in less crime.

Although researchers detected no relationship between reduced levels of fear and the perception of changes in crime rates, they found a significant relationship between initial fear and the perception of crime rate changes. Respondents who were not fearful before the introduction of SCD officers into their neighborhoods perceived a reduction in crime during the study period, while the majority of those who were initially fearful did not perceive any reduction in crime (see Table 5).

Further analyses explored the relationship between initial fear levels and respondents’ perceptions of weapons violations and prior harm or threats occurring at their businesses. Contrary to expectations, no relationship was detected. Nor was there any significant difference in initial fear levels among those who agreed or disagreed that there was not a crime problem in their neighborhoods. Although 85% of respondents indicated that loitering was a problem at their business, there was no significant difference in fear levels among those respondents concerned about loitering and those who were not (see Table 5).

**Discussion**

The CMPD Street Crimes Division was created to address a specific need in the Charlotte-Mecklenburg region. Robbery rates had increased dramatically across the jurisdiction, and the department responded by creating a task force to crack down on
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Table 5. Correlations Between Initial Fear and Measured Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Fearful</th>
<th>Not Fearful</th>
<th>Chi-square</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perceived less crime after SCD</td>
<td>41.7%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>.017*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not perceive less crime after SCD</td>
<td>58.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived more police after SCD</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
<td>.573</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not perceive more police after SCD</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has been harmed/threatened</td>
<td>72.7%</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>.160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has not been harmed/threatened</td>
<td>63.7%</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Believe subjects carry weapons</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>.252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not believe subjects carry weapons</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Believe crime is problem in area</td>
<td>58.3%</td>
<td>41.7%</td>
<td>.289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not believe crime is problem in area</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experienced problems with loitering</td>
<td>76.2%</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
<td>.420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not experience problems with loitering</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$N = 33$

*p < .05

these and other violent crimes. The methods the task force employed were in keeping with police tactics that have proved effective in reducing both crime and fear of crime in various studies. SCD officers conducted field interviews, actively sought out wanted offenders to serve arrest warrants, conducted traffic stops in which they made every effort to detect weapons violations or evidence of future criminal activity, and relied heavily on increased officer presence in the hot spots to which they were assigned to deter crime. This evaluation analyzed the effect of the unit on citizens’ fear of crime by surveying business owners in the assigned hot spots, finding that the majority of business owners did notice the increased police presence, and almost half reported being less fearful after SCD officers began patrolling their neighborhoods. The perception of increased police presence was found to be significantly related to reduced levels of fear.

The literature suggests that officer visibility in hot spots deters crime and reduces fear, provided there is sufficient police response and the officers remain in the area for an adequate time. Studies have indicated the ideal length of time for officers to remain present in any given area is 15 minutes. The reported success of SCD in reducing crime while operating as a task force may have been in part due to the “wolfpacking” method the officers used in which the entire group would attack an area together and then move on to the next hot spot. This strategy allowed for increased officer presence and also kept the officers in each spot for a limited time before they moved to the next. Although their methods had changed slightly at the time of this evaluation, officers were still able to
maintain a high presence in the hot spots by increasing patrols, conducting field interviews and traffic stops, and aggressively serving warrants.

An analysis of the survey responses revealed several facts. The majority of respondents agreed there was a crime problem in their neighborhoods, with approximately 85% reporting that the loitering of unwanted individuals on or around their property was a problem. When asked about fear of crime, more than half of the respondents agreed that they were fearful because of crimes that occurred at or near their businesses; however, just less than half reported being less fearful following SCD deployment. A crosstabulation showed a statistically significant relationship between fear of crime and perceived police presence; those who reported being less fearful were more likely to have perceived an increase in police. No relationship was found between reduced fear and perceived crime reductions; however, respondents who were not fearful before SCD deployment were more likely to perceive crime reductions than those who were initially fearful. Contrary to expectations, no significant relationships were found between initial fear levels and concerns about loitering, reports of harm or threats, or the belief that persons in the area carried weapons. Nor was any significant relationship detected between the belief that there was a problem with serious crime in the neighborhood and initial fear. Although the exact causes of the initial fear reported by business owners were not discernable, these test results indicate that an increase in police presence would be more effective than a reduction in crime when attempting to abate citizen fear.

Several factors should be taken into consideration when interpreting these results. Ideally, the survey should have been administered before and after the deployment of the SCD officers into the assigned areas. Because the SCD officers administered the surveys themselves, respondents may have felt compelled to answer a particular way. Having a uniformed officer administer the survey potentially biased the respondents’ assessment of increased officer presence because he or she was actually interacting with an officer during the course of completing the survey. Despite the issues with the methods used to administer the survey, the overwhelming response supporting increased police patrols should not be dismissed. One hundred percent of respondents indicated that they believed more police would reduce crime, and an overwhelming majority believed increased police presence would make them feel less fearful. It is likely that the responses to these questions would be similar even if the conventional methods of assessing fear had been employed.

Future studies of police initiatives and fear of crime should include analyses of the long-term effects of these initiatives. This study found that citizen fear decreased immediately after the special unit began patrolling the targeted hot spots, but it is unknown whether fear returned to original levels or possibly even increased once the officers moved to
other areas. The tactics used during police initiatives also vary considerably; SCD officers employed several common police tactics but relied ultimately on increased visibility as their primary method of reducing crime. Research regarding these varying tactics and their effects on crime rates and citizen fear could prove enlightening for police agencies planning their next response to crime and disorder problems. Furthermore, a comparison of actual crime rates and perceived criminal activity as related to citizen fear would add to the understanding of fear of crime. Finally, while some initiatives (such as the specialized police unit in this study) are permanent or long-term solutions to identified issues, others are temporary crackdowns of short-term duration. A comparison of the effects of long-term and short-term initiatives could assist police in deciding how to allocate scarce resources most effectively.
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The Issue of Trust in Shaping the Job Stress, Job Satisfaction, and Organizational Commitment of Correctional Staff

Eric G. Lambert, Shanhe Jiang, and Nancy L. Hogan

Trust is an important social construct; yet, criminal justice organizations have left the area of an employee's trust in supervisors and management largely unexplored. The authors investigated the effects of supervision trust and management trust on the job stress, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment of employees at a midwestern private correctional facility by means of Ordinary Least Squares regression. They found both supervision trust and management trust significantly related to lower job stress and higher job satisfaction and organizational commitment after controlling for gender, race, age, tenure, educational level, and custody position. Management trust had a greater effect than supervision trust.

Trust is important in almost all social arenas. Zhang, Tsui, Song, Li, and Jia contend that trust "is a fundamental ingredient in any positive and productive social process" (2008, p. 111). Trust is the glue that binds society together. It allows for social networks and institutions to form, operate, and function (Kaarianien, 2007), which allows for complexity in society so as to ensure societal safety and well-being.

Trust is at the heart of many social interactions, influencing the perceptions, attitudes, intentions, and behaviors of those involved in the social interaction (Zand, 1972). Trust is also important for criminal justice organizations. For example, the public entrusts the police to maintain law and order through the use of authority and, if necessary, force. Research has shown that trust from those who interact with the police contributes to police officers' effectiveness (Wright & Powell, 2007). In democratic societies, the police need the trust of the public to function (Kaarianien, 2007). Without trust, citizens may not view the police or the courts as legitimate social institutions but rather as tools of an oppressive government (Goldsmith, 2005). Trust is important in corrections as well. Trust is important in treatment interventions. The public must trust that the criminal justice system is fair to see it as a legitimate public institution. Trust is also an important source of informal social control or collective efficacy in neighborhoods, such as loaning items to neighbors, trusting that they will return them (Sampson, Raudenbush, & Earls, 1997).
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Eric G. Lambert is a professor of criminal justice at Wayne State University. Shanhe Jiang is a professor of criminal justice at the University of Toledo. Nancy Lynne Hogan is a professor and graduate program coordinator in the School of Criminal Justice at Ferris State University.
Research has found trust to be important between employees and the employing organization. Organizations that have built trust between themselves and their employees tend to be more successful over time compared with organizations where trust is lacking (Robinson, 1996; Zand, 1972). One area where trust should be important is within correctional organizations, but criminal justice literature has largely ignored this area. Liou (1995) indicates a need to examine the effects of trust on correctional staff. Correctional organizations want to trust their employees to put forth efforts in the best interest of the organization. Staff members are no less likely to want to trust the organization to look out for them as well. To determine whether trust is important within correctional organizations, this study examined the influence of trust on correctional staff job stress, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment.

Correctional staff members are the most important asset for any correctional organization. They are responsible for myriad tasks that ensure that a safe and humane correctional facility is maintained. Relatively unstressed, satisfied, and committed staff can help a facility become a successful correctional organization. Conversely, overly stressed, unsatisfied, and uncommitted staff can lead to failure and disaster for a correctional organization.

**Literature Review**

Job stress is the feeling of work-related hardness, tension, anxiety, and/or worry (Castle & Martin, 2006; Cullen, Link, Wolfe, & Frank, 1985; Grossi, Keil, & Vito, 1996; Van Voorhis, Cullen, Link, & Wolfe, 1991). Job stress in correctional workers has been linked with health problems, substance problems, suicide, relationship problems, turnover intent, turnover, absenteeism, burnout, and even a shortened life expectancy (Cheek, 1984; Cheek & Miller, 1983; Dowden & Tellier, 2004; Lambert, Edwards, Camp, & Saylor, 2005; Mitchell, MacKenzie, Styve, & Gover, 2000; Slate & Vogel, 1997; Whitehead & Lindquist, 1986; Woodruff, 1993). All are harmful outcomes for both the employee and the employing organization.

According to Hopkins, job satisfaction is “the fulfillment or gratification of certain needs that are associated with one’s work” (1983, p. 7). Thus, job satisfaction is an affective response by an employee concerning his or her particular job in an organization that results from the employee’s overall comparison of actual outcomes with those that are expected, needed, and wanted (Cranny, Smith, & Stone, 1992). Simply put, job satisfaction is the degree a person likes (or dislikes) his/her job (Spector, 1996). Like job stress, job satisfaction has significant consequences for both the staff member and the correctional organization. Studies have found higher levels of job satisfaction associated with greater support for inmate rehabilitation, greater compliance with organizational rules,
and increased satisfaction with life (Cullen, Link, Cullen, & Wolfe, 1989; Cullen et al., 1985; Fox, 1982; Jurik & Halembo, 1984; Lambert, Hogan, Paoline, & Baker, 2005), while lower levels of job satisfaction have been associated with job burnout, absenteeism, turnover intent, and turnover (Byrd, Cochran, Silverman, & Blount, 2000; Jurik & Winn, 1987; Lambert, 2006; Lambert, Edwards, et al., 2005; Whitehead & Lindquist, 1986; Wright, 1993).

Measurement of job satisfaction in the literature takes two main perspectives, global and facet. Facet-oriented job satisfaction focuses on satisfaction with specific aspects of a job, such as pay, duties, and coworkers, and adds the responses to the different facets of the job to form an overall measure of job satisfaction (Smith, Kendall, & Hulin, 1969). A global measure of job satisfaction asks people how they feel about their jobs in general without asking about specific facets of the job (Cranny et al., 1992). Global measures are recommended because they allow a person to assess how he/she feels about the job overall rather than selecting facets of the job that may or may not be important to the person (Camp, 1994). Research on correctional staff job satisfaction uses global measures more frequently (Lambert, Barton, & Hogan, 1999).

Organizational commitment is a bond the employee has with his/her organization. It is a bond with the entire employing organization and not with the job itself, work group, or some section of the organization (Lambert et al., 1999). Organizational commitment is having loyalty to the organization, identifying with the organization and its core values (i.e., pride in the organization and internalization of the goals of the organization), and having a cognitive desire for meaningful involvement in the employing organization (Mowday, Porter, & Steers, 1982; Mowday, Steers, & Porter, 1979). Organizational commitment is a powerful force. “The committed employee’s involvement in the organization takes on moral overtones, and his/her stake extends beyond the satisfaction of merely personal interest in employment, income, and intrinsically rewarding work” (Lincoln & Kalleberg, 1990). Organizational commitment has been positively related to prosocial organizational behaviors, improved job performance, receptivity to change, and organizational citizenship behaviors (Culliver, Sigler, & McNeely, 1991; Lambert, Hogan, & Griffin, 2008; Robinson, Porporino, & Simourd, 1992). Furthermore, organizational commitment has been inversely linked with absenteeism, turnover intent, and turnover among correctional staff (Camp, 1994; Lambert, 2006; Lambert, Edwards, et al., 2005; Mowday et al., 1982; Stohr, Self, & Lovrich, 1992). The two major forms of commitment are continuance and affective, which both consider organizational commitment as a bond between the employee and the employing organization. The two forms of commitment differ, however, in how this bond forms (Allen & Meyer, 1990; Mowday et al., 1979, 1982). In continuance organizational commitment, the bond forms due to investments the worker...
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has made in the organization, such as through a pension plan, seniority, salary, and social relationships. Depending on the level of investment(s), the employee bonds or does not to the organization (Allen & Meyer, 1990; Becker, 1960). Continuance commitment “reflects a sense of being locked in place because of the high costs of leaving. . . . The employee feels compelled to commit to the organization because monetary, social, psychological, and other costs associated with leaving are high” (Jaros, Jermier, Koehler, & Sincich, 1993, p. 953). In affective commitment the bond is a psychological attachment by the employee to the organization (Allen & Meyer, 1990; Mowday et al., 1982). Here, the employee bonds with the organization because he/she wishes to do so. According to Griffin and Hepburn, “affective commitment stems from an emotional attachment to the organization and is especially sensitive to work experiences” (2005, p. 612). The authors recommend use of an affective measure (Lambert et al., 1999) in considering organizational commitment.

As with job stress and job satisfaction, organizational commitment has salient outcomes for both employees and correctional organizations. This means private correctional facilities need unstressed, satisfied, and committed employees. Exploring the antecedents of job stress, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment of employees, therefore, becomes crucial. A growing body of literature has uncovered how different aspects of the work environment influence the job stress, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment of correctional staff. Research has shown that role stressors of role conflict, role ambiguity, role overload, dangerousness of the job, and work-family conflict are antecedents of job stress, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment for correctional staff (Armstrong & Griffin, 2004; Auerbach, Quick, & Pegg, 2003; Cullen et al., 1985; Dowden & Tellier, 2004; Griffin, 2001, 2006; Grossi & Berg, 1991; Grossi et al., 1996; Hepburn & Albonetti, 1980; Hepburn & Knepper, 1993; Hogan, Lambert, Jenkins, & Wambold, 2006; Lambert, Hogan, & Allen, 2006; Lambert, Hogan, & Barton, 2003; Lambert, Hogan, Camp, & Ventura, 2006; Lambert, Hogan, Paoline, & Clarke, 2005; Lambert & Paoline, 2005; Lambert, Reynolds, Paoline, & Watkins, 2004; Lasky, Gordon, & Strebalus, 1986; Lindquist & Whitehead, 1986; Liou, 1995; Moon & Maxwell, 2004; Pogrebin, 1978; Poole & Regoli, 1980, 1983; Shamir & Drory, 1982; Tewsksbury & Higgins, 2006; Triplett, Mullings, & Scarborough, 1996, 1999; Van Voorhis et al., 1991; Whitehead & Lindquist, 1986). Allowing greater job autonomy, job variety, input into decision-making, instrumental communication, support for employees, integration, and organizational justice generally leads to decreased job stress and increased job satisfaction and organizational commitment (Brief, Munro, & Aldag, 1976; Cullen, Latessa, Kopache, Lombardo, & Burton, 1993; Dowden & Tellier, 2004; Griffin, 2001; Griffin & Hepburn, 2005; Hepburn, 1987; Hepburn & Knepper, 1993; Lambert, 2003, 2004;
Lambert, Barton, Hogan, & Clarke, 2002; Lambert, Paoline, & Hogan, 2006; Lindquist & Whitehead, 1986; Slate & Vogel, 1997; Stohr, Lovrich, Monke, & Zupan, 1994; Stohr, Lovrich, & Wilson, 1994; Whitehead & Lindquist, 1986; Wright, Saylor, Gilman, & Camp, 1997). The literature also indicates that supervisors, in terms of support, consideration, and quality, help shape job stress, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment (Britton, 1997; Castle, 2008; Cullen et al., 1985; Griffin, 2001; Grossi et al., 1996; Jurik & Winn, 1987; Lambert, 2004; Lindquist & Whitehead, 1986; Liou, 1995; Lombardo, 1981; Moon & Maxwell, 2004; Robinson, Porporino, & Simourd, 1997; Van Voorhis et al., 1991). Additionally, the literature indicates that support from coworkers, positive relations with fellow employees, performance feedback, and perceptions of promotional opportunities are linked with correctional staff job stress, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment (Cullen et al., 1989; Grossi & Berg, 1991; Jurik & Halemba, 1984; Jurik & Winn, 1987; Lambert, Hogan, & Barton, 2002; Paoline, Lambert, & Hogan, 2006).

While the literature is extensive, not all possible antecedents of correctional staff job stress, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment have been identified and studied. There is still a need for more research to examine the influence of other aspects of the work environment. Very little research has been performed on the importance of trust in shaping the job stress, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment of individuals working in correctional organizations. Although most people are aware of the concept of trust, the term is difficult to define. Rotter defines trust as “an expectancy held by an individual or a group that the word, promise, verbal or written statement of another individual or group can be relied upon” (1967, p. 651). Lewicki, McAllister, and Bies (1998) see trust as the expectation regarding another person’s conduct. Zhang et al. (2008) contend that trust is the belief by one person/party that another person/party would act benevolently toward them. According to Robinson, trust is a person’s “expectations, assumptions, or beliefs about the likelihood that another’s future actions will be beneficial, favorable, or at least not detrimental to one’s interests” (1996, p. 576). Whitener, Brodt, Korsgaard, and Werner (1998) define trust as the belief by one party that the other party will act honestly and benevolently. Trust results for a person (the trustor) when he/she compares the trustee’s actions with statements and promises made (Whitener et al., 1998). There must be congruency between what is said and what is done. If one thing is said and another done, trust will not develop or be maintained. Thus, trust is a general perception. It results from an overall assessment of a person, group, or organization in terms of the likelihood outcome based on past outcomes (Zhang et al., 2008). Definitions of trust generally include that the trustee honors his/her word and acts fairly/benevolently. This is the definition of trust this study uses.
Trust is an integral aspect of most workplaces. Lack of trust hinders the work quality of most employees. Thus, trust is important for organizations to operate efficiently, including correctional organizations. Psychological contracts are the perceptions of what employees believe they owe to an organization and what they expect from the organization (Robinson, 1996). Trust is an integral aspect of this contract (Rousseau, 1989). If the contract is violated, employee actions in the organization could change. According to Masterson, Lewis, Goldman, and Taylor, employees are “involved in at least two social exchange relationships at work: one with his or her immediate supervisor, and one with his or her organization” (2000, p. 739). Thus, two levels of trust exist for employees in most organizations—in supervisors and in the organization. This study labels the general level of trust an employee has toward his/her supervisor as supervision trust. It labels trust in the organization as management trust. Management represents the organization and is responsible for setting and carrying out the goals and objectives of the organization. Management trust is the general overall trust of the organization.

As stated previously, there has been very little research on the influence of either form of trust on correctional staff. In a study of workers at two juvenile detention centers, supervision trust was negatively associated with job stress (Liou, 1995). Among correctional staff at a federal facility in New York City, trust in management was positively associated with commitment to the Federal Bureau of Prisons (i.e., agency commitment) (Kane, Saylor, & Nacci, n.d.). In a study of midwestern correctional staff, trust in management had a positive effect on both job satisfaction and organizational commitment (Lambert & Hogan, in press). The authors could not locate a published studied that examined the effects on both supervision and management trust on correctional staff job stress, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment is the same analysis. Thus, they undertook this study.

Research Hypotheses

Supervision Trust

Deluga (1994) contended that supervision trust is critical for the success of an organization. Cherniss (1980) reported that supervisors had significant effects on the lives of employees. Supervisors provide guidance, direction, control, and feedback for employees (Brough & Williams, 2007). Workers look to their supervisors to help them cope with the demands of the job (Poulin, 1994). For supervisors to be effective, there must be trust between a supervisor and subordinates. If an employee views the supervisor as untrustworthy or as acting against the employee’s best interests, or if the employee is unsure whether the supervisor will keep his/her word, then the employee will probably feel
tense, frustrated, and stressed. Therefore, the authors hypothesized that supervision trust has a negative relationship with job stress among correctional staff.

Similarly, it is doubtful that working in a job where a person has little or no trust with supervisor is a desirable outcome for most workers. Supervisors give correctional employees under their charge guidance and direction. A lack of trust between the worker and the supervisor would hamper these functions. The lack of trust in supervisors (which this study calls supervision trust) would hinder an employee’s success in the job. Most employees do not seek failure. Conversely, if trust exists, employees will look forward to going to work, put forth greater effort, and be more successful at their jobs. In the end, this trusting relationship should allow most employees to see their jobs in a more favorable light and enjoy their jobs more. Thus, trust in supervisors was hypothesized to be positively associated with correctional staff job satisfaction. Therefore, the focus of the study was on the correctional employees’ level of trust of their supervisors.

Supervisors are not only the first level of management most employees encounter, but they are also the level of management that employees encounter most frequently. Many employees see their supervisor as a salient agent of the organization and as a link with management (Zhang et al., 2008). An employee who trusts his/her supervisors is likely to see the organization in a positive light. Conversely, a worker who does not trust his/her supervisors is likely to see the correctional organization in a poor light. Therefore, an employee’s lack of trust in a supervisor is likely to affect the employee’s view of the organization, making it less likely that a bond would form between the employee and the organization. Conversely, having trust in the supervisor would probably lead the employee to have a favorable impression of the organization, and it is easier to bond with an organization one sees in a positive light. The authors hypothesized, therefore, that supervision trust is associated positively with organizational commitment for correctional staff.

Management Trust

Many correctional organizations are based on the agency theory, which contends that organizations are structured to control, direct, and guide workers (Eisenhardt, 1989). Control is important so as to maximize the economic contribution of employees. The social exchange theory, on the other hand, contends that more than economic desires drive workers (Blau, 1964). Social forces and needs influence the relationship between employees and the employing organization. The social exchange theory focuses on the reciprocal relationships in the workplace. Trust is one of these reciprocal relationships (Blau, 1964; Whitener et al., 1998). Trust between workers and management is built on the belief that a promised action will occur (Clark & Payne, 1997). If they have no trust in management, employees are unsure of what management will do and whether it will keep
its promises. This sense of uncertainty probably adds stress for most workers. Conversely, trust in management likely allows employees to feel more at ease because they have faith that management is looking out for their best interests in the long run. Therefore, the authors hypothesized that management trust has an inverse relationship with correctional staff job stress.

Lack of trust in management leads to employees questioning the management’s decisions and hampers employees’ success at the job. This questioning causes distractions for employees and affects their concentration on their duties as well as their self-confidence. On the other hand, trusting management probably allows employees to experience a stronger connection with their jobs. They are more confident that the organization will treat them well and act benevolently toward them. In the end, this trust should allow workers to experience pleasure and self-worth in their jobs. As such, the authors hypothesized that management trust has a positive effect on job satisfaction for correctional staff.

As previously indicated, management represents the organization and is responsible for setting and carrying out the goals and objectives of the organization. Most workers see management as the organization itself (Robinson, 1996). An employee who lacks trust in management hesitates to bond with the organization, as he or she views the organization in a poor light. Without trust, the employee is less likely to wish to form a long-term relationship with the organization. Conversely, trust allows employees to see the organization in a positive manner, which increases the chance a bond will form. High trust can help bring an employee closer to the organization, while low trust drives a wedge between the worker and the organization (Robinson, 1996). Thus, the authors hypothesized that management trust has a positive relationship with correctional staff organizational commitment.

The Importance of Supervisor Trust Compared With Management Trust

It is unclear if one form of trust is more important than the other in shaping the job stress, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment of correctional employees. Because management generally has more power and controls the entire organization more than supervisors do, it is possible that management trust may be more important in influencing the levels of job stress, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment of correctional staff employees. Furthermore, supervisors are subject to the control of management and must rely on management for resources and direction. If they perceive a problem with trust with their supervisors, workers may be able to turn to management to correct the matter. In addition, management may have greater effect on the life of employees, and, therefore, management trust becomes far more important than supervision trust. On the
other hand, supervisors interact with subordinates on a regular basis and may have a greater effect on the daily lives of employees than management. Supervisors tend to have interpersonal communication, while managers tend to have indirect communication with workers. Trust may be more important in interpersonal relationships than it would be in indirect, formal relationships. Additionally, trust is probably more easily formed in interpersonal interactions than it is in formal, indirect interactions. In this light, supervision trust may be more important in influencing the levels of job stress, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment of correctional staff. Because this is a largely unexplored area, the authors made no predictions of relationships on the importance of management trust and supervision trust.

Methods

Respondents
At the time of the survey, a midwestern state contracted the private prison to incarcerate 450 youthful offenders who had been sentenced to adult sentences for violent crimes. The prison was a closed, high security facility. Of the 220 employees at this private midwestern prison, 200 received a survey packet, which consisted of a cover letter, a survey, a bifurcated raffle ticket, and a return envelope.¹ Twenty staff members were gone from the prison due to vacations, sick leave, and other reasons at the time of the survey. The cover letter explained the purpose of the study, that participation was voluntary, that responses would be confidential and anonymous, how to participate in the raffle, and how to return the survey. A raffle with cash prizes ranging from $50 to $150 was held to increase the response rate. The letter asked employees to return half of the bifurcated raffle ticket in the provided return envelope and to keep the other half, regardless of whether they had completed the survey.² Employees returned a total of 160 usable surveys, which was a response rate of 80% based on the base number of 200.

The respondents were correctional officers, case managers, medical staff, industry staff, food service workers, and so forth. About 62% of the respondents indicated that they held a custody position. About 41% of the respondents were women, and 59% were men. The respondents’ ages ranged from 19 to 68 years of age; the median age was 33, and the mean age was 35.77, with a standard deviation of 10.82. The median tenure at the facility in months was 17 and ranged from 0 to 53. Because the facility at the time of the survey had been in operation for less than five years, the measure for tenure did not exceed 53 months. The mean tenure in months was 20.64, with a standard deviation of 13.84. In terms of race/ethnicity, 79% of the respondents indicated that they were White, 11% Black, 2% Hispanic, 3% Native American, and 4% were another race.
Overall, the respondents appeared to be demographically representative of total employee population at the prison. Specifically, at the time of the survey, men made up 61% of employees and women 39%; 81% were White, 9% were Black, 4% were Hispanic, 3% were Native American, and 3% were other. Records indicated that the median age range was 31 to 35 years. The average tenure was about 20 months, and about two thirds of the employees held a custody position. The human resource office at the private correctional facility could provide no educational information.

**Dependent Variables**
Job stress, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment were the dependent variables in this study. Specific items appear in the Appendix. The study responses used a 5-point Likert scale from strongly disagree to strongly agree and were summed to create the index.

The authors used five items from Crank, Regoli, Hewitt, and Culbertson (1995) to create a perceived job stress index, which had a Cronbach’s alpha of .82. They adapted five items from Brayfield and Rothe (1951) to create a global job satisfaction index, which had a Cronbach’s alpha of .92. and adapted six items from Mowday et al. (1982) to create an affective organizational commitment index, which had a Cronbach’s alpha of .88.

**Independent Variables**
The survey contained two items to measure management trust. The items measured general trust in management at the prison, which were summed together to form an index (see the Appendix for specific items). The management trust index had a Cronbach’s alpha of .78. The study measured supervision trust by using three items. The items measured the general trust the respondent had in his/her supervisor, the responses to which were summed together to form an index (see the Appendix for specific items). The supervision trust index had a Cronbach’s alpha of .78.

The personal characteristics of position, gender, age, tenure, educational level, and race were included more as control variables than explanatory variables. Position measured whether the respondent worked in a custody position (coded 1) or a non-custody position (coded 0). Gender was coded with women as 0 and men as 1. Age was measured in continuous years, tenure at the private prison was measured in continuous months, and educational level was measured as a variable representing whether a respondent had earned a college degree (coded 1) or not (coded 0). Approximately 47% of the respondents had earned some type of college degree (i.e., associate’s, bachelor’s, master’s, or professional). Finally, data on race were collapsed into a dichotomous variable where non-White was coded as 0 and White was coded as 1.
Findings

The descriptive statistics for the variables this study used appear in Table 1. There appeared to be significant variation in both the dependent and independent variables (i.e., none was a constant or close to being a constant). For the non-dichotomous variables, the median and mean were similar to one another for the variables, suggesting that the variables were normally distributed. For the indexes, the Cronbach’s alphas, a measure of internal reliability, were greater than .70, which is viewed as good (Carmines & Zeller, 1979). For each latent concept measured by means of multiple items (i.e., job stress, job satisfaction, organizational commitment, management trust, and supervision trust), the items used to create a specific index were entered into a factor analysis by using principal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>St. Dev.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>0 = Noncustody, 1 = Custody</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>0 = Female, 1 = Male</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Continuous Years</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>35.77</td>
<td>10.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>Months at Prison</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>20.64</td>
<td>13.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Level</td>
<td>0 = No College Degree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 = College Degree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>0 = Nonwhite, 1 = White</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Trust</td>
<td>2 item index, _ = .78</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.24</td>
<td>2.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision Trust</td>
<td>3 item index, _ = .78</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8.63</td>
<td>2.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Stress</td>
<td>5 item index, _ = .82</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>14.29</td>
<td>4.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>5 item index, _ = .92</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>18.34</td>
<td>4.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Commitment</td>
<td>6 item index, _ = .88</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>18.14</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. St. Dev. stands for standard deviation and _ represents Cronbach's alpha, a measure for internal consistency reliability. N = 160.
axis factoring, a rudimentary form of confirmatory factor analysis (Comrey & Lee, 1992; Gorsuch, 1983). Based on the Eigenvalues and the Scree plot, a single factor was extracted for each concept, and the factor loadings for each item were above 0.30, the rule of thumb cut-off point. The factor analyses results indicated that the indexes had convergent validity, a type of construct validity.

Pearson’s correlation coefficients were calculated, and the results appear in Table 2. Tenure, management trust, and supervision trust all had statistically significant correlations with job stress. Tenure had a positive correlation, which meant as tenure increased, job stress increased as well. Management trust and supervision trust both had negative correlations. As each form of trust increased, job stress decreased.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>1.</th>
<th>2.</th>
<th>3.</th>
<th>4.</th>
<th>5.</th>
<th>6.</th>
<th>7.</th>
<th>8.</th>
<th>9.</th>
<th>10.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Position</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Gender</td>
<td>.28*</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Age</td>
<td>-.53**</td>
<td>-.17*</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Tenure</td>
<td>-.20**</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Ed Level</td>
<td>-.29**</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Race</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Mgmt Trust</td>
<td>-.37**</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Sup Trust</td>
<td>-.33**</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.75**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Job Stress</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.20*</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.50**</td>
<td>-.46**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Job Sat</td>
<td>-.30**</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.18**</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.63**</td>
<td>.59**</td>
<td>-.70**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Org Com</td>
<td>-.24**</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.17**</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.72**</td>
<td>.69**</td>
<td>-.53**</td>
<td>.70**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p ≤ .05  ** p ≤ .01

Position, age, management trust, and supervision trust had significant correlations with job satisfaction. In general, respondents working in custody positions reported lower levels of job satisfaction than did their non-custody counterparts. As age increased, job satisfaction increased as well. Both management and supervision trust had positive correlations. Position, age, management trust, and supervision trust had significant correlations...
with organizational commitment. Staff in custody positions on average reported lower levels of organizational commitment than did non-custody staff, as a whole older staff reported higher levels than younger staff. As both forms of trust increased, organizational commitment increased as well.

Along with control variables of position, gender, age, tenure, educational level, and race, management trust and supervision trust were entered as independent variables into Ordinary Least Squares (OLS) regression equations with job stress, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment as the dependent variables. Table 3 reports the results for the three OLS regression equations. While not reported, the tolerance and variance inflation factor statistics indicated no problem of multicollinearity among the independent variables. High multicollinearity occurs when an independent variable shares a very large part of its variance with the other independent variables in the regression equation, and this impedes the estimation of the effects of the affected independent variables on the dependent variable (Berry, 1993). For the job stress equation, the $R^2$ statistic was .34,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Job Stress</th>
<th>Job Satisfaction</th>
<th>Organizational Commitment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$b$</td>
<td>$B$</td>
<td>$b$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position (1 = custody)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender (1 = male)</td>
<td>-1.01</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>.18**</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Level</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1 = college degree)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race (1 = White)</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Trust</td>
<td>-0.78</td>
<td>-.37**</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision Trust</td>
<td>-0.34</td>
<td>-.22*</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$R^2$  .34**         .47**         .58**

*Note. See Table 1 for a description of the variables. $b$ represents the unstandardized regression coefficient, and $B$ represents the standardized regression coefficient. $N = 160$.

* $p \leq .05$      ** $p \leq .01$
which means that the independent variables explained about 34% of the variance observed in the job stress index. Among the control variables, only tenure had a statistically significant effect. As tenure increased, job stress also increased. Both management trust and supervision trust had significant inverse relationships with job stress. An increase in management trust or supervision trust was associated with a decrease in self-reports of job stress. By examining the standardized regression coefficients (i.e., values in the $B$ columns in Table 3), the magnitude of the effect of an independent variable on the dependent variable can be estimated. For the job stress, management trust had the largest effect, followed by supervision trust and tenure. Management trust had more than double the effect of tenure and almost double that of supervision trust.

The independent variables accounted for 47% of the observed variance of job satisfaction. Among the control variables, only gender had a significant association. In general, men reported higher levels of job satisfaction than did women. Both forms of trust had positive effects on job satisfaction. Management trust had the largest-sized effect. Supervision trust had the second largest effect, followed by gender.

For organizational commitment, 58% of the variance was explained by the independent variables in the equation. None of the control variables had a significant relationship. Both management trust and supervision trust had significant positive effects on organizational commitment. Of the two significant variables, management trust had the larger effect.

Discussion and Conclusion

This study focused on the effects of supervision trust and management trust on the job stress, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment of employees. All hypotheses in the study were supported. Furthermore, both supervision trust and management trust had statistically significant effects on correctional staff job stress, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment. If the employee has trust in the supervisor or management, it helps buffer him/her from job stress. It is probably difficult to carry out tasks at work if there is a lack of trust. Likewise, trust appears to be a factor for helping increase the job satisfaction of correctional staff. Having a job where one has trust in supervisors and management probably meets a need of people to think that those in charge will act benevolently toward them. Trust also appears to help increase the level of organizational commitment for workers. It is easier to bond with an organization one sees in a favorable light. Trust probably allows the employee to view the organization in a positive manner. It is not an either/or choice between the two forms of trust. The results suggest that both are important.

The findings indicate that correctional employees must be aware of the issue of trust. According to Robinson (1996), trust is a cognitive outcome that results from one’s expectations
of future outcomes based on past outcomes. In other words, trusts results from the perceptions of the trustor of what was done by another person in the past (Zhang et al., 2008). Trust builds over time and comes from the perceived fairness and consistency of actions. Furthermore, trust results when there is a congruency between words/promises and actions (Mayer, Davis, & Schoorman, 1995). For trust to exist in the workplace, employers and employees must make real efforts to ensure that they keep their promises. When one party cannot keep a promise because of unforeseen forces, then an honest discussion must take place to explain what happened and what can be done about it. Ignoring breaches of promises will only result in decreased trust in the future.

With trust, dealing with perceptions is of utmost importance. When trust is missing in the workplace, even innocent mistakes may produce a sinister interpretation. Where a high level of strong trust exists, employees allow much more leeway in the actions of supervisors and managers before they perceive that the trust bond has been breached or broken. When there is a lack of trust, employees are more likely to question the actions of managers and supervisors, even if these actions are in the best interest of the organization and the employees (Robinson, 1996).

Whitener et al. argue that the initiation of trust in an organization is “the responsibility of management” (1998, p. 523). It is up to the administration of a correctional organization to ensure that there is supervision trust and management trust. Communication is critical in creating, maintaining, and improving trust in the workplace (Whitener et al., 1998). Communication must be two directional—between the employee and the supervisor/management. The information employees receive must be accurate and honest for trust to grow and flourish. If at all possible, questions by employees should be answered honestly. Additionally, both supervisors and management need to provide explanations of why decisions were made. As indicated previously, there must be a direct link between words and deeds (Whitener et al., 1998). Part of communication is ensuring that staff receive feedback on how they are doing in their jobs. Feedback needs to be accurate, honest, and timely (Lambert, Hogan, et al., 2002).

Sharing organizational power may also help build trust with staff members (Driscoll, 1978). Job autonomy and input into decision-making are the two different methods of sharing organizational power. Job autonomy is allowing employees greater say in how they do their jobs (Lambert, Paoline, et al., 2006; Wright et al., 1997). Input into decision-making refers to allowing employees a voice in salient organizational issues, even those that do not directly affect their job (Slate & Vogel, 1997; Wright et al., 1997). Allowing greater job autonomy and input into decision-making shows respect for employees and indicates that the organization values staff members’ ideas. As previously indicated, respect is important in building long-term trusting relationships. In addition, allowing job
autonomy and input into decision-making allows for a more equal footing for relationships between supervisors and managers. This reciprocal relationship is more likely to foster trust than a control relationship. Sharing power is in line with the social exchange theory of using social forces to help build a productive relationship between workers and the organization (Whitener et al., 1998). Furthermore, there needs to be consistent approach to decision-making across time and across different situations and with different employees (Whitener et al., 1998). Supervisors and managers must be fair and consistent in dealings with others (Butler, 1991; Deluga, 1994). Supervisors and managers cannot treat employees impersonally or play favorites. Doing so can lead to some employees feeling that they are second-class citizens in the organization (Deluga, 1994). If depersonalization or favoritism occurs, whether intentional or not, employees’ trust in supervision and management will suffer. Correctional organizations must engage in organizational fairness to increase trust among workers. Organizational fairness means ensuring the organization arrives at fair outcomes and uses fair and open processes to arrive at the outcomes that affect employees (Lambert, 2003).

Unethical behavior can lead to mistrust. Manager and supervisors must not only convey the ethical standards of the organization to employees, they must personally adhere to ethical behavior (Mulki, Jaramillo, & Locander, 2007 ). There can be no “Do as I say rather than as I do” philosophy in the workplace. Managers and supervisors must hold themselves to high ethical standards. Recognizing and rewarding employees who undertake actions for the benefit of the organization should help build trust because it demonstrates a reciprocal relationship between the employee and the organization (Zhang et al., 2008). Reciprocal relationships are at the heart of the social exchange theory, as previously discussed. Additionally, management must be forthcoming when supervisors and managers make mistakes and take responsibility for outcomes.

Furthermore, supervisors and managers should show concern for the well-being of employees. Concern must be genuine (Whitener et al., 1998). Employees will likely see through veneers of pseudo interest and concern. This means supervisors and managers should not exploit their subordinates for their gain or for the sole benefit of the organization. Because managers tend to be removed from the daily activities of line staff, this places greater importance on the interactions between employees and supervisors. Supervisors must be available to subordinates and interact with them on a personal level to build trust (Butler, 1991). Employees must be treated with respect and caring. This, in the end, should increase the level of trust staff feel toward the organization.

As with most research, the current study had shortcomings. The study surveyed staff at a single correctional facility. Staff at other correctional facilities need to be surveyed to determine whether the results can be replicated. There is a need to explore whether the
effects of supervision and management trust change by the type of correctional facility (e.g., private versus public, adult versus juvenile, jail versus prison, etc.). Additionally, it could be that the effects of the two forms of trust may vary by the type of work employees do in the facility. Due to the limited number of respondents it was not possible to conduct analyses among different work groups. Table 2 shows that those who worked in custody in general reported lower levels of trust than those respondents in non-custody positions. There is a need to explore why trust is lower among custody staff. The current study used a limited measure of general trust of supervisors and managers. This study did not examine the effects of perceptions of trust in employees by management and supervisors. There is a difference between these concepts. One is a feeling of trusting others, while the other is a feeling of being trusted by others (Salamon & Robinson, 2008). Basically, trust in the workplace is a two-way process. The level of trust a person believes he/she has from a supervisor and the organization may also influence the levels of job stress, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment. An employee who feels that he/she is not trusted by his supervisor or management may experience stress from this lack of trust as well as decreased job satisfaction and organizational commitment. The relationship between the perception of being trusted and job stress, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment needs to be explored. More detailed and comprehensive measures of supervision trust and management trust need to be developed, tested, and used. There is very little, if any, research on how correctional administrators and supervisors can build trust with staff.

Based on the results of this study, investments in interventions to build a strong bridge of trust in a correctional organization should return a worthwhile dividend; however, it is important to note that the recommendations the authors make for increasing trust within a correctional organization are largely untested. Interventions for improving trust must be studied to determine their effectiveness. In addition, there is a need to explore the forces that shape supervision and management trust among correctional staff. This information is critical to finding and implementing successful interventions to improve the level trust in correctional facilities. There is a need to explore what can be done to build and maintain trustworthy relationships in an organization over the long run.

Questions of whether trust among correctional staff affects other outcomes, such as job performance, organizational citizenship behaviors, burnout, absenteeism, turnover intent, and turnover require answers. Additionally, it is important to explore the antecedents of job stress, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment of employees. Each has profound outcomes for the organization and the employee. The correctional work environment is very complex and comprises many different factors. The research to date has only scratched the surface of how different aspects of the work environment affect correctional
staff. This is a need for much more research on the effects of the correctional work environment of staff.

In closing, correctional staff are the “heart and soul” of any correctional facility. It is important to explore how the work environment affects them. While a growing body of literature has examined different aspects of the work environment, many other aspects of the work environment need to be explored. Trust is one such aspect. Trust is important for a correctional organization to operate effectively and efficiently. Based on a survey of staff at a private midwestern prison, the authors found that supervision trust and management trust both had inverse relationships with the job stress staff members reported. Furthermore, both levels of trust had significant effects on both job satisfaction and organizational commitment. It is recommended that correctional organizations make the effort to ensure that employees have trust in both supervisors and management. There is a need for additional research on the effects of trust on correctional staff. At the very least, it is hoped that the present study will spark renewed interest and research on the effects of trust among correctional staff and on the antecedents of job stress, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment. The knowledge of and ability to understand the antecedents of correctional staff job stress, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment is crucial for all involved, including correctional administrators, correctional staff, academicians, and society. Relatively unstressed, satisfied, and committed staff are necessary for a successful correctional facility.

Notes

1. The 16-page survey measured a wide array of areas concerning the perceptions, views, attitudes, intentions, and behaviors of employees. Because of the wealth of information from the survey, other studies have been conducted by using different parts of the survey. Thus, the methodology section has similar material as some of the past studies. The full citations of these studies are available on request. None of these previous studies examined the influence of supervision and management trust on correctional staff job stress, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment in the same analysis.

2. To ensure there was no possibility of linking a particular employee to a returned survey, the returned tickets were removed from the envelope and separated from the surveys; then at a later date, the surveys were reviewed and entered into a database. Approximately one month after employees received the survey packets, a drawing of raffle tickets took place at an employee function, and individuals with a winning raffle ticket received a particular cash prize. Prizes not claimed were donated to the employee organization.
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It is an interesting finding that tenure had a positive effect on job stress and age had a positive effect on job satisfaction; however, it is important to note that tenure and age are different concepts (i.e., measure different outcomes). For example, it is possible to have low tenure and high age. Therefore, it is possible for each to have different effects on outcome variables. The positive relationship between tenure and job stress suggests that the negative effects of working in corrections add up over time. The positive relationship between age and job satisfaction could be due to aging or a cohort effect. For example, it is possible that as people age, they view their jobs in more favorable ways. It is clear that the findings suggest a need for future research to examine how tenure and age are related to job stress and job satisfaction among correctional staff.
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Appendix

The researchers measured all the following items by using a 5-point Likert response scale ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree.

Job Stress
1) A lot of time my job makes me very frustrated or angry
2) I am usually under a lot of pressure when I am at work
3) When I’m at work I often feel tense or uptight
4) I am usually calm and at ease when I’m working (reverse coded for index)
5) There are a lot of aspects of my job that make me upset.

Job Satisfaction
1) I definitely dislike my job (reverse coded for the index)
2) I like my job better than the average worker does
3) Most days I am enthusiastic about my job
4) I find real enjoyment in my job
5) I feel fairly well satisfied with my job.

Organizational Commitment
1) I tell my friends that this is a great organization to work for
2) I feel very little loyalty to this prison (reverse coded for index)
3) I find that my values and the prison’s values are very similar
4) I am proud to tell people that I work at this prison
5) This prison really inspires the best in me in the way of job performance
6) I really care about the fate of this prison.

Management Trust
1) You cannot trust management at this facility (reverse coded for index)
2) When management says something, you can believe it is true.

Supervision Trust
1) I have little trust in my supervisor (reverse coded for index)
2) My supervisor looks out for my personal welfare
3) Supervisors at this prison give full credit to ideas contributed by employees.
Attitudes Toward Punishment Among Criminal Justice Undergraduates

Youngyol Yim

The present study examined the attitudes on punishment among college students majoring in both law enforcement (LE) and criminal justice (CJ) studies. The author collected data from 256 undergraduates at an urban university located in a metropolitan area in the midwestern United States during the early spring of 2006. The study used a 15-item punitiveness scale Mackey and Courtright (2000) designed to measure the students’ punitive attitudes. It also examined several demographic and social variables, such as gender, race, career goals, and year in college to measure students’ attitudes on punishment and found these variables to be significantly related to students’ punitive attitudes.
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Quite a number of studies have examined public perceptions of the criminal justice system, including punishment and, especially, the death penalty. Gallup polls show that support for the death penalty for convicted murderers has fluctuated since the 1930s. As of October 2007, it is reported that about 69% of Americans are in favor of the death penalty for convicted murderers (Gallup.com, 2008). The literature shows that demographic variables, especially race and gender, as well as social variables (e.g., religious belief, education, income) are related to public attitudes toward the punishment of criminals.

Race seems to be a very important factor influencing public punitive attitudes. Analyzing the results of the General Social Survey (GSS) between 1972 and 1996, Cochran and Chamlin (2006) found that 72.4% of the White population supported the death penalty, whereas only 43.9% of Blacks supported it. Studying public opinion on legal sanctions on various crimes, Thomas, Gage, and Foster (1976) found that, compared with Whites, Blacks were more lenient with respect to sentences for certain violent crimes such as homicide and rape but were more severe with regard to sanctions for possession of marijuana, gambling, and prostitution. Analyzing the 1979 Detroit Area Study, Young (1991) reported that the attitudes toward the death penalty among Whites are caused mainly by the issue of criminal motivation, whereas those among Blacks are caused mainly by the issue of procedural justice. Besides racial differences in punitive attitudes, several studies examined
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gender differences. For example, analyzing the 1994 GSS, Halim and Stiles (2001) found that men were significantly more likely than women to support the death penalty. Other studies found a similar result (O’Neil, Patry, & Penrod, 2004; Stack, 2000).

Several studies also examined whether other social variables such as income, education, and church attendance relate directly to punitive attitudes. In analyzing the National Public Survey on White-collar Crime, Schoepfer, Carmichael, and Piquero (2007) found that respondents with higher education and higher income were more likely to believe that people committing street crimes were more likely to be severely punished than people committing white-collar crimes. Hans (1986) found that education and income were also the only demographic variables significantly related to attitudes toward the insanity defense among 330 respondents. Tyler and Boeckmann (1997) found that education was a primary predictor of overall punitive attitude. Other studies have found church attendance inversely related to support for the death penalty (e.g., Lambert, Clarke & Lambert, 2004). Interestingly, religious ideology or denomination seems to affect punitive attitudes. O’Neil et al. (2004) found greater support for capital punishment among Protestants than among Catholics in terms of general death penalty factors, and Grasmick, Davenport, Chamlin, and Bursik (1992) found that fundamentalist Protestants appear to be more retributive than other Protestants and Catholics. Britt (1998) found that Black fundamentalists show the least support for the death penalty, whereas White fundamentalists show the greatest support.

Some studies measured college students’ attitudes and perceptions of crime and punishment or empathy (e.g., Courtright, Mackey, & Packard, 2005; Lambert et al., 2004). Some studies compared college students, specifically criminal justice (CJ) majors with non-CJ majors, on their attitudes toward various criminal justice-related issues (e.g., Hensley, Koscheski, & Tewksbury, 2003; Hensley, Tewksbury, Miller, & Koscheski, 2002; Lambert, 2004; Mackey & Courtright, 2000). However, few studies examined attitudes and perceptions on crime and punishment among CJ majors only.

This study aims to examine the attitudes of CJ undergraduates toward punishment. Shernock (1992) points out that a number of previous attitude studies failed to focus on the attitudes relevant to professional values. Examining attitudes of punishment among CJ majors is extremely important inasmuch as punitive attitudes are linked directly to professional values. Most of our CJ students will eventually become future practitioners and will play crucial roles in the U.S. criminal justice system. Additionally, research results on students’ perceptions can benefit educators as well. Miller, Tewksbury, and Hensley argue that studying CJ students’ perceptions “may allow educators to see if and how knowledge, perceptions, and attitudes evolve over the course of the educational endeavor . . . and to see the direction of the future” (2004, p. 312).
Literature Review

The literature shows that college students’ demographic variables, particularly gender and race, are related to their punitive attitudes. Surveying undergraduate students at two midwestern public universities, Lambert (2005) found that White students were significantly more likely to support punitive punishment than non-White students. Believing that CJ majors are more punitive and less empathetic toward offenders than are students in other majors, Courtright et al. (2005) found that male CJ students were lowest in empathy (and highest in punitiveness), followed by males from other majors, by female CJ students, and by female students from other majors. Another study found that White male college students were more likely to support capital punishment than Black females (Lambert et al., 2004). However, studies have yielded mixed results about women being less punitive. For example, Mackey & Courtright (2000) found that gender was not a statistically significant predictor of punitiveness, and Tsoudis (2000) found female students significantly more likely to support harsher punishment than male students. Assessing college students’ perceptions of inmate programs, services, and amenities in prison, Hensley et al. (2003) noted gender, race, and age differences. For example, they found that females were more likely to support rehabilitation aspects of inmate programs (e.g., psychological counseling or HIV/AIDS treatment), whereas males were more likely to favor simple recreation programs (e.g., basketball, weightlifting equipment, pornography, conjugal visits, etc.).

Nationality was found to be one of the factors affecting students’ punitive attitudes. Comparing Canadian and U.S. college students, Lambert, Baker, and Tucker (2006) found that 64% of students in the U.S. supported the death penalty, whereas only 27% of students in Canada did. Chinese college students were also found more likely to support the death penalty than their American counterparts (Lambert & Jiang, 2006).

Students’ career goals and choices seem to be related to their attitudes toward punishment and empathy. Courtright et al. (2005) found that students seeking the occupation of corrections counselor showed a significantly higher empathy level compared with students seeking other occupations such as law enforcement. It is not quite clear why career goals influence punitive attitudes; however, some literature touches on the different ideologies on punishment between law enforcement personnel and correctional personnel. Citing several studies, Veneziano and his associates reported that “Law enforcement personnel are likely to be more conservative and thus concerned with ensuring that criminals are punished and deterred . . . On the other hand, correctional personnel traditionally have a rehabilitative perspective. . . .” (Veneziano, Veneziano, Bours, Fichter, & Summers, 2000, p. 380). Citing Garland’s (1985) work on the structural connection between imprisonment and the social
welfare state, Whitman (2005) argued that although punishment plays some role in prisons, prison administrators tend to consider themselves as providing social services (rather than administering punishment) to inmates. Veneziano et al. (2000), surveying criminal justice officials concerning boot camps, found that compared with other occupational groups (e.g., judges, sheriffs, public defendants, etc.), correctional personnel rated punishment as a less important goal. Cullen and his associates reported a similar result, finding that correctional administrators were significantly more supportive of rehabilitation of prisoners than other personnel, including lawyers, judges, and legislators (Cullen, Clark, Cullen & Mathers, 1985).

Besides students’ gender, age, race, and career goals, the literature reveals that other factors such as years in college, religion, and political party affiliations are somehow related to students’ attitudes toward punishment. Farnworth, Longmire, and West (1998) reported that college seniors were less punitive toward capital punishment, other sanctions, and war on drugs than freshmen among all majors. Mackey and Courtright (2000) found that CJ seniors showed consistently less-punitive attitudes than freshmen. Courtright et al. (2005) reported that students enrolled in Catholic colleges or universities were significantly more likely to hold a higher level of empathy than students enrolled in public colleges or universities. Lambert et al. (2004) reported that frequency of church attendance was inversely and significantly related to the level of support of death penalty. They also reported that Republicans were significantly supportive of the death penalty compared with Democrats.

Several studies showed some differences between CJ majors and non-CJ majors when it comes to punishment and criminal justice issues, although results were mixed. Mackey and Courtright (2000) found that CJ majors were significantly more likely to hold punitive attitudes than non-CJ majors. Lambert (2004) reported that CJ majors were significantly more punitive and more conservative in their views on crime and punishment than non-CJ majors. However, in contrast to these studies, Tsoudis (2000) reported that CJ majors were significantly less supportive of harsh punishment than were non-CJ majors.

In a nutshell, the literature clearly shows that some factors need to be considered when it comes to attitudes toward punishment. Based on the literature review, the main goal of the present study is to examine whether students’ gender, race, career goals, and year in college affect their punitive attitudes.

Methods

Sample
In terms of student population sampled, the current study is unique in two ways. First, unlike most colleges and universities that offer a general CJ program, the particular university
where the sample was drawn offers two major distinctive programs: criminal justice (CJ, hereafter) and law enforcement (LE, hereafter). The school undergraduate catalogue describes these two programs/majors as follows:

Criminal justice major [B.A.] is designed for students interested in the full spectrum of criminal justice careers . . . Students completing a criminal justice major will be well-prepared for employment and career advancement in a range of criminal justice occupations including juvenile justice, probation and parole, courts and corrections . . . Law enforcement major [B.S.] degree program helps individuals develop the knowledge, perspectives, and skills for successful law enforcement careers in state, county, and municipal law enforcement agencies.

Second, the student body of this particular university is characterized as non-traditional. The majority of students tend to be older and have jobs and family responsibilities, although the number of younger, or traditional, students has been increasing in the last several years. At the time of this study, the average age of the students in both LE and CJ programs was approximately 28 years old, and 33% of the students in the programs have been working in the criminal justice field as police officers, correctional officers, probation or parole officers, and the like.

To obtain a high representation of the population, the study participants were initially recruited from all LE/CJ major courses offered during the spring of 2006. A total of 256 survey questionnaires were included for data analysis after excluding 57 questionnaires (50 were filled out by non-LE/CJ majors and 7 had a large amount of missing data). Approximately 68% of the student population participated in the study. Table 1 describes the characteristics of the study respondents.

Around 52% of the participants were CJ majors and around 45% of the participants were LE majors (Table 1). Also, 3.5% of the respondents were categorized under “others,” which includes students with double majors. Table 1 shows that 52% of the respondents \((N = 133)\) were male and 47.7% \((N = 122)\) were female. The majority of the respondents \((N = 194, 75.8\%)\) were White and 62 respondents \((24.2\%)\) were non-White. Among non-Whites, 26 respondents \((10.2\%)\) were Black African-Americans, 15 respondents \((5.9\%)\) were Asians, 5 respondents \((2\%)\) were American-Indian or Alaskan, 4 respondents \((1.6\%)\) were Hispanic or Latino, 1 respondent \((.4\%)\) was a native Hawaiian/other Pacific Islander, and 11 respondents \((4.3\%)\) were in the “other” category. The average age of the respondents was 27 years old. Almost 80% of the respondents were either juniors or seniors; the rest were either freshmen or sophomores.
Data collection procedure

Data were collected during the first three weeks of January 2006. The researcher contacted the instructors of the classes to recruit potential study participants. The instructors were given basic information about the research (e.g., purpose of the study, data collection method, human subject issues, etc.) along with the survey questionnaire, and they were asked to participate in the study. When the instructor agreed, he or she was asked to distribute the survey forms to students in the class. The instructors asked students to

Table 1. Characteristics of Sample, Variables, and Coding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables (Coding)</th>
<th>Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Major</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LE (0)</td>
<td>115 (44.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CJ (1)</td>
<td>132 (51.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other* (2)</td>
<td>9 (3.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male (0)</td>
<td>133 (52.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female (1)</td>
<td>122 (47.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing (999)</td>
<td>1 (0.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White (0)</td>
<td>194 (75.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latino (1)</td>
<td>4 (1.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American (2)</td>
<td>26 (10.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaska Native (3)</td>
<td>5 (2.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian (4)</td>
<td>15 (5.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander (5)</td>
<td>1 (0.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (6)</td>
<td>11 (4.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race (Dichotomous)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White (0)</td>
<td>194 (75.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-White (1)</td>
<td>62 (24.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age†</strong></td>
<td>26.5344 (mean)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Year in College</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshman (0)</td>
<td>14 (5.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore (1)</td>
<td>13 (13.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior (2)</td>
<td>90 (35.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior (3)</td>
<td>111 (43.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (4)</td>
<td>4 (1.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>2 (0.8%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*"Other" includes double majors
† Standard deviation = 6.48872; minimum age = 18, maximum age = 50, data missing = 9 (3.5%).
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read a consent form attached to the survey questionnaire before they took part in the survey. In the consent form, students were informed of the purpose of the study, data collection method and procedure, how long it would take to fill out the survey form, human subject issues, and researcher’s contact information. The students who decided to participate in the study completed the survey questionnaire. Students who had already filled out the survey form in another class were instructed not to fill out the survey form again. Once the survey questionnaires were completed, the instructors collected and returned these to the researcher.

Variables and Measures
This study used several independent variables (major, gender, race, year in college). As Table 1 shows, major was coded as LE (0), CJ (1); gender as male (0), female (1); race as White (0), non-White (1-6); and college year as freshman (0), sophomore (1), junior (2), and senior (3). The dependent variable was students’ punitive attitudes as measured by a punitiveness scale designed by Mackey and Courtright (2000). This scale comprises 15 items (see Table 2). In this study, respondents were asked to encircle the response that they think best reflects their experience: 1 = Strongly Disagree and 10 = Strongly Agree. The author found that Cronbach’s alpha was as high as .91 for the punitiveness scale in the study. In fact, this was a little bit higher than the original scale by Mackey and Courtright (2000), which was .85.

Results
The mean of the overall punitiveness scale was 5.466 (min = 4.153, max = 7.786, range = 3.633), indicating that students’ attitudes were neither extremely high nor extremely low. Interestingly enough, the students showed the strongest opinions on sex offenders harming children and the weakest opinions on drug dealers. More specifically, the highest mean score ($\bar{x} = 7.7843$) was found in item 9—A person who sexually abuses children should never be released from prison, while the lowest mean score ($\bar{x} = 4.1451$) was found in item 8—Drug dealers should be given life sentences for their crimes. This particular result indicates that respondents support harsh punishment toward child molesters and lenient punishment toward drug dealers. It seems that harsh punishment toward child molesters has been reflected in our society for a long time. Gibbons (1969) found that child molesting was one of the offenses that study participants would punish more harshly than do the courts.

Gender, Race/Ethnicity, Major, and Punitiveness Scale
Table 3 describes the relationship between respondent’s gender, race, and major and attitudes toward punishment. It shows clearly that males ($p < .01$), Whites ($p < .05$), and
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LE majors \((p < .001)\) were significantly more likely to hold higher punitive attitudes than females, non-Whites, and CJ majors, respectively.

Table 2. Punitiveness Scale Items: Item Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>(\bar{x})</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P1</td>
<td>5.9727</td>
<td>2.11883</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2</td>
<td>6.0433</td>
<td>2.03188</td>
<td>254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P3</td>
<td>4.8594</td>
<td>2.50563</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P4</td>
<td>4.7930</td>
<td>2.53604</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P5</td>
<td>5.4902</td>
<td>2.40875</td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P6</td>
<td>4.3633</td>
<td>2.88826</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P7</td>
<td>4.2617</td>
<td>2.69456</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P8</td>
<td>4.1451</td>
<td>2.65884</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P9</td>
<td>7.7843</td>
<td>2.46842</td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P10</td>
<td>5.2510</td>
<td>2.68412</td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P11</td>
<td>6.2305</td>
<td>3.00679</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P12</td>
<td>6.8633</td>
<td>2.41581</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P13</td>
<td>6.3438</td>
<td>2.25071</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P14</td>
<td>5.4196</td>
<td>2.31233</td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P15</td>
<td>4.6299</td>
<td>2.27828</td>
<td>254</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cronbach’s Alpha = .910; Means of 15 items was 5.4664; for each item, minimum value was 0 and maximum value was 1; P1. We are entirely too soft on people convicted of crime; P2. Offenders should be harshly punished to make them pay for their crimes; P3. We should use the old saying “an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth” as a guideline for determining punishment for criminals; P4. To better control the crime problem, more prisons need to be built; P5. Prisons today are much too lenient; P6. Using the death penalty helps us to better control crime; P7. Prison and jail inmates deserve the humiliation, intimidation, and degradation they may receive; P8. Drug dealers should be given life sentences for their crimes; P9. A person who sexually abuses children should never be released from prison; P10. Probation supervision is a joke; P11. A person who has three convictions for very serious crimes (felonies) should receive life without the possibility of parole; P12. People choose to commit crimes; therefore, they deserve the punishment they get; P.13: Harsh and severe punishments are necessary to preserve a sense of justice in our society; P14. Speedy, severe, and certain penalties are the only way to prevent people from committing crime; P15. Inmates who participate in programs while confined (such as education, counseling, vocational training, etc.) do so only because they are trying to impress the parole board so they can possibly gain an early release.

A regression analysis was performed to determine whether age or year in college is significantly related to punitive attitudes (see Table 4). Year in college was significantly and inversely related to students’ punitive attitudes \((p < .01)\): the longer students stayed in college, the smaller their punitive scores were. As \(\) for “age” \((- .091)\) indicates, it seems
that the older students get, the less punitive attitudes they hold. However, no significant relationship was found between age and students’ punitive attitudes.

Table 3. Gender, Race/Ethnicity, Major & Punitiveness Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>M (N = 127)</th>
<th>F (N = 120)</th>
<th>W (N = 191)</th>
<th>NW (N = 57)</th>
<th>LE (N = 113)</th>
<th>CJ (N = 126)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>5.7990</td>
<td>5.1072</td>
<td>5.5906</td>
<td>5.0503</td>
<td>5.9440</td>
<td>5.0397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>1.60673</td>
<td>1.64490</td>
<td>1.61221</td>
<td>1.74676</td>
<td>1.52894</td>
<td>1.63302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t</td>
<td>3.343</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.178</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.404</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>df</td>
<td>245</td>
<td></td>
<td>246</td>
<td></td>
<td>237</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig</td>
<td>.001**</td>
<td></td>
<td>.030*</td>
<td></td>
<td>.000***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05    ** p < .01    *** p < .001

Table 4. Age, Year in College & Punitiveness Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE B</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year in College</td>
<td>-5.239</td>
<td>1.745</td>
<td>-3.002</td>
<td>.003**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.347</td>
<td>.247</td>
<td>-.189</td>
<td>.161</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** p < .01

**Gender and Punitiveness Scale**

Table 5 describes that males scored higher on every single item than females, indicating that males are generally more punitive than females. In 10 of 15 items, males were found to be significantly different from females. Interestingly, no gender difference was found with the item related to the death penalty (P6: Using the death penalty helps us to better control crime).

**Race/Ethnicity and Punitiveness Scale**

Table 6 illustrates that Whites scored higher than non-Whites in every single item, except the item of P15 (Inmates who participate in programs while confined do so only because they are trying to impress the parole board so they can possibly gain an early release). However, only three items (P1: We are entirely too soft on people convicted of crime; P6: Using the death penalty helps us to better control crime; P9: A person who sexually abuses children should never be released from prison) were found to be significantly related to respondents’ attitudes toward punishment. As expected, Whites were found to favor the death penalty more than non-Whites did (p < .05).
Table 5. Gender and Punitiveness Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>( \overline{X} )</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P1</td>
<td>M (133)</td>
<td>6.3083</td>
<td>2.13620</td>
<td>2.737</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>.007**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F (122)</td>
<td>5.5902</td>
<td>2.04396</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2</td>
<td>M (131)</td>
<td>6.4122</td>
<td>2.00334</td>
<td>3.148</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>.002**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F (122)</td>
<td>5.6230</td>
<td>1.98060</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P3</td>
<td>M (133)</td>
<td>5.2481</td>
<td>2.45075</td>
<td>2.615</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>.009**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F (122)</td>
<td>4.4344</td>
<td>2.51602</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P4</td>
<td>M (133)</td>
<td>5.1128</td>
<td>2.44532</td>
<td>2.118</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>.009**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F (122)</td>
<td>4.4426</td>
<td>2.60657</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P5</td>
<td>M (133)</td>
<td>5.7744</td>
<td>2.37926</td>
<td>2.023</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>.044*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F (121)</td>
<td>5.1653</td>
<td>2.41643</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P6</td>
<td>M (133)</td>
<td>4.6617</td>
<td>2.94106</td>
<td>1.717</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>.087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F (122)</td>
<td>4.0410</td>
<td>2.81788</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P7</td>
<td>M (133)</td>
<td>4.7970</td>
<td>2.75175</td>
<td>3.483</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>.001**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F (122)</td>
<td>3.6475</td>
<td>2.49602</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P8</td>
<td>M (132)</td>
<td>4.7727</td>
<td>2.64890</td>
<td>4.108</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>.000***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F (122)</td>
<td>3.4426</td>
<td>2.49975</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P9</td>
<td>M (133)</td>
<td>7.8271</td>
<td>2.40426</td>
<td>.348</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>.728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F (121)</td>
<td>7.7190</td>
<td>2.54042</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P10</td>
<td>M (132)</td>
<td>5.5152</td>
<td>2.61085</td>
<td>1.628</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>.105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F (122)</td>
<td>4.9672</td>
<td>2.75421</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P11</td>
<td>M (133)</td>
<td>6.6015</td>
<td>2.98212</td>
<td>2.157</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>.032*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F (122)</td>
<td>5.7951</td>
<td>2.98187</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P12</td>
<td>M (133)</td>
<td>7.4586</td>
<td>2.18643</td>
<td>4.161</td>
<td>241.32</td>
<td>.000***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F (122)</td>
<td>6.2295</td>
<td>2.50219</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P13</td>
<td>M (133)</td>
<td>6.8647</td>
<td>2.14540</td>
<td>3.922</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>.000***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F (122)</td>
<td>5.7869</td>
<td>2.24245</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P14</td>
<td>M (132)</td>
<td>5.4621</td>
<td>2.29638</td>
<td>.320</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>.749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F (122)</td>
<td>5.3689</td>
<td>2.34680</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P15</td>
<td>M (131)</td>
<td>4.7710</td>
<td>2.21729</td>
<td>.919</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>.359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F (122)</td>
<td>4.5082</td>
<td>2.32928</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

M = Male, F = Female

* p < .05    ** p < .01    *** p < .001
Table 6. Race and Punitiveness Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>$\bar{x}$</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>$t$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P1</td>
<td>W (195)</td>
<td>6.1231</td>
<td>2.08955</td>
<td>2.043</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>.042*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NW (61)</td>
<td>5.4918</td>
<td>2.15734</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2</td>
<td>W (194)</td>
<td>6.0361</td>
<td>1.99838</td>
<td>-.102</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>.919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NW (60)</td>
<td>6.0667</td>
<td>2.15396</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P3</td>
<td>W (195)</td>
<td>4.9077</td>
<td>2.45195</td>
<td>.551</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>.582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NW (61)</td>
<td>4.7049</td>
<td>2.68542</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P4</td>
<td>W (195)</td>
<td>4.9231</td>
<td>2.46820</td>
<td>1.471</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>.143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NW (61)</td>
<td>4.3770</td>
<td>2.72130</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P5</td>
<td>W (194)</td>
<td>5.6392</td>
<td>2.28392</td>
<td>1.769</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>.078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NW (61)</td>
<td>5.0164</td>
<td>2.73552</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P6</td>
<td>W (195)</td>
<td>4.5641</td>
<td>2.89325</td>
<td>2.001</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>.046*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NW (61)</td>
<td>3.7213</td>
<td>2.79959</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P7</td>
<td>W (195)</td>
<td>4.3949</td>
<td>2.68116</td>
<td>1.416</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>.158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NW (61)</td>
<td>3.8361</td>
<td>2.71527</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P8</td>
<td>W (195)</td>
<td>4.2410</td>
<td>2.61012</td>
<td>1.039</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>.300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NW (60)</td>
<td>3.8333</td>
<td>2.81140</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P9</td>
<td>W (195)</td>
<td>7.9590</td>
<td>2.41950</td>
<td>2.053</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>.041*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NW (60)</td>
<td>7.2167</td>
<td>2.54513</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P10</td>
<td>W (194)</td>
<td>5.3299</td>
<td>2.60618</td>
<td>.837</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>.404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NW (61)</td>
<td>5.0000</td>
<td>2.92689</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P11</td>
<td>W (195)</td>
<td>6.4410</td>
<td>2.88801</td>
<td>1.881</td>
<td>90.701</td>
<td>.063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NW (61)</td>
<td>5.5574</td>
<td>3.29406</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P12</td>
<td>W (195)</td>
<td>7.0205</td>
<td>2.40909</td>
<td>1.871</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>.062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NW (61)</td>
<td>6.3607</td>
<td>2.38770</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P13</td>
<td>W (195)</td>
<td>6.4667</td>
<td>2.18539</td>
<td>1.567</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>.118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NW (61)</td>
<td>5.9508</td>
<td>2.42505</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P14</td>
<td>W (195)</td>
<td>5.4872</td>
<td>2.29153</td>
<td>.841</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>.401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NW (60)</td>
<td>5.2000</td>
<td>2.38498</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P15</td>
<td>W (194)</td>
<td>4.4691</td>
<td>2.07416</td>
<td>-1.743</td>
<td>80.064</td>
<td>.085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NW (60)</td>
<td>5.1500</td>
<td>2.79724</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

W = Whites, NW = Non-Whites
*p < .05
Table 7. Major & Punitiveness Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Major</th>
<th>$\bar{X}$</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P1</td>
<td>LE (115)</td>
<td>6.5739</td>
<td>1.85936</td>
<td>4.653</td>
<td>244.908</td>
<td>.000**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CJ (132)</td>
<td>5.3788</td>
<td>2.17737</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2</td>
<td>LE (114)</td>
<td>6.5263</td>
<td>1.73568</td>
<td>3.736</td>
<td>241.486</td>
<td>.000***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CJ (131)</td>
<td>5.5954</td>
<td>2.16183</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P3</td>
<td>LE (115)</td>
<td>5.0783</td>
<td>2.46786</td>
<td>1.237</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>.217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CJ (132)</td>
<td>4.6818</td>
<td>2.55121</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P4</td>
<td>LE (115)</td>
<td>5.2261</td>
<td>2.56173</td>
<td>2.638</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>.009**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CJ (132)</td>
<td>4.3864</td>
<td>2.43589</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P5</td>
<td>LE (115)</td>
<td>5.8870</td>
<td>2.27791</td>
<td>2.645</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>.009**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CJ (131)</td>
<td>5.0840</td>
<td>2.45901</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P6</td>
<td>LE (115)</td>
<td>4.7652</td>
<td>2.94192</td>
<td>1.992</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>.047*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CJ (132)</td>
<td>4.0379</td>
<td>2.79150</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P7</td>
<td>LE (115)</td>
<td>4.8435</td>
<td>2.78968</td>
<td>3.035</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>.003**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CJ (132)</td>
<td>3.8106</td>
<td>2.55663</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P8</td>
<td>LE (115)</td>
<td>5.0522</td>
<td>2.61857</td>
<td>4.990</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>.000***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CJ (131)</td>
<td>3.4275</td>
<td>2.48389</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P9</td>
<td>LE (115)</td>
<td>8.1478</td>
<td>2.23310</td>
<td>2.078</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>.039*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CJ (131)</td>
<td>7.5115</td>
<td>2.53094</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P10</td>
<td>LE (114)</td>
<td>5.8421</td>
<td>2.45879</td>
<td>3.174</td>
<td>243.889</td>
<td>.002**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CJ (132)</td>
<td>4.7803</td>
<td>2.78851</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P11</td>
<td>LE (115)</td>
<td>6.9043</td>
<td>2.81591</td>
<td>3.298</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>.001**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CJ (132)</td>
<td>5.6742</td>
<td>3.01522</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P12</td>
<td>LE (115)</td>
<td>7.3043</td>
<td>2.21309</td>
<td>2.839</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>.005**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CJ (132)</td>
<td>6.4470</td>
<td>2.49370</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P13</td>
<td>LE (115)</td>
<td>6.7478</td>
<td>2.12687</td>
<td>2.905</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>.004**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CJ (132)</td>
<td>5.9318</td>
<td>2.26555</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P14</td>
<td>LE (115)</td>
<td>5.6174</td>
<td>2.25786</td>
<td>1.088</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>.278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CJ (131)</td>
<td>5.2977</td>
<td>2.33599</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P15</td>
<td>LE (115)</td>
<td>4.7913</td>
<td>2.29223</td>
<td>1.064</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>.288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CJ (130)</td>
<td>4.4769</td>
<td>2.32017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LE = Law Enforcement, CJ = Criminal Justice

*p < .05    **p < .01    ***p < .001
**LE Majors vs. CJ Majors and Punitiveness Scale**

Students with an LE major scored higher in every item in the punitiveness scale than those with a CJ major (see Table 7). The LE majors were significantly more likely to hold punitive attitudes than CJ majors in every item, except three items (P3: We should use the old saying “an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth” as a guideline for determining punishment for criminals; P14: Speedy, severe, and certain penalties are the only way to prevent people from committing crime; P15: Inmates who participate in programs while confined do so only because they are trying to impress the parole board so they can possibly gain an early release.)

**Conclusion**

The main research question this study addressed was whether CJ undergraduates’ gender, race, year in college, and career goals affect their punitive attitudes. Statistical analysis showed that these factors are in fact significantly related to students’ attitudes on punishment. More specifically, it was found that female students had significantly less punitive attitudes than male students. It was also found that non-Whites were less likely to hold harsh punitive attitudes than Whites. These findings are consistent with previous research (e.g., Courtright et al., 2005; Lambert et al., 2004). Stack (2000) argues that women are less supportive of the death penalty than men because of different socialization skills (e.g., women are assumed to be more nurturing and forgiving than men) and different biological makeup (e.g., women are thought to be less aggressive due to lower levels of testosterone compared with men).

As expected, it was found that students seeking law enforcement careers were more likely to hold harsher punitive attitudes than students seeking non-law enforcement careers. This finding seems consistent with the observations of Courtright et al. (2005). Not surprisingly, several studies (e.g., Courtright & Mackey, 2004; Krimmel & Tartaro, 1999; Yim, 2003) have concluded that male CJ majors were more likely to pursue law enforcement than female CJ majors. It is not quite clear why students seeking law enforcement careers have harsher punitive attitudes than those seeking non-law enforcement careers. However, it is assumed that an individual’s authoritarian personality is somehow related to various criminal justice attitudes. Hans (1986) found that people who scored higher in authoritarianism items (e.g., “One good way to teach certain people right from wrong is to give them a good stiff punishment when they get out of line”) were less supportive of the insanity defense. Tyler and Boeckmann (1997) used authoritarianism (as part of social values) as one of the independent variables and found that social values were positively and significantly related to support the “Three Strikes Initiative.” Interestingly, by using the social dominance theory, Sidanis, Pratto, Sinclair, and Laar
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(1996) found that students seeking hierarchy-enhancing (compared with hierarchy attenuating) careers such as being a police officer or a Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) agent showed higher scores on social dominance items (e.g., “This country would be better off if inferior groups stayed in their place.”)

It was also found that year in college is a strong predictor of students’ punitive attitudes: the longer the students stayed in the discipline, the lower they scored in the punitiveness scale. In fact, when six variables (grade point average, age, gender, race, major, year in college) were included in a stepwise regression analysis to predict students’ punitive attitudes, year in college was found to be the most influential factor (the stepwise regression analysis was not presented in this paper). This particular finding seems to be consistent with results of previous research (e.g., Mackey & Courtright, 2000, Courtright & Mackey, 2004; Farnworth et al., 1998). It is supposed that the so-called “liberalizing effect” of higher education can be applied to explain why seniors are less punitive than freshmen (see Courtright et al., 2005; Farnworth et al., 1998). Courtright et al. (2005) found that, with the exception of the senior year, empathy in fact increased with advances in years in college.

It may be argued that the generalizability of the study is limited because the sample was drawn from a non-traditional college population. However, as presented earlier, age does not seem to be significantly related to students’ attitudes. Additionally (although the data are not presented here), it was found that students who currently work in the CJ field are not significantly different from their counterparts when it comes to punitive attitudes. However, several limitations of the study should be mentioned. This study used simple demographic and social variables to measure students’ punitive attitudes, despite the fact that punitive attitudes are very complicated. For example, gender alone cannot fully explain punitive attitudes. Women can be more forgiving than men, but, as Stack (2000) found, women were also more religious than men, which links Christian teachings to forgiveness and less punitiveness.

Evidence suggests that many compounding factors (e.g., knowledge of the criminal justice system, morality, etc.) influence punitive attitudes. Analyzing the public’s attitudes toward punishment from the British Crime Survey (BCS), Hough and Roberts (1998) pointed out that people’s attitudes toward sentencing reflects their poor knowledge of the criminal justice system. Examining CJ and sociology students at four state universities, Miller et al. (2004) pointed out that college students in general hold major misconceptions about the size of the crime problem and the scope of the correctional system, regardless of their grade or major. It is important to evaluate students’ knowledge of crime and punishment to study their attitudes fully (Hensley et al., 2002). Future studies should focus on how students’ knowledge relates to their attitudes toward punishment.
Additionally, it should be mentioned that the current study was conducted at one single point in time. In his longitudinal study of police cadets, Garner (2005) found that cadets’ attitudes toward policing and cadets’ impact or effectiveness in law enforcement shifted over time, although most believed that their attitudes had remained stable. Courtright et al. (2005) were cautious when they drew conclusions about the positive relationship between empathy level and grade level due to lack of a controlled research design (e.g., longitudinal). In the future, a longitudinal study might be conducted to measure students’ attitude changes before and after the semester to see whether knowledge gained from their major has any effect on their attitudes.

In summary, this study confirmed the findings of previous studies, which showed that a CJ undergraduate student’s gender, race, level in college, and career goal are related to his or her punitive attitudes. It seems that White male freshmen seeking law enforcement careers are more punitive toward criminals than non-White female seniors seeking non-law enforcement careers. Citing Millar and Millar (1990), Olson and Zanna (1993) distinguished affect-based attitudes (e.g., liking a beverage because it makes you feel refreshed) from cognition-based attitudes (e.g., liking a beverage because it is low in calories) (p. 121). It is not certain whether students’ punitive attitudes are based on affect or cognition. The attitudes can be affect-based (“Punishing criminals makes me feel good!”) or cognition-based (“Harsh punishment deters crime!”). Whatever their attitudes are based on, it is assumed that the same punitive attitudes would be carried by tomorrow’s practitioners who happened to be today’s CJ students. One hopes this study will help educators as well as criminal justice practitioners understand where our students stand as far as their punitive attitudes are concerned. Educators and practitioners should acknowledge the importance of students’ punitive attitudes as these are linked to their professional values.
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An Analysis of State-Level Correctional Policies for Emergency Releases for Deathbed Visits and Funeral Attendance

Terrence Alladin, Sherrise Truesdale-Moore, and Shaun L. Gabbidon

This paper examines state-level correctional policies for emergency releases. Emergency releases represent those short-term releases that allow inmates either to visit an immediate family member who is terminally ill or to attend a family member’s funeral. The research involved the survey of state-level departments of corrections to determine the nature of the policies regarding emergency releases. The results showed that most states do allow such releases; however, the policies consistently restricted the type of inmates who were eligible for such releases. In addition, the larger share of the policies placed the financial burden of releases on inmates and/or their families. The authors reviewed numerous other nuances of such policies. The authors close arguing that such releases should remain an option for eligible inmates.

_key words:_ emergency release • deathbed visits • funeral attendance • furlough • inmates

During the last two decades, it has been well documented that correctional populations have ballooned. As a consequence of “get tough” policies of the 1980s and 1990s, official statistics show that at year-end 2005, more than 2 million people were incarcerated in federal and state prisons and local jails (Harrison & Beck, 2006). This get-tough philosophy led to political pressures not only to keep criminals away from law-abiding citizens by making criminals serve lengthier sentences but also to make the conditions of incarceration harsher (Shichor, 2000). This initiative was termed the “No-Frills Prison Movement,” which during the 1990s generated legislative discussions and changes in correctional policies that were shaped out of the necessity to downsize government budgets. Supporters of “No Frills” for prisoners argued that inmates should not receive any goods or services for which law-abiding citizens have to pay nor privileges that law-abiding citizens enjoy (Clear & Cole, 1994; Bidinotto, 1994; Hammond & Fox, 1995; Finn, 1996; Peter, 1996; Lee, 1996). To that aim, several states (including Arizona, Mississippi, Louisiana, California, Wisconsin, Florida, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, etc.) have implemented these policies.
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South Carolina, and Texas) passed legislation restricting prisoners' access to recreational activities and prison amenities, such as television, radio, conjugal visits, personal property, tobacco smoking, martial arts, weight lifting, furloughs, educational opportunities, and medical benefits (Johnson, Bennett, & Flanagan, 1997). However, restricting inmates' access to these types of amenities was an idea valued by politicians, the general public, and individuals uninformed of criminal justice issues (Hensley, Miller, Tewksbury, & Koscheski, 2003; Tewksbury & Mustaine, 2005), not that of correctional administrators and correctional staff (Lenz, 2002).

As a result of more punitive approaches to incarceration, furloughs have been under scrutiny by the public. Furloughs are defined as short-term temporary releases from prison (escorted or unescorted and during the day or overnight) that allow an inmate to leave the facility for work; to participate in the furtherance of institutional activities within the community (such as speaking engagements to at-risk youth in high school); or due to the critical illness or death of an inmate's immediate family member. Furloughs often come under scrutiny because of their sensationalized threat to public safety. The most publicized and extreme example concerned Willie Horton, the Massachusetts inmate who, in 1986, escaped correctional supervision while on furlough and committed serious violent crimes.

For the most part, home and work furloughs have been the focus of discussion in terms of the type of temporary releases granted to inmates (Cheliotis, 2008). Unfortunately, even though research on such furloughs has existed for some time (Leclaire, 1978; Smith, McKee, & Milan, 1974; Smith & Petko, 1980; Toch, 1967; Yael, 1977), very little research has been conducted on furloughs in general and even less research has been devoted to emergency furloughs. As a result, we know very little about such policies across all states and the effect of emergency furloughs on a correctional institution’s operation administrators, inmates, inmate families, and other civilians. Research addressing these areas would represent an important direction for correctional research that will better inform correctional administrators about the effect of adopting emergency furlough policies. This paper centers on the nature and scope of emergency release policies in the United States. The paper begins with a discussion of the policy that allows for furloughs. A review of the literature on bereavement and the importance of inmates maintaining family ties follows.

**Review of Furlough Policy and Bereavement Literature**

*Prisoner Rehabilitation Act of 1965*

The Prisoner Rehabilitation Act of 1965 authorized emergency furloughs for inmates to visit a dying relative or to attend the funeral service of a close relative. Whereas the legislative intent was to establish or maintain family and community relationships, the legislators...
acknowledged correctional research that suggested that the problems offenders experienced were significantly related to the offenders’ inability to function adequately in the community, as demonstrated by repeat offending. In this case, offenders indicated that they felt isolated and unprepared to function in the community. For legislators, it was understood that an institutional setting did not provide an environment that was conducive to understanding the relationship between the inmates and their families. Therefore, it was necessary to use the community as a control on inmate behavior. Taking this principle into consideration, the Prisoner Rehabilitation Act of 1965 extended the limits of confinement to the community, so inmates could have constructive family relationships (Smith & Milan, 1973). Moreover, short-term controls allowed offenders to cope with various post-release problems under constructive supervision by, for example, a correctional chaplain or prison therapist who could implement early or continual assessments of progress under life stressors (S. Rep. No. 93-418, 1973).

The Prisoner Rehabilitation Act of 1965 was not implemented without consideration of possible risks in allowing temporary releases. The Federal Bureau of Prisons established guidelines for permitting furloughs. Under the policy of the Bureau, the inmate must request to participate in the community, and the correctional institution reviews requests case by case, determining whether the inmate is dangerous, the inmate’s trustworthiness in the community, and the necessary resources the community could assist with in the inmate’s rehabilitation (S.R. 93-418, 1973). By 1971, 45 correctional agencies within the United States had emergency leave policies (Smith and Milan, 1973).

The Importance of Family
Since the enactment of the Prison Rehabilitation Act of 1965, scholars have given considerable attention to the significance of the relationship between offenders and their families (Christian, Mellow, & Thomas, 2006; Shapiro & Schwartz, 2001; Travis & Waul, 2003). According to King (1993), incarceration is a crucial period for dealing with dysfunctional familial contexts because imprisonment of a family member provides the family with the opportunity for outside intervention. Research has shown that offenders who maintain family contact during incarceration have greater success after release (Travis & Waul, 2003; Vischer & Travis, 2003; Hairston, 1998). Parolees with strong family ties experienced lower re-arrest rates, lower convictions of new crimes, lower drug use, and more resources (such as job opportunities, housing, food, and money) compared with parolees who did not have strong family ties (Travis & Waul, 2003; Vischer & Travis, 2003; Sullivan, Mino, Nelson, & Pope, 2002; Nelson, Dees, & Allen, 1999). During incarceration, offenders can maintain family contact in a number of ways: through letters, telephone calls, prison visitation, family furloughs, and other programs designed to improve the
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well-being of the family. However, these forms of communications between inmates and their families are highly regulated as a result of security concerns, which may promote policies that impede an inmate's relationship with his or her family. In fact, research has shown that the longer the inmate is incarcerated, the more difficult it is for the inmate to maintain family contacts, which may subsequently affect the offender's chances for success at re-entry into the community after release (McMurray, 1993).

Inmate and Family Functioning

The study of inmate and family functioning is built on the premise that human behavior can be shaped or transformed through social contexts (Haney & Zimbardo, 1998). For prison, Haney and Zimbardo asserted that the social contexts that matter before an offender goes to prison are the same social contexts that matter when an offender is released. Equally important are the relationships that offenders maintain with their families while the offenders are incarcerated, but understanding how to sustain these relationships has been challenging (Shirley, Bartholomew, & Hibbert, 2002). One reason is that little is known about the internal functioning of inmate families.

Doherty (1997) contends that an important way of improving family connections is through inmate participation in family rituals. Offenders and their families could improve family functioning by celebrating special person rituals (i.e., birthdays, Mother’s Day, and Father’s Day), holiday rituals (i.e., Thanksgiving, Christmas, and Kwanzaa), and rituals of passage (i.e., christenings, baptisms, funerals, and weddings). Additionally, family meals, retirement parties, and going away parties are significant, as they give a sense of unity within the family. As stated previously, research indicates that offenders who maintain family connections are less likely to engage in criminal behavior, and offenders are more likely to have successful reentry into the community (Bayse, Allgood, & Van Wyk, 1991; Vischer & Travis, 2004; Baer, et al., 2006). But difficult prison conditions, such as overcrowding and violence, compound the stress level of incarceration when an inmate might have to cope with family rituals of passage, such as the death of a family member.

The most current research focuses on the contact offenders may have with family members while they are incarcerated, including parent-child visitation, conjugal visitation, telephone calls, and mail (Carlson & Cervera, 1991; Johnston, 1995; LaVigne, Naser, Brooks, & Castro, 2005). However, as it relates to emergency furloughs for deathbed visits or terminally ill family members, we know very little about inmate-family functioning during bereavement or how inmates and their families together process the permanent absence of the family member who died.

Ginette Ferszt (2002), over a 14-month period, examined grief experiences of three female prisoners who had experienced the death of a loved one. Findings from the study...
revealed that the grief experiences of these women were constrained and isolated. For example, in two of the three situations, the inmates felt that they were given the news of the death of their loved ones in an insensitive manner; in one situation only a counselor was only present, and in the other situation, a correctional officer told the inmate from an announcement in the newspaper. In all situations, the inmates were permitted to view the body, but their experiences were very dehumanizing. For example, the viewing of the body was done in isolation from the rest of the family. The inmates were transported to the funeral home in shackles, handcuffs, and prison attire and accompanied by two correctional officers. Upon returning to the prison facility, all three inmates experienced heightened grief that was consistent with descriptions in the grief literature (i.e. insomnia, anxiety, withdrawal, sadness, guilt, anger, loneliness, pain, isolation, need for bonding) (Rothaupt & Becker, 2007). Grief work for these inmates was very difficult, as they were not given the opportunity to participate in any family funeral ritual where they could share the loss with the family and the community. Although the correctional officers at the funeral homes were supportive, support ended when the women returned to the prison.

The aforementioned research offers little insight on how inmates process grief or undergo grief work with their families during an emergency furlough. Based on the research Ferszt (2002) conducted, we can only make a generalization on three inmates. For other inmates that participate in emergency furloughs, we do not know the extent of inmate participation in family funeral rituals and what interventions or support systems are available to help the inmates and their families work through grief. The questions are even more numerous for those inmates who are not allowed such emergency furloughs.

*Family Functioning and Bereavement*

Death is a universal experience that the living acknowledge as inevitable. Various societal communities express attitudes toward death differently, but it is apparent among all these societies that the way humans interact as a result of a death—through language, symbols, objects, music, dance, and burial preparation—emphasize the fact that death as a rite of passage is a very significant cultural experience globally (DeSpelder & Strickland, 2002). However, Rothaupt and Becker (2007) argue that although death is an essential life experience, clinicians and scholars still struggle to understand how to process bereavement through grief work. Fraley & Shaver describe grief work as “the process of acknowledging the permanent absence of the person who died while attending to feelings and memories of the deceased while not suppressing or isolating them” (1999, pp. 735–759). A theoretical review of western grief and mourning has demonstrated some conflicts and shifts among clinicians and scholars over the years. While both Kubler-Ross in 1969 and Bowlby and Parkes in 1970 (as cited in Rothaupt & Becker, 2007) contend that grief work is a process
with individuals moving through stages, Kubler-Ross’ five-stage model consists of denial, bargaining, anger, despair, and acceptance that the person is dead, and Bowlby and Parkes’ model encompasses numbness, activity in the form of searching and yearning, depression, reorganization, and recovery from loss. Worden in 2002 (as cited in Rothaupt & Becker, 2007) argues that the problem with the stage model of grieving is that clinicians take the stages too literally; there is no definite organization for processing bereavement. However, the bereaved must work through the pain and adjust to the loss, but at the end of mourning, the bereaved must divest emotionally with the deceased (while memorializing the deceased) and reinvest in other relationships. Marrone’s model in 1999 (as cited in Rothaupt & Becker, 2007) posits cognitive restructuring, emotional expression, and psychological reintegration, which leads to spiritual transformation. Walsh and McGoldrick in 2004 (as cited in Rothaupt & Becker, 2007) suggest that bereavement should be a shared experience that includes acknowledgement of the reality of death and loss, reorganization of the family system, reinvestment in other relationships, adaptation to loss, and recognition of the uniqueness of grief, all of which leads to the strengthening and continued functioning of the family unit. The review of the literature makes it obvious that bereavement models have varied across time, but it remains unclear which model is appropriate for inmates given the challenges that they face while incarcerated.

According to Stevenson and McCutchen (2006), the biggest difficulty in grieving in prison is that there is no privacy, no program support for inmates’ grief work, and no peer support from other inmates because many inmates do not understand grief. Other research indicates that inmates are more likely to maintain illusionary control during grief, which means that they often deny their emotions to avoid pain. They often identify with groups (i.e. gangs or religion) to overcome feelings of isolation, and they often embrace an altered time sense to temporarily stop the hurt. The rationale is that when they are released it will be okay. The problem with this approach to grief is that it is only short-term and blocks any functional grief work for coping with the death of a loved one. Finlay and Jones found that many young offenders coping with bereavement were more likely to use drugs to cope and have suicidal thoughts (, 2000). Among all the bereavement issues Stevenson and McCutchen discuss, there is no mention of inmate-family activities geared toward helping the inmate through the loss of a loved one. As research indicates that adequate and appropriate support for bereaved individuals may alleviate future ill health and other complications (Dent, 2005), one would think that correctional policies regarding response to the death of an inmate’s family member (including emergency furloughs) would generate significant attention.
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*Family Equilibrium and Bereavement*

Weizman and Kamm define family as an arrangement of people related and connected to one another, and contributing to a whole unit. It is an arena for many relationships, and a general feeling exists when all are together. The family has characteristic ways of operating, solving problems, caring for each other emotionally, performing tasks, providing food and clothing, dividing chores, having fun, and handling crises (1985, p. 114).

A major priority of family is to seek a sense of equilibrium, but the death of a family member disturbs the equilibrium, and the family members must work to readjust themselves. The normal routines for family functioning among members become different or discontinue, and each family member must work to re-establish a functional balance for the family. Moreover, each family member loses an experience with the deceased. Some family members might say that they are not a family anymore, but what they are really experiencing is the breakdown of the family fabric that needs to be repaired; the family needs a new look and a new way of functioning. Forming a new family system is difficult as they mourn the death of a loved one, but more difficult when one family member is incarcerated and unable to participate in family decisions or day-to-day family events, discussions, or togetherness.

*Kaslow’s Family Systems Theory and Inmate-Family Bereavement*

Kaslow’s (2004) family systems theory may offer basic principles to help inmates process the loss of a loved one. First, all members of the family system are interconnected, and they should be encouraged to talk openly about the relationship each had with the deceased. For this purpose, correctional therapists can encourage inmates during emergency furloughs to turn to other family members to reminisce or grieve together, giving inmates an opportunity during furlough to process the loss of the relationship with the deceased.

Second, families strive to maintain their homeostatic balance and to resist major challenges to their values, lifestyles, and overall equilibrium (Kaslow, 2004). In the case of a death in the family, family members may decide to take on more supportive roles for others. However, at a time when offenders most need support during an emergency furlough (i.e. viewing of the body), furlough policies may subject the inmate to dehumanization (i.e. visiting the funeral home in shackles, handcuffs, and prison attire) and may not permit the offender to participate in family funeral rituals or family decisions, discussions, or togetherness. On the other hand, the circumstances that resulted in the offender’s incarceration should not go without consideration because many family members may not be emotionally or financially...
ready to undertake the challenges of being a supportive family member to an offender; they may resent the idea of being supportive; or they may wish to protect other family members from the offender. Both inmates and their families should be properly prepared ahead of time for the conditions of the emergency furlough.

Third, when one member of the family experiences pain and distress, so do others in the family (Kaslow, 2004). However, the offender’s pain and distress may be exacerbated by his or her incarceration (i.e. lack of privacy, family isolation, illusionary control, pervasive rules) (Stevenson & McCutchen, 2006). Stevenson and McCutchen (2006) suggest that the correctional system should find ways to work within the existing system to help inmates work through their grief. To that aim, inmates should have an opportunity, after the emergency furlough, to participate in family therapy or in a family life education program with other family members. Inmate-family relationships are often in distress at this time, characterized by what they have experienced in common as a result of the death of a loved one and by any lack of empathy, poor communication, and dysfunctional ideas demonstrated by family members (Bayse et al., 1991). The role of counselors is to work with the bereaved inmate and families to help them make sense of their lives in transition and help empower and strengthen the family members to be caring, loving, and supportive (Rothaupt & Becker, 2007). Once again, offenders who learn how to restore and sustain their family relationships have lower recidivism rates (Bayse et al., 1991).

Finally, the emotional support that an inmate can receive during the emergency furlough is a significant activity of grief work. This activity is invaluable in helping the inmate make sense of life transitions, including what will become of the offender once he or she returns to the prison, and after realizing the death of a love one. Kaslow’s (2004) position on family survival of death suggests that once a family member regains composure, he or she is capable of functioning competently, which ultimately affects how the offender may function during post-release.

In summary, inmates who have strong support during an emergency furlough may fare better than inmates who have been isolated from family members or who are forced to embrace dysfunctional methods of coping with bereavement (i.e. lack of privacy, family isolation, illusionary control, pervasive rules). Based on Kaslow’s family systems theory (2004) and what little we have learned from Ferszt’s (2002) research, we anticipate that the inmate’s response to bereavement may be less dysfunctional if he or she has the opportunity to participate in grief work that could result from emergency furloughs.

Our purpose in this study is to examine the policies that permit or deny emergency furloughs. Our investigation sought to determine how state correctional institutions deal with inmate requests to visit an immediate family member who is terminally ill or to attend the funeral of a recently deceased family member. Although it might seem that emergency
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Furloughs would be a privilege not afforded to inmates, this research aimed to investigate whether states accommodate such requests, even within a political climate that clings to punitive policies.

Methods

Our first step in this research was to identify contact persons at each department of corrections in all 50 states plus the District of Columbia. After locating this information, we contacted each state to determine whether they had a policy related to emergency releases. If the state had such a policy, the authors requested a copy of the policy. In some instances, states required the authors to submit a Freedom of Information request to obtain a copy of their policy. For others, we were able to retrieve the policy from the department’s Web site. Of the 50 states and the District of Columbia contacted, the authors were able to secure information on 49 of the 51 locations. After locating the policies, we conducted a content analysis of each one. This procedure resulted in the extraction of key characteristics of each policy. The results of this process follow.

Results

Table 1 shows that 47 states had a policy on emergency furloughs; 45 states permitted emergency furloughs, two states (Missouri and North Dakota) do not permit emergency furloughs, and two states (Connecticut and South Carolina) had no policy. We were unable to obtain information from Oregon and the District of Columbia. Although Illinois confirms that a policy exists, specific information regarding the policy is unavailable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Inmate Notified By</th>
<th>Transportation Costs Paid By</th>
<th>Request Made By</th>
<th>Policy Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>Inmate/Family</td>
<td>Inmate/Family</td>
<td>Emergency visits are for certain inmates as approved by the institution and only for the terminal illness of an immediate family member. No interstate emergency visits are allowed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>Institution/Inmate</td>
<td>Inmate/Family</td>
<td>Only medium or minimum security level inmates may be considered for critical illness or funeral visits. The dept. covers the expense in extreme circumstances, but the inmate and family are expected to pay the cost of the visit.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table (continued). *Emergency Release Policies by State*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Visits Allowed</th>
<th>Visiting Institution</th>
<th>Visiting Inmate/Family</th>
<th>Visiting Inmate/Family</th>
<th>Restrictions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>Inmate/Family</td>
<td>Inmate/Family</td>
<td>Visits are restricted to 8 hours between the hours of 9 a.m. and 5 p.m. only. The chaplain can arrange to meet with the inmate before an escorted visit. Emergency visits are for certain inmates as approved by the institution and only for the terminal illness of an immediate family member. No interstate emergency visits are allowed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>Inmate/Family</td>
<td>Inmate/Family</td>
<td>Inmates may be granted emergency visits to visit a terminally ill immediate relative. Some minimum security inmates may be allowed unescorted visits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>Institution/Inmate</td>
<td>Inmate/Family</td>
<td>The dept. may grant emergency furloughs to inmates. But two members are required to approve furloughs for inmates classified in level 1, 2 or 3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>Inmate/Family</td>
<td>Inmate/Family</td>
<td>Escorted leaves may be approved by the dept. to medium, minimum-restricted, or minimum custody level inmates. Approval is at the discretion of the dept. and is based on sound correctional judgment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>State has no policy on this issue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>N/A*</td>
<td>Inmate/Family</td>
<td>Sentenced inmates are allowed to attend a private viewing of an immediate family member, which is arranged between the funeral director and the institution. No other family members or outsiders can be present at the time of the viewing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District of Columbia</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>Grantor</td>
<td>Type of Release</td>
<td>Eligibility Criteria</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>Inmate/Family</td>
<td>The institution may grant a Type A furlough to an inmate who meets eligibility criteria as determined by the institution. The institution’s rules and regulations outline various requirements.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>Institution/Inmate</td>
<td>The warden may allow a compassionate visit to a critically ill immediate family member. The institution may provide transportation if it is in the best interest of the institution. Georgia allows interstate compassionate visits.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>Inmate/Family</td>
<td>The policy is very broad. Inmates who are minimum security or lower are allowed furloughs. The policy does not specify emergency, deathbed, or terminal illness.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>Inmate/Family</td>
<td>Emergency visits (furloughs) are granted to inmates who are within 6 months of their release or parole date. The director must approve the visit, and the inmate must have been housed in a minimum security facility. Inmates not classified as minimum security can apply for escorted visits; such visits are at the discretion of the director.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>The Illinois Department of Corrections Web site indicates that as these records relate to or affect the security of the correctional institutions and detention facilities; their release would be a threat to security and endanger the life and physical safety of correctional personnel.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table (continued). *Emergency Release Policies by State*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Allowance</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Visitation</th>
<th>Payment</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>Inmate/Institution</td>
<td>Inmate/Family</td>
<td>Inmates are allowed temporary leaves as determined by the institution. Custody levels and other inmate criteria determine whether visit is escorted or unescorted. Generally the inmate must bear the cost, but the institution may assist in the cost on a case-by-case basis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>Inmate/Institution</td>
<td>Inmate/Family</td>
<td>Deathbed visits or funeral trips are allowed for inmates when statutes and circumstances allow. These visits can be escorted or unescorted. The inmate and family must pay all costs associated with the visit before the inmate leaves the institution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>Institution/Inmate</td>
<td>Inmate Only</td>
<td>Kansas policy does not indicate who pays the expense associated with funeral visits. But it indicates that an inmate who meets certain requirements, including, minimum custody classification for at least 120 days before the leave date may be considered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>Inmate/Family</td>
<td>Inmate/Family</td>
<td>Inmates are allowed a bedside visit to an immediate family member. The inmate or family must pay all costs associated with the visit. Under exceptional circumstances the warden may authorize the transportation costs paid from the institution’s inmate canteen fund.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Emergency Policy</th>
<th>Institution Type</th>
<th>Payment for Transportation</th>
<th>Payment for Miscellaneous Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>Institution/Inmate</td>
<td>Inmate/Family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Inmate/Family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>Inmate/Family</td>
<td>Inmate/Family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>Inmate/Family</td>
<td>Inmate/Family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>Inmate/Family</td>
<td>Inmate/Family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>Institution/Inmate</td>
<td>Inmate/Family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>Inmate/Family</td>
<td>Inmate/Family</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table (continued). *Emergency Release Policies by State*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Can Be Selected</th>
<th>Requested By</th>
<th>Eligibility</th>
<th>Access</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Missouri policy does not permit funeral or deathbed visits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>Inmate/Family</td>
<td>Inmate/Family</td>
<td>Only medium or minimum custody level inmates are eligible for this leave policy. All leaves are escorted and only for in-state visits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>Inmate/Family</td>
<td>Inmate/Family</td>
<td>The warden may grant furlough to an inmate at his/her discretion. Inmates convicted of class 1A felonies must notify at least one law enforcement agency in the furlough release jurisdiction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>Inmate/Family</td>
<td>Inmate/Family</td>
<td>Visits are allowed for no longer than 2 hours. Only inmates the dept. believes do not represent an escape risk and without serious behavioral problems and in minimum security classification.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>Inmate/Family</td>
<td>Inmate/Family</td>
<td>This policy does not clearly state whether the inmate is responsible for transportation costs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>Inmate/Family</td>
<td>Inmate/Family</td>
<td>The facility superintendent shall determine whether an inmate is eligible to go on a bedside, private viewing, or funeral visit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>Inmate/Family</td>
<td>Inmate/Family</td>
<td>The warden may grant emergency escorted/ unescorted leaves to inmates. Time limits are established on a case-by-case basis. Inmate must pay all costs associated with the visit, including cost of staff if it is an escorted visit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>Inmate/Family</td>
<td>Inmate/Family</td>
<td>The chaplain verifies all necessary information and recommends to the superintendent whether an inmate should be considered for a visit.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table (continued). *Emergency Release Policies by State*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Emergency Release</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Inmate/Family</th>
<th>Inmate/ Family</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>Inmate/Family</td>
<td>Inmate/ Family</td>
<td>The facility may approve emergency leave for minimum custody inmates for up to 72 hours leave. Medium custody and close custody inmates may be approved for 24 hours leave. Inmates or family bear the costs associated with the visited. Minimum custody inmates may be allowed inter-state visits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Does not allow emergency visits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>Inmate/Family</td>
<td>Inmate/ Family</td>
<td>Inmates who are not likely to pose a threat to the public safety and who are statutorily eligible may be permitted to visit a dying relative or attend a private viewing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>Institution/ Inmate</td>
<td>Inmate/ Family</td>
<td>The institution bears the cost of one visit to a terminally ill immediate relative or to attend a funeral. The inmate or family pays for any subsequent visits to other immediate relatives. The dept. must approve all visits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Information not available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>Inmate/Family</td>
<td>Inmate/ Family</td>
<td>The facility manager may approve an inmate for a deathbed visit or private viewing. Inmates in custody level 5 or serving a life sentence are ineligible. Family pays all transportation costs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>Inmate/Family</td>
<td>Inmate/ Family</td>
<td>Inmates are eligible for leave to visit a seriously ill immediate family member or to attend the funeral or wake of any such person. It is unclear whether the institution or family pays associated costs for visit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>State has no policy on this issue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
<td>Context 1</td>
<td>Context 2</td>
<td>Context 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>Institution/Inmate</td>
<td>Inmate/Family</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Inmates requiring law enforcement escorts are transported by dept. vehicles only. Inmates approved for unescorted visits pay transportation costs. The dept. approves all visits.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>Institution/Inmate</td>
<td>Inmate/Family</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Inmates classified as minimum custody may be granted up to a two-day emergency leave only if they have less than one year remaining until sentence expiration or release date. Inmate is expected to pay all costs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>Institution/Inmate</td>
<td>Inmate/Family</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Inmates who have been incarcerated for a violent felony, sexual offense, or escape offense are ineligible for emergency visits.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>Institution/Inmate</td>
<td>Inmate/Family</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Inmates classified level 3 and below may be considered for compassionate leave on a case-by-case basis. Inmate or family must pay all costs associated with the visit before the visit.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>Institution/Inmate</td>
<td>Inmate/Family</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>An eligible inmate may be granted compassionate leave to visit the bedside of a critically ill immediate family member. Policy does not state whether inmate pays costs associated with visit.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>Institution/Inmate</td>
<td>Inmate/Family</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Only inmates who are custody levels I, II, III, and IV are eligible for bereavement visits. The family pays all costs associated with visits.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>Institution/Inmate</td>
<td>Inmate/Family</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The Prisons Deputy Secretary may approve emergency visits for inmates. All emergency visits are escorted.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
An Analysis of State-Level Correctional Policies for Emergency Releases

Table (continued). Emergency Release Policies by State

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Inmate/Family</th>
<th>Inmate/Family</th>
<th>Eligible inmates may be allowed escorted visits to the bedside of a seriously ill immediate family member.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>Institution/Inmate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Inmate/Family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Only inmates in minimum or community custody status are considered for emergency visits. Inmates are restricted to one deathbed visit or funeral visit at the department’s expense. Visits are limited to a maximum of 2 hours.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>Inmate/Family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Inmate/Family or Inmate/Approved Sponsor by CEO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The CEO shall have the authority to grant bereavement leave to inmates of minimum or work release classification; inmates must be within nine months of parole eligibility or discharge date.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>Inmate/Family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Inmate/Family or Inmate/Approved Sponsor by CEO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The CEO shall have the authority to grant bereavement leave to inmates of minimum or work release classification; inmates must be within nine months of parole eligibility or discharge date.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. “N/A” denotes information not available or no policy, “No” denotes that the institution does not permit emergency furloughs, “Yes” denotes that the institution has a policy and permits emergency furloughs, “dept.” means department.

An overview of each policy showed that a person was designated to inform the inmate of his or her family circumstances: most corrections departments simply designated someone at the institution to deliver news about a family member and the possibility of requesting an emergency furlough. However, policies from Arizona and New York indicated that the chaplain was the designated person, and, in another policy, a social worker served as the designee. As it relates to the content of the policy, once the inmate is notified of the family circumstances, the next step is to submit a request for an emergency furlough for either a deathbed visit or funeral attendance. Most states require that inmates must initiate an emergency furlough request, while Wyoming allows for either an inmate with a family member or an approved sponsor (outside family member) to make the request when no family member exists. In such cases, the Chief Executive Officer of the institution may at his or her discretion grant an emergency furlough if the inmate has a sponsor who has met conditions of responsibility, has demonstrated ability to mentor, and has no legal impediments. Additionally, the policies make reference to who will incur the cost of transporting the inmate to and from the hospital or funeral. In a majority of states, inmates were required to incur the cost. Some states (Indiana, Massachusetts, Delaware, Georgia, and New York) indicated that there was some cost sharing with the transportation
expense but only under extenuating circumstances and on a case-by-case basis. The criteria varied depending on the circumstances of the inmate. Three states (Oklahoma, Nevada, and Wisconsin) indicated that the Department of Corrections incurs the cost of emergency furloughs.

Generally, most states do not allow interstate visits, but some states (Georgia, Minnesota, and North Carolina) allow interstate visits with the approval of governors from both states. Although the criteria for deathbed or funeral visits vary among the states, some guidelines were universal. For example, all the policies clearly indicate that these visits are at the discretion of the institution and not an entitlement to the inmates. Further, prisoners who are classified as a serious risk, either an escape risk and/or risk to public safety, are ineligible for deathbed or funeral visits. There were also several general requirements that an inmate must meet to be eligible for an emergency release. These requirements were similar across most of the states; however, some states may be more or less restrictive on the requirements. The state of Hawaii has established very broad requirements for furlough. The general requirements include being an inmate who is classified as a minimum security level custody or less and the discretion of the Department director. After examining the policies, the following criteria were unanimous among the responding states permitting emergency furlough.

First, an emergency furlough is considered only when an immediate family member has died or is terminally ill. An immediate family member is defined as a father, mother, brother, sister, legal spouse, child, grandparent, grandchild, aunt, uncle, mother-in-law, and father-in-law. The aforementioned should be biological relatives unless related by legal adoption and legal marriage. Some states did include stepparents, but only if they substantially raised the inmate. A terminally ill person is defined as a relative who may not survive under normal circumstances and/or for whom death is imminent.

Second, the inmate must meet custody level requirements. Generally, inmates who are classified as minimum custody are eligible. Each institution determines the level of custody that it will approve for the visit. Some institutions allow medium security inmates the opportunity to visit an immediate family member who is seriously ill.

Inmates who meet these initial screening criteria may be subsequently denied an emergency furlough if they have exhibited illegal conduct while under correctional supervision and the inmate has been held for disciplinary action or both. In making the determination to accommodate the request for an emergency release, the Department of Corrections reviews the following factors to determine whether the inmate is eligible:

- Inmate’s conduct within the last 90 days. Some institutions review conduct within the past year;
Disciplinary convictions involving possession of a weapon, possession of an escape tool, including handcuff keys, and/or escape attempts;

Disciplinary convictions as a result of misconduct occurring during transportation;

Any pending disciplinary actions;

Record of history of substance abuse within the last three years;

Whether there will be public and/or victim outcry;

Is the visit in the best interest of the institution? The institution has an interest in allowing inmates an opportunity to maintain and enhance the family support system provided security is not jeopardized; and

Availability of personnel to escort inmate (if the inmate is required to be escorted).

**Conclusion**

Overall, most states permit emergency furloughs. Unlike work furloughs, the cost incurred by taxpayers’ dollars is not relevant, as inmates’ families typically bear the responsibility of costs associated with the emergency furlough. As noted earlier, access to programs and amenities serve a critical control function within the prisons. For emergency furloughs, the issue is not losing control of an offender population or spending tax-payers’ money; rather, it is about healing an offender and reconnecting the offender with his or her family during despair or crisis because it is during these moments when feelings of isolation and frustration are most poignant.

Because most of the inmates will eventually be returned to society, it is important that they are rehabilitated when they are released. Allowing inmates to attend funerals and/or make deathbed visits benefits the inmate and his or her family by providing them with an opportunity to share their grief and offer support to each other. This reconnection at a time of despair can serve to encourage positive inmate behaviors. Society will benefit as a result of more inmates being released who are less likely to become recidivists.

Twenty-first century “get tough” policies insinuate that offenders should be only warehoused, suggesting that offenders should sit idle, undeserving of anything but daily necessities. According to James Robertson (1997), the disassociation from central beliefs and values of the society, and self-estrangement, are profoundly detrimental. The continuation of emergency furloughs might be in the best interest of the offender as well as society. Further investigations on emergency furloughs might shed greater light on this issue. More specifically, researchers need to examine the outcomes of emergency releases; that
is, do those granted such leaves abscond during the visits? Also, for those who return, does affect their healing? Finally, it would be useful to determine whether, after release, those inmates who received emergency releases were less likely to recidivate than similarly situated offenders who were not granted release.
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