Journal of Applied Juvenile Justice Services (2021)

Journal of Applied Juvenile Justice Services

Attitudes toward Rehabilitation and Punishment Orientations among Juvenile Detention and Probation Officers

Kristin Y. Mack, Ph.D.
University of Northern Iowa

Gayle Rhineberger-Dunn, Ph.D
University of Northern Iowa

The purpose of this paper was to explore the individual factors, job perceptions, and organizational characteristics that predict rehabilitation and punishment orientations among juvenile detention and probation staff members. Our results indicated juvenile officers who reported more education, less job ambiguity, and more adequate safety training were more likely to indicate preference for a rehabilitation orientation. However, those who reported less education, worked in detention rather than probation, and had higher job ambiguity were more likely to hold a punishment orientation. Finally, individual characteristics had a greater impact on both rehabilitation and punishment than either job perceptions or organizational factors. These results provide useful information for agencies about staff perceptions, which may in turn impact their interactions with and decision-making related to juvenile offenders under their supervision. Keywords: juvenile detention officers, juvenile probation officers, community corrections, punishment orientation, rehabilitation orientation, professional orientation

Attitudes toward Rehabilitation and Punishment Orientations among Juvenile Detention and Probation Officers

In the United States, adult courts historically tried and sentenced juveniles, with juveniles by and large detained in facilities with adult offenders. This changed, however, when the New York House of Refuge was opened in 1825. Generally, houses of refuge were "designed to house poor, destitute and vagrant youth who were deemed by authorities to be on the path towards delinquency" (Center on Juvenile and Criminal Justice, 2019). Then in 1899 the juvenile justice system was created as the first juvenile court opened in Cook County, Illinois. This system was originally predicated on the need to treat juveniles differently than adult offenders by concentrating more on rehabilitation than punishment (Feld, 1999). However, beginning with case law focused on due process and other rights of juvenile offenders, together with the "get tough" era of the 1980s and 1990s, the juvenile system has moved toward a more punitive

approach to juvenile criminal behavior over time (Bernard, 1992; Feld, 1999). While the juvenile system has, in practice, always operated under the auspices of both rehabilitation and punishment orientations (Ward & Kupchik, 2010), it has recently become more outwardly explicit in its dual purpose of both rehabilitating and punishing offenders (Elin-Blomquist & Forst, 1993). This explicit shift in philosophy has led researchers to consider if adherence to rehabilitation ideologies still exists among juvenile corrections and probation staff, and if so, whether or not the determinants of it differ when compared to the predictors of orientations that are more clearly tied to punishment (Bazemore, Dicker, & Al-Gadheeb, 1994; Blevins, Cullen, & Sundt, 2007; Farnworth, Frazier, & Neuberger, 1988; Gordon, 1999; Leiber, Schwarze, Mack, & Farnworth, 2002; Ward & Kupchik, 2009, 2010).

The need to study the predictors of rehabilitation and punishment orientations among both juvenile detention officers and juvenile probation officers is rooted in the widespread reliance on discretion in decision-making (Farnworth et al., 1988), as well as the continual fluctuations in juvenile justice policy between rehabilitation and punishment (Bernard, 1992; Ward & Kupchik, 2010). The juvenile court was founded on an orientation of rehabilitation, where presumably most people working in the field favored rehabilitation and acted accordingly toward juvenile offenders. Today, staff members in the juvenile justice system are tasked with both punitive and rehabilitation obligations. As Blevins et al. (2007) point out, "these dual roles may be especially problematic for those working in juvenile facilities because they may be obligated to provide extra services to youths" (p. 48-49). Understanding the factors that influence staff member attitudes toward the populations with which they work is essential in a field where discretion is so widely used. Existing research indicates that correctional officers' job orientation influences, at least to some degree, their use of discretion when making decisions about the treatment and discipline of their clients (Bolin & Applegate, 2016, 2018; Dembo, 1972, Steiner et al., 2011). For example, holding a punishment orientation has been found to increase parole officers' decision to take formal action on technical violations of parole (Dembo, 1972). Similarly, Schwalbe and Maschi (2009) found that juvenile probation officers who perceive probation as helpful to juvenile offenders were more likely to emphasize rehabilitation-related strategies, while officers who perceive probation as a punishment function were more likely to emphasize accountability-related strategies.

This is important because juvenile officers' use of discretion impacts not only the daily lives of offenders (i.e., individual freedoms, access to extra-curricular activities, home-visits, etc.), but also their short-term and long-term successes. Cullen, Latessa, Burton, and Lombardo (1993) purport that the continuous interaction of correctional officers with offenders impacts their attitudes and behaviors, both inside and outside the institution (i.e., how successful offenders will be once released). More rehabilitation-oriented strategies may give inmates more skills and motivation to be more successful once released from prison, while more punitive approaches may result in increased feelings of hopelessness or anger, potentially leading to less successful reintegration when released from prison.

Professional orientation may also influence attitudes toward the organization and perceptions of other job experiences. For example, correctional officers who hold a rehabilitation orientation report greater commitment to the organization (Lambert, Hogan, Barton, Jiang, & Baker, 2008),

greater organizational citizenship behavior (Lambert, Barton-Bellessa, & Hogan, 2014), and greater integration and moral commitment (Lambert, Altheimer, Hogan, & Barton-Bellesa, 2011). Correctional officers who hold a punishment orientation, in contrast, are found to have greater turnover intention (Liou, 1998). They also experience greater role stress and work-family conflict, are less likely to perceive the organization as fair, have reduced life satisfaction, and less moral commitment (Lambert et al., 2011).

With fluctuating purposes in the system, combined with the potential impact of staff orientations toward rehabilitation and punishment on offender experiences and outcomes, it is essential to analyze the factors that influence these distinct orientations. The purpose of this study was to examine the predictors of rehabilitation and punishment for juvenile detention and probation officers. Additionally, given the current focus in the corrections literature on the importance of organizational characteristics in determining workplace outcomes, we were particularly interested in the relative impact of individual versus job-related and organizational factors on attitudes toward both rehabilitation and punishment.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Background on Professional Orientation

Professional orientation implies that individuals working in a particular field (such as corrections or probation) have specific perceptions about the purpose of their work. For example, a correctional orientation refers to the perceptions of correctional officers as to the purpose of imprisonment (Cullen, Latessa, Burton, & Lombardo, 1993; Farkas, 1999; Lambert et al., 2014), which typically falls along a continuum of support for rehabilitation/treatment or support for punishment (because rules/laws were broken). For juvenile detention officers, this translates into perceptions of the purpose of detention, and for juvenile probation officers, as to the purpose of probation. A rehabilitation/treatment purpose generally focuses on believing the juveniles are malleable and can change with proper support and resources (Butts & Mears, 2001; Lopez & Russell, 2008), while a punishment purpose generally reflects the belief that juveniles need to be held accountable for their delinquent acts (Forst & Blomquist, 1992; Lopez & Russell, 2008).

There are generally two arguments used to explain why criminal justice staff adopt more of one model or the other of professional orientation. The first is the individual/importation model (Irwin and Cressey, 1962), which suggests that individuals bring with them a set of personal ideologies and beliefs into the workplace that impact their job-related behavior (e.g., discretion, praise, leniency, punishment) (Cullen et al., 1993; Jurik, 1985; Van Voorhis et al., 1991). Such individual characteristics include gender, age, race, and education (Blevins et al., 2007; Lopez & Russell, 2008).

The second approach is the work/role model, which says that individuals are impacted by the environment in which they work (Jacobs & Retsky, 1975; Lombardo, 1981; Thomas, 1977). Blevins et al. (2007), in particular, provided a succinct summary of the argument when they stated, “This perspective posits that correctional workers’ reactions are influenced by the institution’s organizational factors and the work role, rather than individual attributes” (p. 55). While individual employees bring with them personal beliefs and values, this approach holds that

ultimately they are impacted more by the environment in which they work such that their attitudes and behaviors are altered by how the organization is structured as well as by the specific role demands of their position (Cullen et al., 1993; Jurik, 1985; Van Voorhis et al., 1991; Whitehead & Linquist, 1989, 1992).

Juvenile Justice Staff Orientation

Research that specifically examines the rehabilitation and punishment orientations of juvenile justice staff spans over the last 20 years. This includes studies of both juvenile correctional officers (Blevins et al., 2007; Bazemore, et al, 1994; Gordon, 1999) and juvenile probation officers (Lopez & Russell, 2008; Schwalbe & Maschi, 2009; Ward & Kupchik, 2010). In addition, studies have focused on identifying predictors of professional orientation among juvenile probation and juvenile corrections officers (Leiber et al., 2002), as well as comparisons of juvenile to adult probation and parole officers (Bolin & Applegate, 2016, 2018; Sluder & Reddington, 1993), or juvenile probation officers to other juvenile court professionals (e.g., judges, prosecutors, and defense attorneys) (Ward & Kupchik, 2009). As our research investigates the relative impact of individual, job, and organizational factors on rehabilitation and punishment orientations, we turn first to a discussion of how individual characteristics have been included in the existing literature.

Individual Factors. Studies on the orientation of juvenile correctional officers often consider the influence of demographic variables such as gender, race, age, educational level, tenure, job position, and contact. The results for the impact of these variables on orientation have been mixed. For example, some studies have found gender to be a significant predictor of a punishment ideology for juvenile correctional officers, with female officers being less likely than male officers to indicate support for punishment (Bazemore et al., 1994; Gordon, 1999). Another study, however, found that gender was not a significant predictor of attitudes toward either punishment or rehabilitation (Blevins et al., 2007). Similarly, all three of these studies (Bazemore et al., 1994, Blevins et al., 2007, Gordon, 1999) included race as a possible predictor of punishment and rehabilitation orientations, but none found that it had a significant effect on either ideology.

Results for age are also mixed. One study demonstrated that older juvenile correctional staff were less likely to favor a punitive orientation (Bazemore et al., 1994), another one found that punitiveness increased with age, as did less favorable attitudes toward rehabilitation (Blevins et al., 2007), while the results from a third study indicated that age was not a significant predictor of rehabilitation or punishment for juvenile correctional officers (Gordon, 1999). In terms of educational attainment, Blevins et al. (2007) found that support for rehabilitation declined as education level increased, and that support for punishment increased with increased education levels. However, two other studies failed to demonstrate a significant relationship between education and orientation (Bazemore et al., 1994; Gordon, 1999). Similarly, studies examining the influence of tenure on orientations also produced mixed results. While longer tenure was a significant predictor of punishment but not rehabilitation in the study by Blevins and colleagues (2007), tenure did not produce significant effects on juvenile correctional officer orientation in the research by either Bazemore et al. (2009) or Gordon (1999). Further, only two studies have included a measure of contact hours between juvenile officers and their clients and its impact on

officer orientation. Both studies found that contact hours did not impact officer orientation (Bolin & Applegate, 2016; Sluder & Reddington, 1993).

Although more limited in scope, two studies have specifically analyzed the orientations of juvenile probation officers. Among this group, Ward and Kupchik (2010) found that women were more likely to indicate support for rehabilitation and less likely to indicate support for punishment. In terms of age, Ward and Kupchik (2010) found that as age increased, so did support for punishment. However, they, along with Lopez and Russell (2008), found that age was not a significant predictor of a rehabilitation orientation for juvenile probation officers. Additionally, while Ward and Kupchik (2010) did not include an education measure in their analysis, Lopez and Russell (2008) found that education level was not a significant predictor of a rehabilitation orientation. Finally, in terms of job tenure, both Lopez and Russell (2008) and Ward and Kupchik (2010) found that job tenure was not a significant predictor of rehabilitation or punishment.

To date, only two studies have examined the differences in predictors of orientation between juvenile correctional officers and juvenile probation officers. First, Farnworth et al. (1988) studied Florida juvenile justice personnel. They found that staff who reported higher educational levels were more likely to indicate support for rehabilitation orientations compared to staff with lower educational levels. In a subsequent study, Leiber et al. (2002) studied 86 juvenile probation officers and 114 juvenile detention officers, as well as 53 teachers in juvenile correctional institutions. They found that "juvenile justice personnel in corrections were significantly more likely than those in probation to prefer a punitive approach" (Leiber et al., 2002, p. 309). Further, they found that as education level increased, support for a punitive orientation was reduced. However, gender and age were not significantly related to a punitive orientation for juvenile justice personnel. Leiber et al. (2002) included several other variables (e.g., religiosity, blame family for juvenile offending, blame society for juvenile offending), but they did not consider job-related or organizational factors as potential predictors of orientation among juvenile corrections and juvenile probation officers.

Job Perceptions. In addition to these individual factors, Blevins et al. (2007) and Bazemore et al. (2009) included work-related variables as potential predictors of rehabilitation orientation. Blevins et al. (2007) examined perceived dangerousness, role conflict, and supervisory support. They found that the only variable to significantly predict a rehabilitation orientation was dangerousness, but only in the model exclusively including work-related factors. Officers who perceived their job as more dangerous were more likely to support a rehabilitation orientation. Dangerousness was not significant in the full model that included individual characteristics. Similarly, Blevins et al. (2007) also found that dangerousness was the only work-related predictor of a punishment orientation, with officers who reported greater perceptions of dangerousness indicating less support for a punishment orientation. Finally, Bazemore et al. (2009) included job stress as a possible factor influencing juvenile probation officers' punishment orientation but it was not found to be a significant predictor of this outcome.

The study of juvenile probation officers by Lopez and Russell (2008) also included type of work, social support, and cultural competency as potential factors influencing juvenile probation

officers' support for rehabilitation. They found that officers who indicated they worked in non-diversionary probation programs were less likely to support rehabilitation compared to officers who worked in diversionary probation programs. While cultural competency was not a significant predictor of a rehabilitation orientation, social support was. However, social support in their study referred to officers' perceptions of the social support youth under their supervision had from their mother, father, friends, etc. Interestingly, Lopez and Russell (2008) found that officers who reported that youth had greater social support were more likely to indicate support for rehabilitation.

Organizational Characteristics. Of the two studies that included both juvenile probation and adult corrections officers, neither considered the differential impact of organizational factors (e.g., input into decision-making, lack of opportunities) compared to individual and/or job-related variables. More recent research in adult corrections has established that organizational characteristics typically have a stronger influence on workplace experiences such as job stress and job satisfaction, than either individual or job-related factors (Hogan, Lambert, Jenkins & Hall, 2009; Lambert & Paoline, 2008). As the focus in the research on workplace experiences has shifted in this direction, it is important to consider the relative impact of these types of factors on attitudes toward rehabilitation and punishment as well. If rehabilitation orientation is influenced more by organizational and/or job-related factors than individual characteristics, then it may be possible for agencies to modify policies, procedures, and/or office climate in ways that foster more of a rehabilitation orientation toward juveniles.

Our review of the existing literature identifies mixed support for the impact of individual factors such as gender, age, educational level, and tenure on rehabilitation and punishment orientations of juvenile corrections officers and/or juvenile probation officers. Further, while some studies have included job or organizational factors as potential predictors of orientation, they have not examined the relative influence of these different variables. Recent research on adult corrections has shown greater support for the work/role model of professional orientation, where organizational characteristics have a greater impact than work place experience (e.g., job stress, job satisfaction) and individual factors (Hogan et al., 2009; Lambert & Paoline, 2008). Therefore, it is relevant to also assess if these patterns persist when looking at juvenile detention and probation officer orientations toward rehabilitation and punishment.

Based on the existing literature, the current study is framed by two hypotheses. *Hypothesis 1:* Predictors of punishment orientations will differ from predictors of rehabilitation orientations. Blevins et al. (2007) found some differences in variables that predict rehabilitation compared to those that predict a correctional orientation. *Hypothesis 2:* Organizational factors will have a greater impact on both orientations than individual or job-related factors. This hypothesis is largely based on the adult correctional literature suggesting that the organizational structure has a greater impact on correctional officer experiences and perceptions than either individual or job-related characteristics (Hogan et al., 2009; Lambert & Paoline, 2008).

METHODS

Data Collection

Data were collected via an electronic survey from juvenile detention and probation agencies from across Iowa, Kansas, Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Wisconsin between March 2015 and November 2017. One of the authors contacted directors/administrators at juvenile detention and probation agencies across these Midwestern states, asking if they would be willing to send an Institutional Review Board-approved email containing a link to the anonymous online survey to their juvenile corrections or juvenile probation staff. After removing surveys completed by supervisors and other types of staff (e.g., custodial staff, office staff, mental health counselors, etc.) our sample totaled 298 officers, of which 88 (29.50 %) were probation officers and 210 (70.50 %) were detention officers[i].

Measures

Dependent variables. *Rehabilitation orientation* was measured using four items adapted from Blevins et al.'s (2007) rehabilitation scale, which was based on previous research by Poole and Regoli (1980). This included statements such as: "Rehabilitating a juvenile is just as important as making a juvenile pay for his or her crime" and "The most effective and humane cure to the juvenile crime problem in American is to make a strong effort to rehabilitate juvenile offenders." Answer categories were strongly disagree (1), disagree (2), neutral (3), agree (4) and strongly agree (5).

Similarly, *punishment orientation* was measured using items adapted from Blevins et al.'s (2007) punishment scale. Participants responded to seven items representing a punishment orientation toward their jobs and the juveniles they supervised. The items included, "So long as the juveniles I supervise stay quiet and don't cause any trouble, I really don't care if they are getting rehabilitated or cured while they are in here," "A juvenile offender will go straight only when he finds that detention life is hard," and "Sleep 'em, feed 'em, and work 'em is the best way to handle juvenile offenders." Answer categories for these items also ranged from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5).

Independent variables. As part of the survey, participants were also asked to identify their *gender* (male=0, female=1) and to indicate their highest educational *degree* obtained (e.g., high school diploma or GED (1) to PhD (7)). *Tenure* was measured by asking participants to select the number of years employed in their current agency (less than 1 year (1) to 21 years or more (6)). *Position* was measured by a question asking participants to indicate their current job title (probation=0, detention=1). Participants also reported the number of hours they spend in direct, routine *contact* with juvenile offenders in a typical week. Categories ranged from none (0) to 30 hours or more (4).

In addition to these individual factors, we included variables that tap into various job perceptions. For example, participants were asked to assess the *dangerousness* of their job. This variable was measured by asking respondents how much they disagreed or agreed with three statements: "I work in a dangerous job," "My job is A LOT more dangerous than other types of jobs," and "In my job, a person stands a good chance of getting hurt." Additionally, individual

threat of harm was determined by asking participants how much they disagreed or agreed with three statements about their experiences with offenders: "In the past 60 days, I have feared for my safety while working with a client," "I am or have been frightened by things an offender has said to me," and "I am or have been frightened by things an offender has done to me." *Role conflict* was measured by four items related to getting caught in the middle between supervisors and subordinates, chain of command adherence, differential acceptance of actions, and conflicting requests from others. To assess *job ambiguity*, participants were asked to report how strongly they disagreed or agreed with statements related to the clarity of duties, objectives, work expectations, and connection of work to organization goals. Finally, *role overload* was measured with five items about number of assignments or offenders, unreasonable work quality demands, difficulty of work tasks, and skill expectations. For each of these job-related variables (i.e., dangerousness, threat of harm, role conflict, job ambiguity, and role overload), response categories ranged from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5).

The analysis also included variables that captured organizational climate. We measured *safety trainin*g by asking participants how strongly they disagreed or agreed with the statement: "I have received proper training on how to keep myself safe while doing my job in the office/facility." *Input into decision-making* was determined by asking participants to indicate their level of agreement with four statements about whether or not they can make decisions on their own, take part in making decisions that affect them, have a say in what happens on the job, and have a say in what happens to them on job. Lastly, *lack of opportunities* was measured by asking participants to indicate how strongly they disagreed or agreed with five statements related to career advancement. Items included lacking the proper opportunities to advance in agency, lacking opportunities to advance in the agency, hurting their career progress by staying with the agency, lacking opportunities to grow and learn new knowledge and skills, feeling at a standstill in their career. In each case (i.e., safety training, input into decision-making and lack of opportunities), participants responded according to 1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree response options.

RESULTS

Individual items for each of the measures described in the section above and Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficients for the additive scales are presented in the Appendix. Table 1 provides the descriptive statistics for each of the variables in the study. This information suggests that the variables we included in the analysis appeared to have sufficient variation.

Bivariate correlations between the study variables are presented in Table 2. These results indicated that only three independent variables were significantly correlated with rehabilitation orientation (i.e., degree, job ambiguity, and safety training), although it is interesting to note that it is one from each category of individual, job, and organizational factors. A larger number of variables demonstrated significant relationships with punishment. In fact, it was only gender, dangerousness, role conflict, and safety training that failed to demonstrate significant correlations with punishment orientation. Again, it is noteworthy that at least some variables in each category of individual, job, and organizational characteristics were significantly correlated with views on punishment.

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics for Study Variables (N=298)

Variable	Range	Mean	Median	SD
Dependent				
Rehabilitation Orientation	6 to 20	14.92	15.00	2.59
Punishment Orientation	7 to 14	11.83	12.00	2.03
Individual Factors				
Female	0, 1	.44	.00	.50
Degree	1 to 7	3.84	4.00	1.18
Tenure	1 to 6	3.20	3.00	1.61
Detention Officer	0, 1	.71	1.00	.46
Contact	0 to 4	2.69	3.00	1.22
Job Perceptions				
Dangerousness	3 to 15	10.44	11.00	2.61
Threat of Harm	3 to 15	6.74	6.00	2.99
Role Conflict	4 to 20	9.90	10.00	3.68
Job Ambiguity	4 to 20	7.48	8.00	2.93
Role Overload	5 to 25	11.84	12.00	3.56
Organizational Characteristics				
Safety Training	1 to 5	3.97	4.00	.85
Input into Decision-Making	0 to 16	9.01	9.00	3.11
Lack of Opportunities	5 to 25	13.74	13.00	4.99

The next step in the analysis involved estimating ordinary least squares (OLS) regression equations to assess the impact of individual factors, work-place perceptions, and organizational variables on rehabilitation and punishment orientations. As shown in Table 3, three variables influenced probation and detention officers' support for a rehabilitation orientation toward juveniles. Officers with higher degree attainment were more likely to support rehabilitation than officers with less education. However, those who experienced more job ambiguity, were less likely to report favorable opinions on rehabilitation. Finally, safety training also had a significant effect on this orientation, with those reporting that they had been properly trained on how to keep themselves safe while doing their job in the office/facility were more likely to support rehabilitation than those who found their safety training to be inadequate.

In terms of support for punishment, officers who reported lower degree attainment were more likely than those who reported higher levels of education to support a punishment orientation. Additionally, detention officers were more likely than probation officers to support a punishment orientation towards juvenile offenders. Lastly, officers who reported greater job ambiguity were more likely to indicate support for punishment than officers who reported less job ambiguity.

Table 2 Bivariate Correlations between Study Variables (N=298)

	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.	9.	10.	11.	12.	13.	14.	15.
1. Rehabilitation Orientation	1.00														
2. Punishment Orientation	-.30**	1.00													
3. Female	.04	.07	1.00												
4. Degree	.20**	-.33**	.15*	1.00											
5. Tenure	-.09	-.14*	.01	-.02	1.00										
6. Detention Officer	-.01	.37**	-.15*	-.46**	-.17**	1.00									
7. Contact	.07	.21**	-.08	-.23**	-.14*	.44**	1.00								
8. Dangerousness	-.02	.18	-.10	-.20**	.11	.19**	.19**	1.00							
9. Threat of Harm	-.09	.14*	.10	.01	.13*	.09	.14*	.43**	1.00						
10. Role Conflict	-.07	.17	-.04	-.07	.08	.23**	.19**	.26**	.36	1.00					
11. Job Ambiguity	-.15*	.21**	-.09	.07	-.02	.01	.01	.11	.23**	.55**	1.00				
12. Role Overload	-.08	.15*	-.07	.05	.09	.02	.14*	.31**	.39**	.56**	.57**	1.00			
13. Safety Training	.17**	-.08	-.04	-.11	.09	.05	.01	-.17**	-.25**	-.22**	-.34**	-.36**	1.00		
14. Input into Decision-Making	.11	-.16**	-.08	.09	-.01	-.08	-.06	-.23**	-.22**	-.45**	-.46	-.47**	.37**	1.00	
15. Lack of Opportunities	-.02	.13*	-.04	.13*	.08	.12	.13*	.26**	.26**	.56**	.48**	.56**	-.32**	-.52**	1.00

Note: *p < .05; **p < .01

Table 3. OLS Models Predicting Rehabilitation and Punishment Orientations (N=298)

	Rehabilitation		Punishment	
	B	β	B	β
Individual Factors				
Female	.02	.01	.14	.03
Degree	.60	.28**	-.43	-.25**
Tenure	-.15	-.09	-.15	-.12
Detention Officer	-.02	-.01	1.11	.25**
Contact	.19	.09	.10	.06
Job Perceptions				
Dangerousness	.05	.05	.05	.06
Threat of Harm	-.04	-.04	.01	.02
Role Conflict	.07	.10	-.07	-.13
Job Ambiguity	-.16	-.18*	.16	.22**
Role Overload	.01	.01	.01	.02
Organizational Characteristics				
Safety Training	.68	.22**	-.17	-.07
Input into Decision-Making	.03	.03	.01	.02
Lack of Opportunities	.01	.02	.03	.08
R^2		.15**		.27**

Note: B represents unstandardized coefficients; β represents standardized coefficients; * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$.

We were also interested in determining if organizational characteristics had a greater impact than job or individual factors on each orientation. To assess this, we entered each group of variables separately into a regression model. The results are displayed in Table 4. Surprisingly, the individual variables (e.g., female, degree, tenure, position, and contact hours) had a greater impact on preference for a rehabilitation orientation (r^2=.06) than either job characteristics (r^2=.04) or organizational variables (r^2=.04). The impact of the individual factors was even greater for punishment. In fact, individual characteristics explained much more variance in a punishment orientation (r^2=.20) than either job perceptions (r^2=.07) or organizational characteristics (r^2=.03).

Table 4. OLS Models for Individual, Job, and Organizational Variables Entered as Blocks Predicting Rehabilitation and Punishment Orientations (N=298)

	Rehabilitation		Punishment	
	B	β	B	β
Individual Factors Only				
Female	.13	.03	-.01	-.01
Degree	.53	.24**	-.34	-.20**
Tenure	-.11	-.07	-.13	-.10
Detention Officer	.18	.03	1.16	.26**
Contact	.22	.10	.10	.06
R^2		.06**		.20**
Job Perceptions Only				
Dangerousness	-.01	-.01	.11	.14*
Threat of Harm	-.05	-.06	.02	.03
Role Conflict	.06	.09	.02	.04
Job Ambiguity	-.20	-.22**	.13	.18*
Role Overload	-.01	-.02	-.01	-.03
R^2		.04*		.07**
Organizational Characteristics Only				
Safety Training	.53	.17**	-.06	-.03
Input into Decision-Making	.08	.10	-.08	-.12
Lack of Opportunities	.04	.08	.02	.05
R^2		.04**		.03

Note: B represents unstandardized coefficients; β represents standardized coefficients; * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$.

It is also interesting to note that, for the most part, when each group of variables were entered separately, the significant effects did not change. The one exception to this occurred in the punishment models. When the job perception variables were entered alone, dangerousness became significant in addition to job ambiguity. Given the coding of the dangerousness variable, this indicated that the more dangerous officers perceived their job to be, the more likely they were to support a punishment orientation.

DISCUSSION

The purpose of this paper was to add to the existing literature on juvenile justice staff, specifically by examining predictors of support for punishment or rehabilitation orientations and by assessing which group of variables had the greatest influence on these orientation preferences. We found partial support for *Hypothesis 1*, that predictors of a rehabilitation orientation would differ from predictors of a punishment orientation. In the full models, three variables were statistically significant for rehabilitation orientation and three were statistically significant for punishment orientation. For both orientations, degree and job ambiguity were statistically significant, and in the expected directions. Staff who reported higher degree attainment indicated support for rehabilitation, while staff who reported lower degree attainment were more supportive of punishment. In terms of job ambiguity, staff who reported less job ambiguity indicated greater support for punishment, while those who reported greater job ambiguity indicated greater support for rehabilitation. However, safety training was significant for the rehabilitation orientation but not for the punishment orientation, and position (detention officer) was significant for the punishment orientation but not the rehabilitation orientation. Staff who strongly agreed or agreed that they had received adequate safety training were more likely to support a rehabilitation orientation. Additionally, as noted above, detention officers were more likely to indicate support for the punishment orientation than the rehabilitation orientation.

These results may be of particular interest to juvenile justice agencies wanting to minimize support for punishment and encourage support for rehabilitation, at least in terms of recruitment. Educational degrees matter in terms of both rehabilitation and punishment orientations. Staff with higher levels of education are more likely to support rehabilitation and less likely to support a punishment orientation. By hiring staff with a college degree or higher, it is possible that these facilities or agencies would be able to hire staff who hold less of a punishment orientation. This is important not just for the organization itself, but also for offenders under their care. Prior research has found that staff who hold a punishment orientation are less likely to be committed to the organization, which may result in higher staff turnover rates (Lambert et al, 2008; Liou, 1998), job stress (Lambert et al., 2011), and less job satisfaction and/or willingness to do more for the organization than is required (Lambert, et al, 2008). Officers who favor punishment over rehabilitation may also treat juvenile offenders differently because of their punishment orientation. This may have negative outcomes for juveniles, such as greater likelihood of recidivism upon release.

In addition, officers who indicated less job ambiguity had a greater support for rehabilitation. Therefore, if organizations want to change the correctional environment to increase support for rehabilitation and decrease support for a punishment orientation, our results suggest that one way to do this is to making sure job duties, objectives, and work expectations are clearly defined. Job ambiguity might also be further reduced when the importance of what the staff members do in the context of organizational goals is reinforced. Safety training also appears to impact rehabilitation but not punishment, such that officers who indicated they had received better safety training also indicated support for rehabilitation. Agencies that are able to offer training that actually gives staff members the tools they need to feel safe in their work environment are more likely to have staff that support rehabilitation. It is important that detention and probation

agencies not only closely examine their safety-related training protocols, but also obtain feedback from staff as to what specific aspects of their training make them feel safer in their jobs.

Further, being a detention officer was significant for punishment but not rehabilitation orientation, however, these results should be viewed with caution. They do not mean that detention officers are bad people or that they are not good employees. Rather, our findings suggest that there may be something about the job itself or the work environment that influences perceptions toward punishment. It is possible that individuals choosing to work in detention do so with a predisposition to a punishment orientation. Detention is short-term confinement focused on control of offenders in the facility at that time. Many offenders are placed in detention as punishment for offenses as a means to keep the public safe. In this position, there is very little expectation for rehabilitation work with offenders and very few opportunities for long-term follow up. It is also possible that given the short-term nature of detention and the general lack of resources to offer rehabilitation in these facilities, the behaviors exhibited by juvenile offenders may undermine officers' initial beliefs in rehabilitation.

One of the contributions of this study was to assess if organizational variables have a greater impact than individual and job factors on preferences for rehabilitation versus punishment. Recent research on adult institutional correctional officers has found that organizational characteristics were more impactful than other variables on workplace outcomes such as job stress, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment (Lambert & Paoline, 2008). However, we did not find support for *Hypothesis 2*, that organizational factors would have a greater impact on orientation than individual or job-related factors. In fact, for rehabilitation, individual characteristics (r^2=.06) had a slightly stronger impact compared to both job (r^2=.04) and organizational variables (r^2=.04). For the punishment models, we found that individual characteristics had a much greater impact (r^2=.20) than either job factors (r^2=.07) or organizational variables (r^2=.03). While surprising, these results may be explained by the fact that we examined philosophical preferences versus actual workplace experiences (e.g., job stress, job satisfaction) as was the case for Lambert and Paoline (2008). Attitudes about the population with which one works may be more individual than other workplace experiences. While Lambert and Paoline (2008) noted that organizational factors and job characteristics are elements that organizations have a greater ability to change compared to individual characteristics, in this case it is possible that juvenile justice agencies may consider increasing the educational requirements for the job, especially if they wish to encourage a rehabilitation orientation and minimize a punishment orientation among staff members.

As Lambert and Paoline (2008) noted, a correctional environment that supports a rehabilitation orientation may provide some cost-savings for the organization. They found that rehabilitation orientation predicted organizational commitment, such that "dedicated employees would be less likely to abuse sick leave or leave the prison" (Lambert & Paoline, 2008, p. 95). Staff who support a punishment orientation are more likely to indicate greater turnover intention (Liou, 1998), and have greater role stress and higher work-family conflict (Lambert et al., 2011). Therefore, providing an atmosphere that encourages support for rehabilitation and tamps down

support for a punishment orientation may improve other work-related experiences for staff, leading to a more productive and positive work environment.

As with most research, there are some limitations that need to be acknowledged. Although our study included facilities in a number of Midwestern states, it lacks generalizability because we did not have a representative or balanced sample from each state. Additionally, the manner in which Midwestern states organize their juvenile detention and juvenile probation departments may be quite different from how other regions of the U.S. organize them. It is also possible that adherence to a rehabilitation or punishment orientation differs by regions within the U.S.A. nationally representative sample of juvenile detention and juvenile probation officers is needed to accurately assess any regional differences in orientation.

Similarly, our sample was racially homogenous, which precluded us from including race as a potential predictor variable of rehabilitation or punishment orientations. However, as noted above, the three studies of juvenile correctional officers that included race was not a significant predictor of orientation. A related limitation of the study was the sample size. Although adequate for our purposes, the sample consisted of just over 200 juvenile detention and slightly less than 100 juvenile probation officers. This relatively low number, particularly in terms of juvenile probation officers, limited the scope of our analysis and the number of variables that could be included in the models. Research is needed that includes larger samples so that additional, more complex analyses can be completed.

Despite these limitations, our research contributes to the existing literature on juvenile justice personnel. There is a relative lack of recent research assessing rehabilitation and punishment orientations of staff. Our study provides a more current example of staff orientations, particularly as it relates to two different occupational groups (e.g., juvenile detention and juvenile probation). This is especially important given the dynamic changes that have occurred in the juvenile justice system in the past 10 years. Additionally, given that existing research has provided evidence documenting the benefits of having an environment that supports rehabilitation, understanding the differential predictors of rehabilitation and punishment orientations has the potential to benefit employees, the organization, and even the juvenile offenders under their care. Our results provide some possible areas for change that could facilitate an environment where more staff support rehabilitation.

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

Kristin Y. Mack, Ph.D., is a Professor of Sociology in the Department of Sociology, Anthropology, and Criminology at the University of Northern Iowa. Her research interests include how significant life events influence individual well-being and family relationships and the link between family factors and occupational outcomes, especially in the criminal justice system. Her most recent publications appear in *Corrections*, *Criminal Justice Policy Review*, *Journal of Crime and Justice*, and *Women & Criminal Justice*.

Gayle Rhineberger-Dunn, Ph.D., is a Professor of Criminology in the Department of Sociology, Anthropology, and Criminology at the University of Northern Iowa. Her research focuses on the work experiences of criminal justice personnel, particularly adult and juvenile community corrections officers and juvenile detention staff; media and crime; and ethics in criminal justice. Her most recent publications appear in *Criminal Justice Policy Review*, *Journal of Crime and Justice*, *Corrections*, and *Journal of Ethnicity and Criminal Justice*.

Corresponding Author:
Kristin Y. Mack, Ph.D.
Department of Sociology, Anthropology, and Criminology
University of Northern Iowa
1227 West 27th Street
Cedar Falls, IA 50614-0513
kristin.mack@uni.edu

*This project was supported in part by a University of Northern Iowa's College of Social and Behavioral Sciences Small Project Grant and a Graduate College Summer Fellowship.

REFERENCES

Bazemore, G., Dicker, T., & Al-Gadheeb, H. (1994). The treatment ideal and detention reality: Demographic, professional/occupational, and organizational influences on detention worker punitiveness. *American Journal of Criminal Justice*, *19*, 21-41.

Bernard, T. J. (1992). *The cycle of juvenile justice*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Blevins, K. R., Cullen, F. T., & Sundt, J. L. (2007). The correctional orientation of "Child Savers": Support for rehabilitation and punishment among juvenile correctional workers. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*, *45*(3/4), 47-83.

Bolin, R. M., & Applegate, B. K. (2016). Adultification in juvenile corrections: Examining the orientations of juvenile and adult probation and parole officers. *American Journal of Criminal Justice*, *41*, 321-339.

Bolin, R. M., & Applegate, B. K. (2018). Supervising juveniles and adults: Organizational context, professional orientations, and probation and parole officer behaviors, *Journal of Crime and Justice*, *41*(4), 410-426. DOI: 10.1080/0735648X.2018.1440616

Butts, J. A., & Mears, D. P. (2001). Reviving juvenile justice in a get-tough era. *Youth and Society*, *33*, 169−198.

Center on Juvenile and Criminal Justice. (2019). "Juvenile Justice History." *Center on Juvenile and Criminal Justice*. San Francisco, CA. Retrieved March 20, 2019. http://www.cjcj.org/education1/juvenile-justice-history.html

Cullen, F., Latessa, E., Burton, V., & Lombardo, L. (1993). The correctional orientation of prison wardens: Is the rehabilitative ideal supported? *Criminology*, *31*, 69-92.

Dembo, R. 1972. Orientation and activities of the parole officer. *Criminology*, *10*(2): 193–215.

Elin-Blomquist, M., & Forst, M. L. (1993). Moral and practical problems with redefining the goal of the juvenile justice system as accountability. *Journal of Juvenile Law*, *14*, 26-46.

Farkas, M. (1999). Correctional officer attitudes toward inmates and working with inmates in a "get tough" era. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, *27*, 495-506.

Farnworth, M., Frazier, C., & Neuberger, A. (1988). Orientations to juvenile justice: Exploratory notes from a state-wide survey of juvenile justice decision makers. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, *16*, 477-491.

Feld, B. C. (1999). *Bad kids: Race and the transformation of juvenile court*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Forst, M. L., & Blomquist, E. (1992). Punishment, accountability, and the new juvenile justice. *Juvenile and Family Court Journal*, *43*, 1−9.

Gordon, J. A. (1999). Do staff attitudes vary by positon?" A look at one juvenile correctional center. *American Journal of Criminal Justice*, *24*(1), 81-93.

Hogan, N., Lambert, E., Jenkins, M., & Hall, D. (2009). The impact of job characteristics on private prison staff: Why management should care. *American Journal of Criminal Justice*, *34*, 151-165.

Irwin, J., & Cressey, D. (1962). Thieves, convicts, and the inmate culture. *Social Problems*, *10*, 142-155.

Jacobs, J. B., & Retsky, H. G. (1975). Prison guard. *Urban Life*, 4, 5-29.

Jurik, N. (1985). Individual and organizational determinants of correctional officer attitudes toward inmates. *Criminology*, *23*, 523−539.

Lambert, E. G., Altheimer, I., Hogan, N. L., & Barton-Bellesa, S. M. (2011). Correlates of correctional orientation in a treatment-oriented prison: A partial test of person–environment fit theory. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, *38*(5), 453-470. DOI: 10.1177/0093854811400716

Lambert, E., Barton-Bellessa, S. M., & Hogan, N. L. (2014). The association between correctional orientation and organizational citizenship behaviors among correctional staff. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, *58*(8), 953-974.

Lambert, E. G., Hogan, N., Barton, S. M., Jiang, S., & Baker, D. N. (2008). The impact of punishment and rehabilitation views on organizational commitment among correctional staff: A preliminary study. *American Journal of Criminal Justice*, *33*, 85–98. DOI 10.1007/s12103-007-9026-7

Lambert, E. G., & Paoline, E. (2008). The influence of individual, job, and organizational characteristics on correctional staff job stress, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment. *Criminal Justice Review*, *33*, 541-564.

Leiber, M. J., Schwarze, K., Mack, K. Y., & Farnworth, M. (2002). The effects of occupation and education on punitive orientations among juvenile justice personnel. *Journal of Criminal Justice, 30*, 303-316.

Liou, K. T., (1998). Employee turnover intention and professional orientation: A study of detention workers. *Public Administration Quarterly*, *22*(2), 161-175.

Lombardo, L. (1981). *Guards imprisoned: Correctional officers at work*. New York, NY: Elsevier

Lopez, V., & Russell, M. (2008). Examining the predictors of juvenile probation officers' rehabilitation orientation. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, *36*, 381-388.

Poole, E.D., & Regoli, R. M. (1980). Role stress, punishment orientation, and disciplinary actions: A study of prison guards. *Criminology*, *18*, 215-226.

Schwalbe, C. S., & Maschi, T. 2009. Investigating probation strategies with juvenile offenders: The Influence of Officers' Attitudes and Youth Characteristics. *Law & Human Behavior*, *33*, 356–367.

Sluder, R. D., & Reddington, F. P. (1993). An empirical examination of the work ideologies of juvenile and adult probation officers. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*, *20*(1-2), 115-137.

Steiner, B., Travis, L. F., Makarios, M. D., & Brickley, T. (2011). The influence of parole officers' attitudes on supervision practices. *Justice Quarterly, 28*(6), 903–927.

Thomas, C. (1977). Theoretical perspectives on prisonization: A comparison of the importation and deprivation models. *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*, *68*, 135-145.

Van Voorhis, P., Cullen, F. T., Link, B. G., Wolfe, N. T. 1991. The impact of race and gender on correctional officers' orientation to the integrated environment. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 28*(4), 472-500.

Ward, G., & Kupchik, A. (2009). Accountable to what? Professional orientations towards accountability-based juvenile justice. *Punishment & Society*, *11*(1), 85-109.

Ward, G., & Kupchik, A. (2010). What drives juvenile probation officers? Relating organizational contexts, status characteristics, and personal convictions to treatment and punishment orientations. *Crime & Delinquency*, *56*(1), 35-69.

Whitehead, J. T., & Lindquist, C. A. (1989). Determinants of correctional officers' professional orientation. *Justice Quarterly*, *6*, 69-87.

Whitehead, J. T., & Lindquist, C. A. (1992). Determinants of probation and parole officer professional orientation. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, *20*, 13-24.

[i] We were unable to determine a response rate for this study. A large number of agencies were contacted. As we only sent the survey to one person, who then distributed the survey to their staff, we had no control over the people to whom the survey was sent. Some of the agencies that agreed to participate sent the survey to everyone in their organization, including kitchen and secretarial staff, skewing the total number of people reached and those who participated in the survey. We removed individuals who indicated their position as something other than the equivalent to a probation officer or detention officer.

Appendix Individual Items and Cronbach's Alpha Reliability Coefficients

Variable	Item(s)	Alpha
Rehabilitation Orientation	Rehabilitating a juvenile is just as important as making a juvenile pay for his or her crime. One of the reasons why rehabilitation programs often fail with juvenile offenders is because they are underfunded; if enough money were available, these programs would work. The most effective and humane cure to the juvenile crime problem in America is to make a strong effort to rehabilitate juvenile offenders. I would support expanding the rehabilitation programs with juvenile offenders that are now being undertaken in our detention centers.	.65
Punishment Orientation	Keeping juvenile offenders from causing trouble is my major concern while I'm on the job. So long as the juveniles I supervise stay quiet and don't cause any trouble, I really don't care if they are getting rehabilitated or cured while they are in here. My job isn't to rehabilitate juveniles; it is only to keep them orderly so that they don't hurt anyone or tear this place apart. A juvenile offender will go straight only when he or she finds that detention life is hard. Many people don't realize it, but detention centers today are too soft on juvenile offenders. We would be successful even if all we taught juvenile offenders was a little respect for authority. Sleep 'em, feed 'em, and work 'em is the best way to handle juvenile offenders.	.81
Female	What is your gender?	---
Degree	Please select your highest degree and, where applicable, indicate your field of study.	---
Tenure	How many years have you been employed in your current agency?	---
Detention Officer	What is your current job title?	---
Contact	On a typical week, how many hours do you spend in direct, routine contact with juvenile offenders?	---
Dangerousness	I work in a dangerous job. My job is a lot more dangerous than other types of jobs. In my job, a person stands a good chance of getting hurt.	.81
Threat of Harm	In the past 60 days, I have feared for my safety while working with a juvenile offender. I am or have been frightened by things a juvenile offender has said to me. I am or have been frightened by things a juvenile offender has done to me.	.82
Role Conflict	I get caught in the middle between my supervisors and other staff. The formal chain of command is not adhered to. I do things on the job that are accepted or approved of by one person and not by others. I receive conflicting requests at work from two or more people.	.85

Role Ambiguity	My job duties and work objectives are unclear to me. I am unclear about whom. I report to and/or who reports to me. I do not fully understand what is expected of me at work. I do not understand the part my job plays in meeting overall organizational goals.	.86
Role Overload	I am responsible for an almost unmanageable number of offenders at the same time. The demands for work quality made upon me are unreasonable. My assigned tasks at work are sometimes too difficult and/or complex. Tasks at work seem to be getting more and more complex. The agency expects more of me than my skills and/or abilities provide.	.72
Safety Training	I have received proper training on how to keep myself safe while doing my job in the office/facility.	---
Input into Decision-Making	How much freedom do you have as to how you do your job? How much does your job allow you to make decision on your own? How much does your job allow you to take part in making decisions that affect you? How much say to you have over what happens on your job?	.87
Lack of Opportunities	I lack the proper opportunities to advance in this agency. If I want to get promoted I have to look for a job with another agency. I am hurting my career progress by staying with this agency. I have few opportunities to grow and learn new knowledge and skills in my job. I feel that I am at a standstill in my career.	.92