



The correctional ideology of prison chaplains A national survey

Jody L. Sundt^{a,*}, Francis T. Cullen^b

^a*Center for the Study of Crime, Delinquency, and Corrections, Mail Code 4504, Southern Illinois University,
Carbondale, IL 62901-4504, USA*

^b*Division of Criminal Justice, University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, OH 45221-0389, USA*

Abstract

Since the inception of the penitentiary, prison chaplains have been an integral part of the correctional enterprise and identified with fostering offender reformation. This image of the kindly chaplain ministering to the spiritual needs of inmates, however, can be juxtaposed with the view that prisons are dehumanizing and invariably inculcate custodial sentiments among those who work within their walls. In this context, this study used a national survey to examine the correctional orientation of prison chaplains, with a special focus on the level and sources of support for rehabilitation and punishment. The results reveal that chaplains support incapacitation as the primary goal of prisons but also express high levels of support for rehabilitation. Chaplains' attitudes are influenced by their religious beliefs, the characteristics of the work environment, and age. Implications of the findings are discussed in light of the individual experiences/importation and work role/prisonization models.

© 2002 Elsevier Science Ltd. All rights reserved.

Introduction

Discussions of the prison typically begin with the view that they are painful places. As Johnson R. (1987, p. 4) has observed, for example, "the history of prisons tells us that the dominant reality of penal confinement has been and remains one of pain. This holds true independent of a wide range of social forces and of variations in the stated purposes of prisons at different times." Given this seemingly inherent, painful quality, the prison is thought to harm and corrupt inmates and a great deal of prison scholarship has been devoted to understanding the ways in which inmates adapt to the "pains of imprisonment" (Sykes, 1958). Within the last twenty years,

scholars have also begun to turn their attention to the ways in which the prison affects those who work within them. Although correctional employees have frequently been viewed as collaborators in the dehumanizing regimen of the prison, revisionist scholars suggest that working in prison also may have a deleterious effect on correctional employees (Jacobs & Retsky, 1975; Lombardo, 1981). Thus, it has been argued that prison employees, like inmates, experience a process of "prisonization" that shapes them into keepers who are both brutalized and brutalizing.

One implication of this line of thought has been that impulses to "do good" are corrupted, or at the least negated, by the insidious influence of the prison and its goals. Despite a long history of efforts to reform penal institutions and transform them into places that humanely facilitate inmate change (McKelvey, 1977), prisons remain painful, depriving places that are at times characterized by abuse and injustice. David Rothman maintains that the failure

* Corresponding author. Tel.: +1-618-453-6371; fax: +1-618-453-6377.

E-mail address: jlsundt@siu.edu (J.L. Sundt).

of the prison's benevolent goals—most notably rehabilitation—can be attributed to their incompatibility with custodial objectives. Rothman (1980, p. 419) contends, for example, “to join assistance to coercion is to create a tension that cannot persist indefinitely and will be far more likely to be resolved on the side of coercion.” Thus, Rothman argues that the expediency and convenience of custodial goals will ultimately corrupt efforts to help, support, or rehabilitate inmates.

In addition to questioning whether prisons can be humane and effective, doubt has also been raised about the ability of individuals who work in prison to “do good.” Specifically, Rothman (1980, p. 10) questions the capacity of the same person to simultaneously “guard and help, protect and rehabilitate, maintain custody, and deliver treatment.” In the end, argues Rothman, custody becomes the primary, if not the only, concern of the correctional officer and warden. Consistent with this perspective, it has been maintained that those who work in prisons are likely to adopt a custody orientation to avoid the complexity and ambiguity associated with a rehabilitative or helping role (Hepburn & Albonetti, 1980; Jacobs & Retsky, 1975; Poole & Regoli, 1980) or are transformed into inhumane keepers through identification with their custody role (Haney, Banks, & Zimbardo, 1973). In short, much has been made of the punitive and custodial orientation of those who work in prison.

The characterization of the correctional employee as exclusively control-oriented has not been substantiated by empirical research, however. Studies have consistently found that correctional employees—including correctional officers and wardens—support both custody and treatment (Arthur, 1994; Cullen, Latessa, Burton, & Lombardo, 1993; Cullen, Lutze, Link, & Wolfe, 1989; Harris, 1968; Jacobs, 1978; Jacobs & Kraft, 1978; Toch & Klofas, 1982; Whitehead & Lindquist, 1989; more generally, see Johnson, 1996; Philliber, 1987). This research challenged the view that prison employees were unable to balance rehabilitative and punitive goals. In addition, these findings called into question the assumption that attitudes that were supportive of inmates were nullified by the experience of working in prison.

Although this body of scholarship has significantly broadened views of the prison and those who work within them, knowledge about the attitudes and beliefs of the variety of staff employed within correctional institutions remains limited. In general, research on the correctional orientation of prison personnel has been restricted to samples of correctional officers and, to a lesser extent, to wardens. As a result, very little is known about the correctional orientation of other prison workers. In addition, most of the existing

research on the attitudes of correctional employees has been limited to samples drawn from one state or from only a few (primarily maximum-security) prisons. For this reason, the effect of variation in region has not been examined and the influence of working in various types of prison environments (e.g., minimum security prisons and prisons for women or juveniles) has not been fully explored.

This research attempted to broaden knowledge about the prison by examining the correctional orientation of one group of prison employees whose attitudes had yet to be explored: prison chaplains. In general, little academic attention has been directed at the chaplaincy, an oversight that is important for several reasons. Since the inception of the penitentiary prison chaplains have played an important role in the lives of inmates. Chaplains, for example, are responsible for providing inmates with a variety of services including counseling, facilitating adjustment to prison, visiting prisoners in isolation, helping inmates make plans for their release, counseling and helping inmates' families, providing religious and general education, and, of course, conducting religious services (Sundt & Cullen, 1998). Further, chaplains have historically played a role in shaping correctional policy, have advocated for reform, and have occasionally raised an intrainstitutional voice against inhumane practices (Skotnicki, 1991). It is also noteworthy that virtually every prison in the United States has at least one full time chaplain (Religious Programs, 1983) and that approximately 30 percent of the inmate population participates in religious programs and services.

There is also some evidence that points to the potential importance of the chaplain as an agent of social change. In his classic study, *The Effectiveness of a Prison and Parole System*, Glaser (1964) found that, among inmates who attributed their postrelease success to members of the prison staff, one-sixth cited the prison chaplains, although they constituted less than 1 percent of all prison employees. Furthermore, chaplains were the second most frequently cited staff members credited with bringing about inmates' rehabilitation (1964, pp. 141 and 145). Finally, a handful of studies have tentatively concluded that participation in religious programming improves institutional adjustment and reduces recidivism among certain inmates (Clear et al., 1992a,b; Johnson B.R., 1987; Johnson, Larson, & Pitts, 1997; O'Connor, Ryan, & Parikh, 1997; Young, Gartner, O'Connor, Larson, & Wright, 1995).

Notwithstanding these observations, chaplains occupy a unique place within the prison system. Shaw (1995, p. 7)—a chaplain himself—has pointed out, for example, that “chaplains are the only personnel, other than Corrections Officers, who regularly

interact with inmates on the tier area.” Unlike correctional officers, however, the chaplain’s role is not explicitly custodial. An intriguing feature of prison chaplaincy is that the chaplain occupies a position between offenders and their custodians. In addition, chaplains are in the unusual position of being an outsider on the inside in the sense that they are also a representative of their Church or denomination and may have a parish position in the community as well. There is, of course, also a spiritual element to the chaplain’s role. In contrast to the caricature of the brutish guard, there is the image of the virtuous, devout chaplain answering a call to minister to inmates. In light of these considerations, chaplains may have diverse experiences in and hold divergent views of the prison.

The role of the chaplain has traditionally emphasized compassion and human service. Several authors have observed, however, that chaplains also serve a custodial function at times (Metts & Cook, 1982; Morris, 1961; Murton, 1979). Consider, for example, Murton’s highly critical assessment of the chaplain:

The chaplain, perhaps unwittingly at first, becomes an organ of control and oppression. This peculiar behavior—serving the state, frequently in opposition to Christian precepts—does not so much reflect an inconsistency [in the chaplain’s role] as an erroneous assumption: that the objects of ministerial service are the prison inmates while in fact one could make a strong argument that it is the prison administration whom he serves. (Murton, 1979, p. 11)

This interpretation of the chaplaincy raises questions about the correctional orientation of prison chaplains. Although chaplains have traditionally been identified with treatment goals and a religious perspective to forgive and reform, the extent to which chaplains endorse rehabilitation or punishment as the goal of prison is unclear. Further, it remains to be seen how chaplains’ correctional orientation compares to that of other occupational groups within the prison. At issue here, then, is whether chaplains support rehabilitation or alternatively, whether the calling to minister to inmates is corrupted by custodial objectives.

The correctional orientation of prison employees

As discussed above, there is a tendency to assume that correctional officers are authoritarian, brutal, and control-oriented. Nevertheless, this characterization has not been substantiated by the data. Less clear is the correctional ideology and role orientation of prison staff who are responsible for the treatment, care, and support of inmates. An issue

that has yet to be adequately explored is the extent to which those who deliver treatment services to inmates adopt a custodial versus a rehabilitative orientation (cf. Robinson, Porporino, & Simourd, 1993). Like correctional officers and wardens, treatment staff work within the confines of a total institution where they must negotiate a balance between helping and guarding, protecting and rehabilitating, maintaining order, and delivering services. Therefore, if, as it has been argued, treatment is eventually co-opted by custody, if guarding is less difficult than helping, or if working in prison is inherently dehumanizing, treatment staff should also be affected by these processes.

A handful of studies suggest that treatment staff may be more supportive of rehabilitation and less supportive of punishment and custody than correctional officers (Hepburn & Albonetti, 1980; Robinson et al., 1993; Robinson, Porporino, & Simourd, 1997a,b). Although neither Hepburn and Albonetti (1980) nor Robinson et al. (1993, 1997a,b) report specific levels of support for rehabilitation versus punishment, all found that treatment staff were significantly less likely to endorse punishment than were correctional officers. Further, Robinson et al. (1997b) found that case managers reported the highest level of support for rehabilitation, followed by professionals, administrators, correctional supervisors, labor and support staff, and correctional officers.

The determinates of correctional orientation

Variation in the correctional orientation of prison employees is not limited to occupational differences. Indeed, the vast majority of research that has examined the determinates of correctional orientation has focused on the relative importance of individual versus organizational predictors of correctional officers’ attitudes. This line of analysis has been encouraged by claims that professionalizing correctional officers (i.e., increasing their level of education) and recruiting women and minorities will result in a work force that is less punitive, more human-service-oriented, and generally more respectful of inmates (Jurik, 1985a,b; Van Voorhis et al., 1991). This argument is consistent with the *individual experiences/importation model*, which proposes that an individual’s attributes and personal experiences shape their perceptions of work. Similar to the importation model of inmate experiences (Irwin & Cressey, 1962), the individual-experiences/importation model of employee experiences maintains that individual attributes affect perceptions and experiences of work because individuals “import” onto the job various orientations and statuses that influence their work experiences.

In contrast, the *work role/prisonization model* suggests that correctional orientation is influenced primarily by the characteristics of the work environment and by the nature of the work role rather than the characteristics of the individuals who work in prison. This hypothesis is most strikingly illustrated by the Stanford Prison Experiment (Haney, Banks, & Zimbardo, 1973), although this model is also consistent with the *prisonization* and *deprivation* models of inmate behavior (see, e.g., Clemmer, 1940; Sykes, 1958). The Stanford Prison Experiment examined the influence of contextual factors and adherence to social roles on the behavior of a homogenous group of college students who were assigned the roles of “inmates” and “guards” within a mock prison. After six days, however, the experiment, which was planned to last two weeks, was halted because the behavior of the participants had become “pathological.” Among the guards, for example, the experimenters observed high levels of aggression and negativity. Some guards exhibited “tyrannical” behavior and even the “good” guards tolerated the dehumanizing, brutal behavior of their fellow officers. These dramatic results led to the conclusion that the behavior of the research participants was the result of the roles that they had been assigned and the “inherent pathological characteristics of the prison situation itself” (Haney et al., 1973, p. 30). According to the *work role/prisonization model*, then, the work experiences and attitudes of correctional employees are determined by the structural and contextual influences of the prison and the nature of the work role.

Research that had examined the merits of the two models revealed mixed results. In general, neither model had been particularly successful in explaining variation in correctional officers’ attitudes. Indeed, Whitehead and Lindquist (1989) had raised the possibility that it might be time to turn away from this apparently fruitless line of analysis. While it appeared to be the case that the research in this area had not produced uniform or robust findings, several patterns were noteworthy.

Individual experiences

Most of the research that examined the validity of the *individual experiences/importation* model focused on the influence of demographic characteristics. Among the frequently examined variables were race, age, gender, and education. Only race, however, emerged as a significant predictor of correctional orientation with any regularity. Research consistently showed that Whites were less supportive of rehabilitation (Cullen et al., 1989; Jurik, 1985b; Van Voorhis, Cullen, Link, & Wolfe, 1991). Race was not, however, significant predictor of punitive orientations (Burton,

Ju, Dunway, & Wolfe, 1991; Crouch & Alpert, 1982; Cullen et al., 1989; Jurik, Halemba, Musheno, & Boyle, 1987; Van Voorhis et al., 1991; cf. Whitehead & Lindquist, 1989). There was also limited evidence that suggested that age might soften attitudes toward inmates (Arthur, 1994; Bazemore, Dicker, & Al-Gadheeb, 1994; Crouch & Alpert, 1980; cf. Jurik et al., 1987) and increased support for rehabilitation among correctional employees (Cullen et al., 1989; Van Voorhis et al., 1991). Most models, however, failed to uncover a relationship between age and correctional orientation (see, e.g., Arthur, 1994; Burton et al., 1991; Cullen et al., 1989; Robinson et al., 1993; Shamir & Drory, 1981; Van Voorhis et al., 1991; Whitehead & Lindquist, 1989).

Although it has been argued that a work force comprised of more women and college educated correctional officers will be less punitive and more human-service-oriented, research has failed to reveal a consistent relationship between gender or education and correctional orientation in multivariate models. Among five models that examined the influence of gender on support for rehabilitation, none reported a significant relationship between these variables (Arthur, 1994; Burton et al., 1991; Cullen et al., 1989; Robinson et al., 1993; Van Voorhis et al., 1991). Bazemore et al. (1994) and Crouch and Alpert (1980) did find, however, that male juvenile “detention care workers” and correctional officers, respectively, were more punitive than female officers and Whitehead and Lindquist (1992) reported a similar finding among their sample of probation and parole officers. Thus, when a relationship between gender and correctional orientation was observed, males tended to be more supportive of custody and punishment than females, but gender seemed to have no influence on support for rehabilitation. Similarly, twelve of fifteen models that examined the effect of education on the orientation of correctional employees reported no relationship between these variables (Arthur, 1994; Bazemore et al., 1994; Burton et al., 1991; Crouch & Alpert, 1982; Cullen et al., 1989; Cullen et al., 1993; Jurik et al., 1987; Shamir & Drory, 1981; Van Voorhis et al., 1991; Whitehead & Lindquist, 1989, 1992). Among the three studies that did find a significant relationship, Burton et al. (1991) and Robinson et al. (1993) reported that education increased support for rehabilitation and Poole and Regoli (1980) found that education decreased correctional Officers’ custodial orientation.

One limitation of the previous research on the *individual experiences/importation* model is that tests of the model were restricted to examining the influence of a few demographic variables. A broader conceptualization of the model seem desirable, especially in light of the modest explanatory power of

race, age, gender, and education. One domain of individual experiences that are particularly relevant for the purposes of this study is religious beliefs.

In contrast to correctional officers and other prison employees, chaplains presumably bring a uniquely spiritual outlook to correctional work. Accordingly, a key issue of interest is the extent to which chaplains' religious beliefs influence their correctional orientation. Two studies suggest that this line of analysis might prove valuable. Leiber, Woodrick, and Roubush (1995) found, for instance, that juvenile court personnel who interpreted the Bible literally were more likely to support a stricter court and to endorse the death penalty for juveniles. Similarly, Leiber and Schwarze (1999) reported that Biblical literalness was positively related to support for a stricter juvenile court and the juvenile death penalty among a sample of correctional officers and probation officers. Together, these studies indicate that the correctional orientation of prison employees is likely to be influenced by religious beliefs.

The general research on public attitudes toward crime and its control also points to the importance of examining the influence of religious beliefs. This literature focused on the effect of religious affiliation, fundamentalism, and religious orientation. Most of the research failed to uncover a relationship between broad measures of religious affiliation and punitiveness (Bohm, 1987; McCorkle, 1993; Osbourne & Rappaport, 1985; Samuel & Moulds, 1986; Tyler & Weber, 1982) or rehabilitation (Applegate, Cullen, Fisher, & Vander Ven, 2000). Blumstein and Cohen (1980) did discover, however, that those respondents who reported no religious affiliation were significantly less punitive than other respondents were.

Grasmick, Davenport, Chamlin, and Bursik (1992) argued that the failure to identify a relationship between religious denomination and correctional orientation might be due to the practice of combining fundamentalist/evangelical Protestants with more moderate or liberal Protestants in a single category of measurement. In support of this contention, Grasmick et al. found that compared to other religious affiliations, fundamentalist/evangelical Protestants were more likely to endorse a retributive orientation than members of other beliefs were. Similarly, Grasmick, Cochran, Bursik, and Kimpel (1993) discovered that fundamentalists were more likely to support the death penalty and stiffer criminal legislation. Young (1992) also reported that those who held fundamentalist beliefs were more likely to support the death penalty. Young discovered, however, that evangelism was negatively related to support for the death penalty in this study. More recently Sandys and McGarrell (1997) reported that fundamentalism (as measured by religious affiliation) was unrelated to

support for the death penalty in their sample of Indiana residents.

There is a beginning literature that suggests that religious orientation might be particularly important to understanding attitudes toward punishment. Two domains of religious orientation examined were "hellfire" beliefs and religious forgiveness. "Hellfire" beliefs are a set of attitudes associated with the idea that God is wrathful and seeks to punish sinners for their transgressions (see Evans, Cullen, Dunaway, & Burton, 1995). This orientation was hypothesized to positively influence punitive attitudes and decrease support for rehabilitation. In contrast, religious forgiveness refers to belief in the importance of forgiving people for their sins (see Applegate et al., 2000). Further, this orientation hypothesized to positively influence support for rehabilitation.

Both expectations have received support. Specifically, Applegate et al. (2000) discovered that members of the public who believed in religious forgiveness were more likely to support rehabilitation. Furthermore, religious forgiveness was the strongest predictor of support for rehabilitation in this study. Conversely, those who expressed a "hellfire" religious orientation were less likely to support rehabilitation. Although preliminary, these findings suggest that chaplains who believe in religious forgiveness will be supportive of rehabilitation while those who hold a "hellfire" orientation will be supportive of punishment and control.

Finally, it is expected that individuals who see the chaplaincy as a special religious calling will experience their work differently than those who are drawn to prison ministry for extrinsic reasons or those who see it as just another pastorate. Although the effect of a belief in a higher calling was not explored, Jurik (1985b) found that correctional officers who were intrinsically motivated held more positive attitudes toward offenders than those who took the job for extrinsic reasons. It might be argued by generalizing from these findings that chaplains who feel that they are answering a calling to the prison ministry (i.e., are intrinsically motivated) will be more likely to support rehabilitation.

Work experiences

Research that examined the merits of the *work-role/prisonization* model explored the effects of a number of factors, but little continuity across studies exist. Among the most frequently examined predictors were role problems, working in a maximum security prison (versus other security levels), and work experience. Among these variables, only role problems maintained a consistent relationship with correctional ideology, with those employees reporting greater role problems holding more punitive attitudes

(Cullen et al., 1989; Hepburn & Albonetti, 1980; Poole & Regoli, 1980; Whitehead & Lindquist, 1989; cf. Whitehead & Lindquist, 1992). Further, Shamir and Drory (1981) found that role problems decreased support for rehabilitation.

Among sixteen models that explored the effect of experience on correctional orientation, only five reported a statistically significant relationship and, in these cases, the direction of the relationship was not consistent. Shamir and Drory (1981) and Van Voorhis et al. (1991) found that experience was negatively related to a rehabilitative orientation among correctional officers. Jurik (1985b) also detected a negative relationship between experience and positive attitudes toward inmates. In contrast, Hepburn and Albonetti (1980) and Poole and Regoli (1980) found that experience was negatively related to a punitive orientation. Finally, Cullen et al. (1993) reported that experience increased support for rehabilitation among a sample of wardens.

None of the seven multivariate models in the empirical literature that examined the effect of working in a maximum security prison on correctional orientation reported a significant relationship between these factors (Cullen et al., 1989, 1993; Hepburn & Albonetti, 1980; Van Voorhis et al., 1991; Whitehead & Lindquist, 1989). Jurik (1985b) did find, however, that working in a minimum-security prison was related to more positive attitudes toward inmates.

Although less frequently examined, the influence of a number of other experiential features of correctional employment on the orientation of employees were also explored. Two such variables were job satisfaction and belief that correctional employment was dangerous. Although the theoretical relationship was not clearly identified, the assumption was that punitiveness was an adaptation to job dissatisfaction (Hepburn & Albonetti, 1980; Shamir & Drory, 1981, 1982). This expectation received some support: two out of three studies that examined this issue found that job satisfaction was positively related to a rehabilitative orientation (Arthur, 1994; Shamir & Drory, 1981; cf. Robinson et al., 1993). No relationship, however, was detected between job satisfaction and punitiveness in the four studies that examined this relationship (Arthur, 1994; Hepburn & Albonetti, 1980; Whitehead & Lindquist, 1989, 1992).

Belief that one's work is dangerous is similarly expected to increase punitiveness and decrease support for rehabilitation. It is thought that those employees who feel that their work is dangerous will view offenders as threatening and in need of punishment and control. Although this issue has been examined infrequently, Cullen et al. (1989) reported that per-

ceptions of dangerousness were unrelated to either support for rehabilitation or punishment among their sample of correctional officers.

In addition to the numerous variables identified in the correctional officer literature as important sources of correctional orientation, one factor unique to the chaplaincy that is a potential source of chaplains' correctional orientation is whether or not they are employed by the prison in which they worked. Chaplains were historically concerned about the source of their pay and the implications of becoming a paid employee of the prison. It was suggested, for example, that chaplains who were employed by the prison would experience a conflict of interest between their religious duties to inmates and their obligations to the state (Murton, 1979; Stolz, 1978). Further, it may be argued that chaplains who are employed by the prison system will be more fully socialized to a correctional work role and will consequently be more likely to identify with the prison's custodial and punitive objectives.

Social context

Aside from the variables derived from the *individual experiences/importation* and *work role/prisonization* models, the influence of the broader social context in which correctional employees work was explored by Cullen et al. (1993) and Wright and Saylor (1992). It had been suggested that the distinct development of southern prisons (see McKelvey, 1977) might have an impact on correctional work roles. Further, southern correctional systems tended to be more punitive toward offenders (Burton, Cullen, & Travis, 1987; Burton, Dunaway, & Kopache, 1992; Olivares, Burton, & Cullen, 1996). These interpretations are consistent with Cullen et al.'s (1993) findings, which revealed that prison wardens who worked in the south were less supportive of rehabilitation. Working in the south was unrelated, however, to support for punishment and custody among the correctional officers surveyed by Wright and Saylor (1992).

The relevance of previous research to the chaplaincy

To the extent that previous research on prison employees might be generalized to prison chaplains, this literature suggests that chaplains might be more supportive of rehabilitation than correctional officers, given their ostensible human-service orientation. It is also expected, however, that like other correctional employees, chaplains will hold complex attitudes about corrections and will support both treatment and custody. Thus, while it is likely that chaplains will strongly endorse rehabilitation, it is also expected that they would identify with the custodial and

punitive objectives of the prison as well. The extant literature also suggests that chaplain's correctional ideology will be influenced to a limited extent by individual factors and occupational conditions. In particular, racial and ethnic minorities may be expected to report higher levels of support for rehabilitation and those who experience role problems are likely to exhibit stronger support for punishment. Previous research also suggests that chaplain's religious beliefs will affect their views of formal social control.

Examining the correctional orientation of prison chaplains provides a unique opportunity to explore further the levels and sources of support for treatment and punishment among correctional employees. This is an intriguing line of inquiry given preliminary findings that indicate that treatment staff have divergent work experiences and attitudes from custodial staff. While little discussion of the implications of these patterns had occurred, three interpretations may be suggested.

First, it is possible that individual differences in correctional orientation exist between treatment staff and correctional officers prior to their occupational socialization, a view that is consistent with the individual experiences/importation model. Accordingly, it may be argued that individuals who aspire to be counselors, psychologists or chaplains possess a strong human service orientation prior to their employment, while those seeking work as correctional officers are more likely to hold a custodial or punitive orientation. Second, the apparent differences in attitudes expressed by treatment staff may be due to a process of occupational socialization that places strong emphasis on rehabilitation and denigrates custodial goals and orientations. Based on this model, it may be argued that occupation-specific socialization exhibits a stronger influence on an employee's attitudes than do individual differences. Third, and similarly, it is possible that the occupational role is a more important determinate of correctional ideology than is a process of prisonization, whereby prison employees are affected by the context of the prison environment itself (see, e.g., Cullen, Link, Wolfe, & Frank, 1985; Jurik, 1985b).

Method

Sample and data collection

In the fall of 1997, a simple random sample of five hundred chaplains was drawn from a directory of prison ministers maintained by the American Correctional Association. A mail survey was administered to the sample following Dillman's (1978)

“total design method.” During the first mailing, each person in the sample was sent a questionnaire, a letter of introduction, and a postage-paid return envelope. A reminder letter was mailed to the entire sample one week later thanking respondents and encouraging nonrespondents to complete the survey. Three weeks after the initial mailing, replacement questionnaires were sent to all of those who had not responded. This process was again repeated five weeks after the initial mailing. The original sample size was reduced to 402 when a number of surveys were returned undelivered because the respondents were either retired, no longer at the address listed, or deceased.¹ Out of the 402 deliverable questionnaires, 232 were returned for a response rate of close to 58 percent.

The sample's characteristics are reported in Table 1. The chaplains surveyed were predominately White males in their fifties and sixties with an average of ten years of experience at the institution where they were employed. More than 90 percent of the chaplains were college graduates and the vast majority of these individuals had completed graduate degrees. Close to 70 percent of the sample was Protestant, 26 percent was Catholic, close to 1 percent was Jewish, 2 percent were Islamic, and 2 percent reported that they had other religious affiliations.

Table 1
Sample characteristics

Variable	Percentage	Number
<i>Sex</i>		
Male	85.2	190
Female	14.8	33
<i>Race</i>		
White	84.2	186
Black	10.4	23
Other	5.4	12
<i>Education</i>		
High school graduate	5.0	11
Associates degree	2.7	6
Bachelor's degree	14.5	32
Master's degree	60.2	133
Doctoral degree	17.6	39
<i>Religious affiliation</i>		
Protestant	69.4	154
Catholic	25.7	57
Jewish	0.9	2
Islamic	1.8	4
Other	2.3	5
Mean age	56.5	
Mean years experience	10.3	

Measures

Correctional orientation

Chaplains' global, or general, support for various correctional philosophies was assessed with a forced-choice question previously used by Jacobs (1978, p. 192) and Cullen et al. (1989). In particular, chaplains were asked: "What, in your opinion, is the main reason for putting the offender in prison?" Possible responses included: "to rehabilitate him," "to protect society by making sure that he does not commit any more crimes for a while," "to punish him for what he did wrong," and "to deter him from committing a crime in the future." In addition to providing a measure of chaplains' general support for various correctional orientations, the use of this measure allowed for a rough comparison of chaplains' attitudes with the attitudes of correctional officers reported in previous research.

Chaplains' correctional orientation was measured with two scales comprised of items developed by Cullen et al. (1989), with some minor modification for use with this population (see Tables 3 and 4).² The first scale assessed the extent to which respondents held a rehabilitative orientation ($\alpha=.76$), and the second scale indicated support for a custody or punishment orientation ($\alpha=.56$). For each of the items in these scales, respondents were asked to indicate their degree of agreement or disagreement on a six-point Likert scale, with responses ranging from *strongly agree* to *strongly disagree*. Summated scales were constructed by weighting the standardized variables by their factor scores. This process provided greater weight to those items with larger factor loadings.

While chaplains were expected to report high levels of support for rehabilitation, it was unclear whether chaplains would attribute successful rehabilitation to treatment programs or to religious experiences. Of interest was whether chaplains believed in the reformative ability of religion or credit treatment programs with the rehabilitation of inmates. To assess this issue chaplains were asked: "What do you think is the *best* way to rehabilitate offenders?" Response categories included: "give them a good education," "teach them a skill that they can use to get a job when they are released from prison," "help them with their emotional problems that caused them to break the law," and "change their values through religion."

Independent variables

Individual experiences

Among the individual-level variables examined were age, level of education, race (1 = non-White, 0 = White), gender (1 = female, 0 = male), and reli-

gious affiliation (1 = Catholic, 0 = Other). In addition, this research also considered whether respondents viewed themselves as fundamentalists, assessed chaplains "hellfire" beliefs, belief in religious forgiveness, and sense of calling to prison ministry.

Although fundamentalism is typically measured indirectly by coding respondents' religious denomination as fundamentalist, moderate, or liberal (see Smith, 1990; also see Grasmick, Bursik, & Kimpel, 1991; Grasmick et al., 1992, 1993), a more direct measure seemed preferable. It was likely, for example, that individual variation existed among members of denominations that might generally be classified as fundamentalist. Therefore, in order to assess the extent to which chaplains held fundamentalist beliefs, respondents were asked: "In most religions, there are those who see themselves as more 'fundamentalist' or conservative in their beliefs and those who see themselves as more liberal in their beliefs. How would you identify your religious orientation?" Possible responses included "very fundamentalist," "fundamentalist," "moderate," "liberal," and "very liberal." The responses to this question were dichotomized by comparing those who identified themselves as "very fundamentalist" or "fundamentalist" to those with moderate or liberal beliefs (1 = fundamentalist, 0 = other).³

Two aspects of chaplains' religious orientation were also examined. The first domain of religious beliefs examined was referred to as a "hellfire" orientation. This concept was measured with a six-item scale that assessed "beliefs in and fear of supernatural sanctions" (Evans et al., 1995, p. 204). This scale consisted of four questions drawn from Evans et al. (1995) and two additional questions ($\alpha=.81$). The second domain of religious beliefs examined here was belief in religious forgiveness. Belief in religious forgiveness was measured with a three-item scale developed by Applegate et al. (2000) that measured the extent to which respondents believed that those who sinned should be forgiven ($\alpha=.44$). Although the reliability coefficient for this scale was low, when factor analyzed each of the items in the scale loaded on one factor with scores that ranged from .714 to .651. Given the results of the factor analysis and the theoretical relevance of each of the items, the scale was retained.

Finally, a sense of calling to the chaplaincy was measured with the following two-item scale ($\alpha=.61$): "Being a prison chaplain has special meaning because I have been called by God to do what I am doing" and "I was put on earth to do what I am doing." This measure was adapted from Davidson and Caddell (1994) and was designed to tap whether chaplains felt called by God to their work with prisoners.

Work experiences

A number of variables were included to assess the prison environment in which chaplains worked including working in a maximum security prison (1 = maximum security, 0 = other), working in a women's prison (1 = women's prison, 0 = other), working in a juvenile facility (1 = juvenile facility, 0 = other), and working in a federal prison (1 = federal prison, 0 = state prison).

In addition to measuring these broad features of the work environment, several experiential factors were examined. These variables included number of years of experience as a prison chaplain, whether the chaplain was employed by the prison (1 = employed by prison, 0 = other), job satisfaction, role conflict, role ambiguity, and belief that the work environment was dangerous.

Consistent with previous research on correctional employees, job satisfaction was operationalized with Quinn and Staines' (1979) five-item measure of "global" job satisfaction. Following Quinn and Staines' (pp. 209, 221) suggestions, this scale was created by assigning numeric values to each response and calculating the mean of the summed scores ($\alpha=.74$). This method resulted in a scale that ranged from one to five, with a high score indicating high job satisfaction.

Role conflict and role ambiguity were assessed using scales developed by Rizzo, House, and Lirtzman (1970). In addition to being theoretically derived and subjected to reliability testing, these measures had the advantage of being factorially independent. The role conflict scale consisted of eight items, which assessed the extent to which individuals experienced conflict between internal standards and defined role behavior, conflict between time, resources, or capabilities and role behavior, conflict between several roles, and conflicting expectations and organizational demands ($\alpha=.71$). The role ambiguity scale consisted of six items ($\alpha=.81$) that were designed to tap perceptions of "certainty about duties, allocation of time, and relations with others; the clarity and existence of guides, directives, and policies; and the ability to predict sanctions as outcomes of behavior" (Rizzo et al., 1970, p. 156).

Finally, chaplains' perceptions of dangerousness were measured with Cullen et al.'s (1985) five-item dangerousness scale ($\alpha=.85$). This scale measured the extent to which respondents felt that their work place was dangerous.

With the exception of the job satisfaction scale, all of the scales discussed above were summated scales that were created by weighting the standardized variables by their factor score. Responses to individual scale items were answered on a six-point Likert scale, with options ranging from *strongly agree* to *strongly disagree*.

Social context

Consistent with previous research that had examined national samples of correctional employees (Cullen et al., 1993; Wright & Saylor, 1992), south was defined as Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, and West Virginia. Region was measured indirectly by coding the chaplains' addresses "south" or "other" (1 = south, 0 = other).

Results

Levels of support for rehabilitation

Responses to the forced-choice question asking chaplains to select the "main purpose for putting the offender in prison" revealed modest support for rehabilitation and punishment and strong support for incapacitation. As displayed in Table 2, 19.4 percent of chaplains said that rehabilitation was the main purpose for putting an offender in prison. In contrast, 47.2 percent of the chaplains surveyed endorsed incapacitation (i.e., "to protect society"), 19.9 favored punishing offenders for their wrong doings (retribution), and 13.4 percent supported deterrence.

Although chaplains expressed a general preference for incapacitation as the main purpose of prison in the forced-choice question, this left open the possibility that they might still embrace treatment as an important function of the prison experience. In this regard, the results presented in Table 3 indicate that they also strongly support the treatment of offenders. For instance, 85 percent of chaplains "agree" or "strongly agree" that treating offenders was as important as punishing them (item 1). Further, 90 percent of chaplains indicated that they would be in favor of expanding rehabilitation programs, four out of five agreed that rehabilitation was the most

Table 2

Chaplains' views on the main purpose of prison (percentages reported)

Purpose of prison	Percentage	Number
Rehabilitate offender	19.4	42
Protect society	47.2	102
Punish offender	19.9	43
Deter offender	13.4	29

Question: "What, in your opinion, is the main purpose for putting the offender in prison? To rehabilitate him, to protect society by making sure that he does not commit any more crimes for a while, to punish him for what he did wrong, or to deter him from committing a crime in the future?"

Table 3
Frequency distribution for rehabilitative orientation items (percentages reported)

Item	Agree strongly	Agree	Agree slightly	Disagree slightly	Disagree	Disagree strongly	Mean
1. Rehabilitating a criminal is just as important as making a criminal pay for his or her crime.	54.7	31.8	7.6	1.8	2.2	1.8	5.30
2. One of the reasons why rehabilitation programs often fail is because they are underfunded; if enough money were available, these programs would work.	5.9	21.2	27.0	10.4	27.5	8.1	3.43
3. The most effective and humane cure to the crime problem in America is to make a strong effort to rehabilitate offenders.	17.9	44.4	18.4	8.1	9.4	1.8	4.48
4. The rehabilitation of prisoners has proven to be a failure.	6.8	13.1	17.6	14.4	30.6	17.6	4.02 ^a
5. All rehabilitation programs have done is to allow criminal who deserve to be punished to get off easily.	0.0	2.7	6.7	15.2	46.2	29.1	4.92 ^a
6. The only way to reduce crime in society is to punish criminals, not to try to rehabilitate them.	1.4	0.9	3.6	5.9	44.6	43.7	5.23 ^a
7. The rehabilitation of criminals just does not work.	1.3	3.6	10.3	13.9	42.6	28.3	4.78 ^a
8. I would support expanding the rehabilitation programs with criminals that are now being undertaken in our prisons.	25.0	50.0	16.4	4.1	3.2	1.4	4.85

^a Mean calculated from reversed scale; higher scores reflect stronger support for rehabilitation.

effective and humane cure to the crime problem, and 94 percent disagreed that punishing criminals was the only way to reduce crime (items 8, 3, and 6). In addition, chaplains disagreed that the rehabilitation of prisoners has proven to be a failure, indicated that treatment programs could be improved with better funding, and overwhelmingly rejected the idea that rehabilitation does not work (items 4, 2, and 7). Also strongly rejected by chaplains was the idea that rehabilitation programs allowed criminals who deserved to be punished to get off easily (item 5).

If the results presented in Table 3 portray a chaplaincy highly supportive of treatment, the results reported in Table 4 portray a chaplaincy resistant to a custodial orientation. For instance, only 2 percent of

chaplains agreed that so long as inmates did not cause any trouble, they did not care if they were rehabilitated (item 1). Furthermore, chaplains strongly rejected the notion that inmates would go straight only when they found prison life hard (item 2). Some support was expressed, however, for the position that “prisons today are too soft on the inmates,” with 28 percent of chaplains agreeing with this statement. Finally, approximately one-third of the chaplains surveyed agreed, at least slightly, that they would be successful even if all they taught inmates was “a little respect for authority” (item 4).

While these results indicated that chaplains were supportive of treatment, it was unclear whether prison ministers attributed the rehabilitation of offenders to

Table 4
Frequency distribution for custodial/punitive orientation items (percentages reported)

Item	Agree strongly	Agree	Agree slightly	Disagree slightly	Disagree	Disagree strongly	Mean
1. So long as inmates 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.	0.9	0.5	1.4	5.0	46.8	45.5	1.67
2. An inmate will go straight only when he or she finds that prison life is hard.	0.5	2.7	8.1	10.8	50.9	27.0	2.10
3. Many people don't realize it, but prisons today are too soft on the inmates.	1.3	8.1	16.1	13.5	39.5	21.5	2.54
4. We would be successful even if all we taught inmates was a little respect for authority.	2.7	10.0	25.6	14.2	36.1	11.4	2.95

Higher scores reflect stronger support for custody/punishment.

Table 5
Chaplains' views on the best method of rehabilitation

Method	Percentage	Number
Education	10.2	21
Teach vocational skills	13.1	27
Change values through religion	60.2	124
Help with emotional problems	16.5	34

Question: "What do you think is the *best* way to rehabilitate offenders: give them a good education, teach them a skill that they can use to get a job when they are released from prison, change their values through religion, or help them with their emotional problems that caused them to break the law?"

the reformative ability of religion or to the success of secular treatment programs. To address this question

respondents were asked to report on what they thought was the best method of treatment. The results of this inquiry are displayed in Table 5. A clear majority of chaplains (60.2 percent) said that changing an offender's values through religion was the best method of rehabilitation. Teaching inmates a skill that they could use to get a job was the second most frequently selected response, closely followed by helping offenders with their emotional problems. Lastly, providing inmates with a good education was the least frequently selected response. These findings advanced the idea that chaplains not only supported treatment, but also saw their spiritual work as rehabilitative.

Viewed together, the results discussed above revealed that, like other correctional employees,

Table 6
Correctional orientation scales regressed on individual characteristics, religious beliefs, work-related variables, organizational characteristics, and social context

Variable	Rehabilitative orientation		Punitive orientation	
	B	β	B	β
<i>Individual characteristics</i>				
Age	-0.016	-0.050	0.024	0.134**
Education	0.214	0.062	-0.168	-0.084
Race (White)	-0.394	-0.045	0.380	0.076
Gender (male)	1.051	0.117*	-0.457	-0.089
<i>Religious beliefs</i>				
Catholic	1.036	0.142**	-0.364	-0.087
Fundamentalist	-0.523	-0.074	0.129	0.032
Hellfire orientation	-0.246	-0.244**	0.184	0.318**
Religious forgiveness	0.154	0.068	-0.226	-0.175**
Calling to chaplaincy	0.101	0.047	-0.227	-0.183**
<i>Work-related variables</i>				
Experience	0.010	0.025	-0.017	-0.071
Dangerousness	-0.074	-0.073	0.120	0.206**
Role conflict	0.105	0.086	0.097	0.139*
Role ambiguity	0.0005	0.001	-0.052	-0.089
Job satisfaction	0.394	0.096	-0.154	-0.065
Employed by prison	-0.717	-0.098	-0.150	-0.036
<i>Organizational characteristics</i>				
Security level (max.)	0.953	0.091	-0.913	-0.152**
Federal prison	0.749	0.082	-0.270	-0.052
Male prison	-0.173	-0.017	0.920	0.156**
Juvenile prison	1.204	0.131**	0.009	0.017
<i>Social context</i>				
Region (South)	0.369	0.058	-0.414	-0.113*
Model summary	F=2.577* N=232 R ² =.196 Adjusted R ² =.120		F=4.175* N=232 R ² =.284 Adjusted R ² =.216	

Models were calculated with mean substitution for missing values.

* $P \leq .10$.

** $P \leq .05$.

chaplains held complex views about the purpose of prisons. Most chaplains surveyed said that the main purpose of incarceration was to protect society. Nevertheless, chaplains did not in turn dismiss the rehabilitation of offenders. To the contrary, the chaplaincy had a strong rehabilitative orientation and largely rejected a custodial orientation. While chaplains did not support rehabilitation as the main purpose of prisons, when probed further about their feelings, they expressed strong support for the treatment of offenders.

Determinates of chaplains' correctional orientation

In addition to investigating the level of support that chaplains expressed for rehabilitation and custody, this research was concerned with exploring the conditions under which chaplains' correctional orientation varied. Specifically, this study examined the effect of regressing the rehabilitation scale and the custody/punishment scale on individual characteristics, work-related factors, organizational characteristics, religious beliefs, and social context. Research on correctional orientation had shown consistently that it was misleading to conceptualize support for punishment or rehabilitation as mutually exclusive (Cullen, Fisher, & Applegate, 2000). Therefore, these scales were utilized to assess chaplains' preferences for rehabilitation and punishment using multiple-item scales.

As reported in Table 6, the model predicting rehabilitative orientation was statistically significant ($F=2.577$) and explained 12 percent of the variance in the dependent variable (adjusted $R^2=.12$). Among the significant predictors of chaplains' support for a rehabilitative orientation were having a hellfire orientation, being Catholic, and working in a prison for juveniles. Specifically, it was found that those chaplains who had a hellfire religious orientation were less likely to support rehabilitation, whereas Catholic chaplains and chaplains who worked in a juvenile prison were more likely to support treatment. In addition, gender approached statistical significance, with males being more likely to support treatment. It was also notable that none of the work-related variables substantially affected chaplains' rehabilitative attitudes.

The model predicting a custody/punishment orientation also achieved statistical significance ($F=4.175$) and explained close to 22 percent of the variance in chaplains' beliefs about punishment (adjusted $R^2=.216$).⁴ Further, the results presented in Table 6 reveal that chaplains' custody/punishment orientations varied significantly by age, perception that the prison was dangerous, security level, working in a male prison, "hellfire orientation," belief in

religious forgiveness, and calling to the chaplaincy. In addition, region and role conflict approached statistical significance. Thus, older chaplains, non-Catholics, and those chaplains who believed in a wrathful God were more likely to adopt a custodial orientation toward offenders and their work while chaplains who felt called by God to their work and those who believed in religious forgiveness were less likely to endorse punishment. Chaplains who felt that their work was dangerous were also more likely to support punishment, but those who worked in maximum-security prisons were less supportive of punishment. Finally, those who worked in the south were slightly less likely to support punishment and those who experienced role conflict were slightly more punitive.

Discussion

Although chaplains are a fixture at virtually every prison facility in the United States (Religion Behind Bars, 1998; Religious Programs, 1983), they have been infrequently studied—a fact that has limited understanding about the chaplain's work role and, more broadly, of how prisons affect those who work within their walls. In this latter regard, a popular—indeed, longstanding view—in the social science literature is that prisons are total institutions that dehumanize custodians to the point of fostering punitive views toward inmates. An alternative view, however, is that chaplains, who traditionally have been identified with treatment goals, a religious calling, and religious perspective to forgive and reform, would express high levels of support for rehabilitation.

The results of this research tend to confirm the second expectation: chaplains reported high levels of support for the treatment of offenders. It may be recalled that over 80 percent of respondents felt that treatment was as important as punishment and that rehabilitation programs should be expanded. Chaplains also overwhelmingly rejected the idea that treatment did not work. Furthermore, prison ministers tended to reject punitive responses to inmates. For example, chaplains almost uniformly rejected the idea that it did not matter if inmates were rehabilitated as long as they stayed quiet and did not cause trouble. Thus, these findings call into question assumptions about the brutalizing effect of working in prison. Similarly, there is no evidence to suggest that chaplains take on a custodial orientation to avoid the complexity of preaching love in a punishment setting.

Although not addressed directly, the findings of this research also suggest that chaplains see their role as rehabilitative. Besides expressing high levels of

support for rehabilitation, most chaplains believed that changing an offender's values through religion was the best method of rehabilitation. Significantly, this finding reveals that chaplains not only support treatment but also see their spiritual work as reformative.

Despite these findings, it would be misleading to overlook the fact that when chaplains were presented with a forced-choice question asking them about the "main purpose of putting the offender in prison," the majority endorsed incapacitation. In this regard, the findings reported here are consistent with past research and indicate that, like other correctional employees, chaplains hold complex views about the purpose of prisons. Although chaplains see the protection of society as the main purpose of prisons, support for incapacitation does not preclude belief in the treatment of offenders. In fact, the vast majority of chaplains supported offender treatment and rejected punishment when questioned further about their correctional orientation.

Nevertheless, the level of support for incapacitation expressed by chaplains is surprising. Several explanations may be put forth in this regard. First, the level of support expressed for incapacitation might mirror general trends among the public. Recent research on public attitudes generally found that when citizens were questioned about the main purpose of prisons, the protection of society was their first or second choice (Applegate, Cullen, & Fisher, 1997; Sundt, Cullen, Turner, & Applegate, 1998). Thus, chaplains' endorsement of incapacitation may reflect a consensus about the purpose of prisons among the public from which chaplains are drawn.

Second, chaplains' support for incapacitating offenders may be indicative of being socialized to a work-role. Working in prisons may have the effect of increasing chaplains' support for incapacitation. For instance, if incapacitation is the stated objective or the preferred policy of the prison in which chaplains work, this will likely influence their views. This interpretation receives some support from the finding that wardens also tend to see incapacitation as the main objective of imprisonment (Cullen et al., 1993; Johnson, Bennett, & Flanagan, 1997). Moreover, this explanation would account for the high percentage of chaplains supporting this correctional goal globally but rejecting a custodial orientation when questioned further about their attitudes.⁵

Third, chaplains may believe that once an offender is incarcerated and society has been protected, the best policy for dealing with the inmate while they are incarcerated is rehabilitation. The finding that chaplains exhibited low levels of support for deterrence and retribution tends to support this conclusion, as does the finding that chaplains were enthusiastic about the treatment of inmates. Further-

more, this interpretation is consistent with previous research on public attitudes toward corrections. Innes (1993, p. 232) noted, for example, that Americans' attitudes toward *offenders* appear to be distinct from their attitudes toward *inmates*, suggesting that citizens may be more willing to support treating an offender once he or she is no longer a threat to society.

Fourth, these results could be a methodological artifact. Chaplains' responses may reflect what they believe the main purpose of prison *is* rather than what they think the main purpose of prison *should* be. For example, chaplains were asked "what in your opinion *is* the main purpose for putting the offender in prison" (emphasis added). Previous research on public attitudes toward rehabilitation that specifically asked respondents to report what the emphasis in prisons *was* and what it *should be* indicated that there might be considerable divergence in responses between these two questions. Rich and Sampson (1990) found, for example, that 20 percent of Chicago residents thought that rehabilitation was the main emphasis in prisons while 57 percent thought that rehabilitation should be the main emphasis. Similarly, Applegate (1997) found that 41 percent of Ohio residents reported a preference for rehabilitation (also see the results of *The Harris Survey* reported in Hindelang, Dunn, Aumick, & Sutton, 1975; McGarrell & Flanagan, 1985). Although the measure used in the current study asked a slightly different question than the one posed to the public in the above studies, it is possible that if an alternative question had been presented to chaplains, their responses would have been different.

Despite the apparent inconsistencies between the global and specific questions discussed above, chaplains' responses were markedly similar when questioned further about support for rehabilitation and punishment. In particular, it appears that there is a consensus of views among chaplains with regard to the importance of rehabilitation. The multivariate analysis accounted for a modest amount of variance (12 percent) and revealed that chaplains' support for rehabilitation did not vary significantly by their work experiences or social context. Employment in a juvenile facility was the only organizational variable that effected chaplains' beliefs about treatment and among the individual characteristics examined only gender approached statistical significance. To a greater extent, chaplains' views of treatment were influenced by their religious beliefs, with Catholics and those who rejected a hellfire orientation more likely to endorse rehabilitation.

More variation existed among chaplains' attitudes toward custody and punishment and the multivariate analysis met with more success in identifying the sources of this variation. Chaplains' religious beliefs

exhibited the strongest effect on support for punishment, but certain work experiences and features of the work environment also proved to be important determinates of punitive attitudes as did age and social context.

These results have several theoretical implications for the individual experiences/importation model and the work role/prisonization model. With regards to the individual experiences/importation model, this research revealed that traditional indicators of this theory had a limited effect on chaplains' support for either correctional orientation: gender approached statistical significance in the model predicting support for treatment and only age was significantly related to punitiveness. Religious beliefs, however, proved to be robust, meaningful predictors of both correctional orientations. Thus, when the importation model was conceptualized more broadly, strong support for this perspective was found here.

These findings suggest that future research that tests the individual experiences/importation model should conceptualize this perspective more broadly. The failure of past research to find support for this model may be due to the way in which the theory has been operationalized (i.e., by measuring individual attributes). One domain of individual experiences that seems to be a promising source of attitudes toward crime control are religious beliefs. Other indicators of individual experiences, characteristics, and orientations, including such factors as personality, affective traits, political ideology, and self-efficacy, may prove to be important predictors of variety of work-related attitudes and experiences.

The results of this research are more mixed with regard to support for the work role/prisonization model. Little support for this perspective was found in the model predicting a rehabilitative orientation. In contrast, however, variables derived from this model were among the strongest predictors of support for a custody or punishment orientation. Two interpretations of these findings seem warranted. First, it seems clear that the sources of support for rehabilitation and punishment are distinct and that these orientations, although inversely related, are not opposite ends of a continuum of beliefs. It is possible that dehumanizing qualities of the work experience did lead to a more punitive orientation, but have a negligible effect on support for treatment.

Second, it is possible that there is an *occupational* consensus among prison chaplains about the importance of rehabilitation—but not about punishment—irrespective of features of the work place or other work experiences. In other words, features of the occupational work role may be more salient in determining correctional orientation than a process of prisonization. If this is the case, little variation should be found

in correctional orientation within occupational groups. While this is a complicated issue that cannot be fully examined here, these observations point to the need for future research on correctional orientation to examine multiple occupational groups.

Over ten years ago, Whitehead and Lindquist (1989) suggested that it might be prudent to turn attention away from exploring the determinates of correctional orientation. This research suggests, however, that the sources of correctional ideology among prison employees may not be as elusive as previously thought. A fuller development of both the individual experiences/importation and work role/prisonization models is warranted. In particular, attention should be turned toward examining the influence of religious beliefs and occupational socialization. This line of analysis will shed further light on the nature of the prison and its effect on those who work within.

The results of this analysis have various implications for understanding chaplains and prisons. In one respect, these findings indicate that chaplains are not immune to the influences of the prison. Chaplains' who view their work as dangerous are more likely to endorse punishment and other work-related factors, such as role conflict and security level, also shape their beliefs. Moreover, incapacitation is endorsed as the primary purpose of prison, even among those charged with the moral and spiritual care of inmates.

Nevertheless, chaplains' personal orientations remain highly supportive of inmate change and human service. This study also found that chaplains believe that religion has the potential to reform inmates, which is a distinctly moral view of rehabilitation. As such, chaplains are potentially a source of support for rehabilitating inmates and treating them humanely. Those who work in prisons are not only shaped by their work, but have the ability to affect these environments. Although prisons exert a degree of influence on prison ministers, the findings indicate that chaplains too have the potential to exert a humanizing influence on the prison and "do good."

Acknowledgments

A version of this study was presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Society of Criminology, Washington, DC, November 1998.

Notes

1. The relatively high number of undeliverable surveys was most likely due to the nature of prison chaplaincy. For example, there was a tradition of itinerancy in prison minis-

try. It also appeared that the chaplaincy was “graying” as fewer young ministers were attracted to this type of work. Further, many ministers turned to prison chaplaincy after they had retired from their community pastorates.

2. Although Klofas and Toch’s scale has been validated, subjected to factor analysis, and is reliable (see Whitehead, Lindquist, & Klofas, 1987), it is not well suited for assessing support for rehabilitation. In particular, the Klofas and Toch scale was designed to measure support for a counseling role, concern with the corruption of authority, social distance between guards and inmates, and punitiveness.

3. A measure of fundamentalism was also constructed following the procedure specified by Smith (1990) in order to compare the predictive strength of the two measures. The correlation between the two measures was .402, suggesting that, while the two variables were strongly related, they tapped slightly different information. Each measure was then correlated with custody orientation and rehabilitative orientation. The bivariate correlation between both measures of fundamentalism and custody orientation was identical (.218). The self-reported measure of fundamentalism, however, maintained a stronger relationship to rehabilitative orientation than the measure of fundamentalism based on denominational classification ($-.231$ vs. $-.177$).

4. Parsimonious models predicting each orientation were also run using a method of backwards deletion. Variables were retained in the models if their inclusion contributed to the adjusted R^2 . This procedure did not change the substantive findings in either model. Region did, however, obtain statistical significance at the .05 level in the reduced model predicting a custody/punishment orientation.

5. The determinates of support for incapacitation were explored post-hoc in a logistic regression model. The overall model was not statistically significant, however, and none of the independent variables were significant at the .05 level. The analysis did reveal that those chaplains who worked in maximum security prisons were slightly more likely to support incapacitation ($P=.06$). This finding is consistent with the above interpretation if it is assumed that incapacitation is given more primacy in maximum security prisons.

References

- Applegate, B. K. (1997). Specifying public support for rehabilitation: a factorial survey approach (Doctoral dissertation, University of Cincinnati, 1997). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 58, 1927.
- Applegate, B. K., Cullen, F. T., & Fisher, B. S. (1997). Public support for correctional treatment: the continuing appeal of the rehabilitative ideal. *Prison Journal*, 77, 237–258.
- Applegate, B. K., Cullen, F. T., Fisher, B. S., & Vander Ven, T. (2000). Forgiveness and fundamentalism: reconsidering the relationship between religion and correctional attitudes. *Criminology*, 38, 719–754.
- Arthur, J. A. (1994). Correctional ideology of black correctional officers. *Federal Probation*, 58, 57–66.
- Bazemore, G., Dicker, T. J., & 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.
- Blumstein, A., & Cohen, J. (1980). Sentencing of convicted offenders: an analysis of the public’s view. *Law and Society Review*, 14, 223–261.
- Bohm, R. M. (1987). American death penalty attitudes: a critical examination of recent evidence. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 14, 380–396.
- Burton, V. S., Jr., Cullen, F. T., & Travis, L. F. III (1987). The collateral consequences of a felony conviction: a national study of state statutes. *Federal Probation*, 51, 52–60.
- Burton, V. S., Jr., Dunaway, R. G., & Kopache, R. (1992). To punish or rehabilitate? A research note assessing the purpose of state correctional departments as defined by state legal codes. *Journal of Crime and Justice*, 16, 177–188.
- Burton, V. S., Jr., Ju, X., Dunaway, R. G., & Wolfe, N. T. (1991). The correctional orientation of Bermuda prison guards: an assessment of attitudes toward punishment and rehabilitation. *International Journal of Comparative and Applied Criminal Justice*, 15, 71–80.
- Clear, T. R., Stout, B. D., Dammer, H. R., Kelly, L., Hardyman, P. L., & Shapiro, C. (1992, November). Does involvement in religion help prisoners adjust to prison? *National Council on Crime and Delinquency Focus*.
- Clear, T. R., Stout, B. D., Dammer, H. R., Kelly, L., Hardyman, P. L., & Shapiro, C. (1992). *Prisoners, prisons, and religion*. Unpublished final report, Rutgers University, School of Criminal Justice, Newark, NJ.
- Clemmer, D. (1940). *The prison community*. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.
- Crouch, B. M., & Alpert, G. P. (1982). Sex and occupational socialization among prison guards: a longitudinal study. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 9, 159–176.
- Cullen, F. T., Fisher, B. S., & Applegate, B. K. (2000). Public opinion about punishment and corrections. In M. Tonry (Ed.), *Crime and justice: a review of research*, vol. 27 (pp. 1–79). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Cullen, F. T., Latessa, E. J., Burton, V. S., Jr., & Lombardo, L. X. (1993). The correctional orientation of prison wardens: is the rehabilitative ideal supported? *Criminology*, 31, 69–92.
- Cullen, F. T., Link, B. G., Wolfe, N. T., & Frank, J. (1985). The social dimensions of correctional officer stress. *Justice Quarterly*, 2, 505–533.
- Cullen, F. T., Lutze, F. E., Link, B. G., & Wolfe, N. T. (1989). The correctional orientation of prison guards: do officers support rehabilitation? *Federal Probation*, 53, 33–42.
- Davidson, J. C., & Caddell, D. P. (1994). Religion and the meaning of work. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 33, 135–147.
- Dillman, D. A. (1978). *Mail and telephone surveys: the total design method*. New York: Basic Books.
- Evans, T. D., Cullen, F. T., Dunaway, R. G., & Burton, V. S., Jr. (1995). Religion and crime reexamined: the impact of religion, secular controls, and social ecology on adult criminality. *Criminology*, 33, 195–224.

- Glaser, D. (1964). *The effectiveness of a prison and parole system*. Indianapolis, IN: Bobbs-Merrill.
- Grasmick, H. G., Bursik, R. J., & Kimpel, M. (1991). Protestant fundamentalism and attitudes toward corporal punishment of children. *Violence and Victims*, 6, 283–298.
- Grasmick, H. G., Cochran, J. K., Bursik, R. J., & Kimpel, M. (1993). Religion, punitive justice, and support for the death penalty. *Justice Quarterly*, 10, 289–314.
- Grasmick, H. G., Davenport, E., Chamlin, M. B., & Bursik, R. J. (1992). Protestant fundamentalism and the retributive doctrine of punishment. *Criminology*, 30, 21–45.
- Haney, C., Banks, C., & Zimbardo, P. (1973). Interpersonal dynamics in a simulated prison. *International Journal of Criminology and Penology*, 1, 69–97.
- Harris, L. (1968). *Corrections 1968: a climate for change*. Washington, DC: Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training.
- Hepburn, J. R., & Albonetti, C. (1980). Role conflict in correctional institutions: an empirical examination of the treatment-custody dilemma among correctional staff. *Criminology*, 17, 445–459.
- Hindelang, M. J., Dunn, C. S., Aumick, A. L., & Sutton, L. P. (Eds.) (1975). *The sourcebook of criminal justice statistics—1974*. U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Statistics. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Innes, C. A. (1993). Recent public opinion in the United States toward punishment and corrections. *Prison Journal*, 73, 220–236.
- Irwin, J., & Cressey, D. (1962). Thieves, convicts, and the inmate culture. *Social Problems*, 10, 142–155.
- Jacobs, J. B. (1978). What prison guards think: a profile of the Illinois force. *Crime and Delinquency*, 24, 185–196.
- Jacobs, J. B., & Kraft, L. J. (1978). Integrating the keepers: a comparison of black and white prison guards in Illinois. *Social Problems*, 25, 304–318.
- Jacobs, J. B., & Retsky, H. G. (1975). Prison guard. *Urban Life*, 4, 5–29.
- Johnson, B. R. (1987). Religiosity and institutional deviance: the impact of religious variables upon inmate adjustment. *Criminal Justice Review*, 12, 21–30.
- Johnson, B. R., Larson, D. B., & Pitts, T. C. (1997). Religious programming, institutional adjustment, and recidivism among former inmates in prison fellowship programs: a research note. *Justice Quarterly*, 14, 145–166.
- Johnson, R. (1987). *Hard time: understanding and reforming the prison*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Johnson, R. (1996). *Hard time: understanding and reforming the prison*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Johnson, W. W., Bennett, K., & Flanagan, T. J. (1997). Getting tough on prisoners: results from the national corrections executive survey, 1995. *Crime and Delinquency*, 43, 24–41.
- Jurik, N. C. (1985a). An officer and a lady: organizational barriers to women working as correctional officers in men's prisons. *Social Problems*, 32, 375–388.
- Jurik, N. C. (1985b). Individual and organizational determinates of correctional officer attitudes toward inmates. *Criminology*, 23, 523–539.
- Jurik, N. C., Halemba, G. J., Musheno, M. C., & Boyle, B. V. (1987). Educational attainment, job satisfaction, and the professionalization of correctional officers. *Work and Occupations*, 14, 106–125.
- Leiber, M. J., & Schwarze, K. (1999). *The effect of gender, occupation, and education on adherence to correctional orientations*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Midwestern Criminal Justice Association, Chicago, IL.
- Leiber, M. J., Woodrick, A. C., & Roudebush, E. M. (1995). Religion discriminatory attitudes, and the orientations of juvenile justice personnel: a research note. *Criminology*, 33, 431–449.
- Lombardo, L. X. (1981). *Guards imprisoned: correctional officers at work*. (2nd ed.). Cincinnati, OH: Anderson.
- McCorkle, R. C. (1993). Research note: punish and rehabilitate? Public attitudes toward six common crimes. *Crime and Delinquency*, 39, 240–252.
- McGarrell, E. F., & Flanagan, T. J. (Eds.) (1985). *The sourcebook of criminal justice statistics—1984*. U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Statistics. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- McKelvey, B. (1977). *American prisons: a history of good intentions*. Montclair, NJ: Patterson Smith.
- Metts, J. R., & Cook, T. (1982). Full service chaplaincy program. In P. Walters (Ed.), *Innovations in South Carolina law enforcement* (pp. 23–33). Columbia, SC: Division of Public Safety, Office of the Governor.
- Morris, A. (1961). What's new in the work of the church and the chaplain in correctional institutions? *Correctional research bulletin, vol. 11*. Boston: United Prison Association of Massachusetts.
- Murton, T. O. (1979). The prison chaplain: prophet or pretender? *Reformed Journal*, 7–12.
- O'Connor, T. P., Ryan, P., & Parikh, C. (1997). *The impact of religious programs on inmate infractions at Lieber Prison in South Carolina*. Unpublished report prepared for the South Carolina Department of Corrections.
- Olivares, K. M., Burton, V. S. Jr., & Cullen, F. T. (1996). The collateral consequences of a felony conviction: a national study of state legal codes 10 years later. *Federal Probation*, 60, 10–17.
- Osbourne, Y. H., & Rappaport, N. B. (1985). Sentencing severity with mock jurors: predictive validity of three variable categories. *Behavioral Sciences and the Law*, 3, 467–473.
- Philliber, S. (1987). Thy brother's keeper: a review of the literature on correctional officers. *Justice Quarterly*, 4, 9–37.
- Poole, E. D., & Regoli, R. M. (1980). Role stress, custody orientation, and disciplinary actions. *Criminology*, 18, 215–226.
- Quinn, R. P., & Staines, G. L. (1979). *The 1977 quality of employment survey: descriptive statistics with comparison data from the 1969–70 and the 1972–73 surveys*. Ann Arbor, MI: Institute for Social Research.
- Religion Behind Bars (1998). *Corrections Compendium*, 23, 8–21.
- Religious Programs (1983). *Corrections Compendium*, 7(7), 1, 5–11.
- Rich, R. F., & Sampson, R. J. (1990). Public perceptions of criminal justice policy: does victimization make a difference? *Violence and Victims*, 5, 109–118.

- Rizzo, J. R., House, R. J., & Lirtzman, S. I. (1970). Role conflict and ambiguity in complex organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 15, 150–163.
- Robinson, D., Porporino, F. J., & Simourd, L. (1993). The influence of career orientation on support for rehabilitation among correctional staff. *Prison Journal*, 73, 162–177.
- Robinson, D., Porporino, F. J., & Simourd, L. (1997a). The influence of educational attainment on the attitudes and job performance of correctional officers. *Crime and Delinquency*, 43, 60–77.
- Robinson, D., Porporino, F. J., & Simourd, L. (1997b). Do different occupational groups vary on attitudes and work adjustment in corrections? *Federal Probation*, 60, 45–53.
- Rothman, D. J. (1980). *Conscience and convenience: the asylum and its alternatives in progressive America*. Collins, USA: Harper.
- Samuel, W., & Moulds, E. (1986). The effect of crime severity on perceptions of fair punishment: an essay on the justifications of correctional policy. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice*, 6, 127–138.
- Sandys, M., & McGarrell, E. F. (1997). Beyond the bible belt: the influence (or lack thereof) of religion on attitudes toward the death penalty. *Journal of Crime and Justice*, 20, 179–190.
- Shamir, B., & Drory, A. (1981). Some correlates of prison guard beliefs. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 8, 233–249.
- Shamir, B., & Drory, A. (1982). A cross-cultural comparison of prison guards' beliefs regarding the rehabilitation potential of prisoners, the rehabilitative potential of prison and their own supportive role. *International Journal of Comparative Sociology*, 23, 216–224.
- Shaw, D. R. (1995). *Chaplains to the imprisoned: sharing life with the incarcerated*. New York: Haworth.
- Skotnicki, A. (1991). Religion and the development of the American penal system (Doctoral dissertation, Graduate Theological Union, 1991). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 54, 1371.
- Smith, T. W. (1990). Classifying Protestant denominations. *Review of Religious Research*, 31, 225–245.
- Stolz, B. A. (1978). Prison as political institutions: what are the implications for prison ministry? *Proceedings of the One Hundred and Eighth Annual Congress of Correction of the American Correctional Association*.
- Sundt, J. L., & Cullen, F. T. (1998). The role of the contemporary prison chaplain. *Prison Journal*, 78, 271–298.
- Sundt, J. L., Cullen, F. T., Turner, M. G., & Applegate, B. K. (1998). The tenacity of the rehabilitative ideal revisited: have attitudes toward offender treatment changed? *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 25, 426–442.
- Sykes, G. M. (1958). *The society of captives: a study of a maximum security prison*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Toch, H., & Klofas, J. (1982). Alienation and desire for job enrichment among correction officers. *Federal Probation*, 46, 35–44.
- Tyler, T. R., & Weber, R. (1982). Support for the death penalty: instrumental response to crime, or symbolic attitude? *Law and Society Review*, 17, 21–45.
- 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, 472–500.
- Whitehead, J. T., & Lindquist, C. A. (1989). Determinates of correctional officers' professional orientation. *Justice Quarterly*, 6, 69–87.
- Whitehead, J. T., & Lindquist, C. A. (1992). Determinates of probation and parole officer professional orientation. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 20, 13–24.
- Whitehead, J. T., Lindquist, C. A., & Klofas, J. (1987). Correctional officer professional orientation: a replication of the Klofas–Toch measure. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 14, 468–486.
- Wright, K. N., & Saylor, W. G. (1992). A comparison of perceptions of the work environment between minority and non-minority employees of the federal prison system. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 20, 63–71.
- Young, M. C., Gartner, J., O'Conner, T., Larson, D., & Wright, K. (1995). The impact of a volunteer prison ministry program on the long-term recidivism of federal inmates. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*, 22, 97–118.
- Young, R. L. (1992). Religious orientation, race and support for the death penalty. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 3, 76–87.