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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

The Background of the Study

The U.S. Department of Justice reports that crime rates and incarceration rates have steadily increased over the past two decades. In a report to the nation on crime and justice the Bureau of Justice Statistics (1983) reported that 2.4 million or 1.2 percent of United States citizens over the age of 18 were under correctional supervision.

With regard to actual incarceration the Bureau of Justice Statistics (1983) states that nearly 700 United States prisons presently contain over 500,000 men and women. Almost 3,500 jails in the United States also have an average daily population of over 200,000.

Historically, correctional education has existed with programs of varied emphasis since the first penitentiary opened. Wolford (in press) examined early programs and found them to be focused on Bible study and were directed by chaplains and religious volunteers. In 1847 New York became the first state to mandate that correctional education be available in all institutions. The reformatory movement began at Elmira, New York (circa 1870), this movement included educational and vocational programming as key elements. Eventually reformatories based on this model were to be constructed in 30 states. The post World War Two era saw an expansion of correctional education programming because of the increasing population of
institutions and the end of massive prison industry programs. However, it was the application of federally supported programs to correctional settings during the 1960's and 1970's which helped make education an essential component of nearly all institutions. At the present time there are approximately 7,000 educators working in the nation's long-term state and federal correctional institutions (Rutherford, Nelson and Wolford, 1984). According to Horvath (1982) correctional educators represent the largest noncustodial employee group in United States prisons.

The inmates correctional educators come in contact with are, according to Coffey (1984), a predominantly male population incarcerated in the nation's long-term correctional institutions (prisons) and includes "a disproportionate number of unemployed, undereducated and learning handicapped individuals." Conrad (1981) supports this profile by contending that "over 80 percent of the prison population did not complete a high school education, less than 10 percent can pass a standardized achievement test at the 12.0 grade level and 60 to 80 percent have been classified as functionally illiterate."

The effectiveness of schools to educate is the crucial issue in the evaluation of the education system. In examining this issue, using over 5,000 references, Stern and Keislar (1977) found the following:

The effectiveness of the school depends upon the organizational environment, the competencies of the teaching staff, and the instructional resources. It also involves consideration of the predispositions of teachers, their affective reactions--their attitudes. This is the case because not only do such facets of the teachers make up help determine how such resources are utilized in the classroom, but also they have a profound influence upon the student.
Often such programs fail to fulfill expectations because a key factor, the human element, is given inadequate consideration. (p. 63)

Attitude or the affective domain has been an important concept since Gordon Allport asserted over 50 years ago that attitude is probably the most distinctive and indispensable concept in contemporary American social psychology. Allport's ideas are as sound today as they were in 1935. Fishbein (1967) points out that "the attitude concept has come to play an increasingly important part in almost all of the behavioral sciences and many of the applied disciplines" (p. 5).

Stern and Keislar (1977) also point out that a group of nationally known educators agreed that teachers are the single most important element in the school. This is as true for teachers in corrections as it is for teachers in the community. In studying teachers and their effectiveness the question of whether teacher attitudes do make a difference in the learning situation has only been recently raised (Stern and Keislar, 1975).

"Teacher attitudes do make a difference in the teaching-learning process" (Stern and Keislar, 1977, p. 74). Aiken (1970) found that fine-grained analysis to clarify the relationship between teacher attitudes and achievement, seems to indicate that while a teacher with a positive attitude may have little influence, the teacher with a negative attitude can have an adverse effect. Stern and Keislar (1977) support this position and claim that "Most people would agree that teachers attitudes toward students have an important impact on how students feel about themselves as well as on the rate at which they acquire academic skills" (p. 66).
Teacher attitudes do make an important difference in the teaching-learning relationship. If correctional educators are able to gain insight into their attitudes toward inmate learners they will be better equipped to meet their responsibilities in the correctional classroom.

**Statement of the Problem**

Research suggests that the attitude of a teacher has an important impact on the student. This is particularly so if the attitude of the teacher toward the student is negative.

Although literature on the subject of attitudes is voluminous and the literature on teacher attitudes is also large there has been very limited research conducted on the attitudes of correctional educators. Friedman (1978) found that "the literature on attitudes toward those incarcerated in correctional institutions was sparse."

Specifically, this research was focused on the correctional educators' attitude toward the inmate learner and organized to determine if certain characteristics of the teacher may be related to their attitudes. So the statement of the problem takes the form of a question--what are the attitudes of correctional educators toward inmate learners in Ohio's maximum and close security prisons?

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of the study was to determine the attitudes of prison educators to the inmates they teach. A description of those attitudes and an analysis of whether the correctional educators in maximum and close security prisons in Ohio hold positive, neutral or negative attitudes toward the inmates they teach is provided in this study.
This study also provided an analysis of the types of attitude various subgroups (i.e., male, female, experienced, inexperienced, academic, vocational) of correctional educators hold and determined the significance of any differences in attitude among the subgroups.

This study is founded on the notion that it is detrimental for teachers to have negative attitudes toward the population being taught.

**Central Research Question**

1. What are the attitudes of correctional educators toward inmate learners in Ohio’s maximum and close security prisons?

**Subsidiary Research Questions**

1. Are the attitudes of experienced correctional educators toward inmate learners different from those of correctional educators with less experience?
2. Is there a difference between the attitudes of male and female correctional educators toward inmate learners?
3. Is there a difference between the attitudes of academic and vocational correctional educators toward inmate learners?
4. Is there a difference between the attitudes of correctional educators in maximum security prisons and close security prisons toward inmate learners?

**Definition of Terms**

The following definitions are used in the study:

**Attitudes**: "An enduring system of positive and negative evaluations, emotional feels and pro or con action tendencies, with respect to a social
object. Attitude has three components (i) cognitive, (ii) affective, and (iii) action tendency" (Kretch, Crutchfield and Ballachey, 1962).

"Operationally, attitude is defined as a score on a semantic differential test and a Likert rating scale" (Friedman, 1978, p. 12).

**Negative Attitude**—an adverse, unfavorable opinion.

**Neutral Attitude**—neither a positive nor negative opinion.

**Positive Attitude**—favorable opinion.

Operationally this study uses the following definitions:

**Positive Attitude.** This is indicated by a score in the range 28-54 on the Attitudes Toward Correctional Inmates Scale (ATCI) and a score in the range 40-78 on the Semantic Differential.

**Neutral Attitude.** This is indicated by an overall score of 27 on the ATCI. And a score of 39 on the Semantic Differential.

**Negative Attitude.** This is indicated by an overall score in the range 0-26 on the ATCI and a score in the range 0-38 on the Semantic Differential.

**Correctional Education:** "an organized and individualized self-help strategy to interrupt nonsocial or antisocial behavior through vocational and academic learning activities that foster social attitudes and equip students in contact with the criminal justice system for lives as responsible community members" (Gehring, 1984, p. 4).

**Correctional Educator:** a person who is employed full-time to teach in the correctional education system. This term is synonymous with prison educator, prison teacher and corrections teacher.

**Academic Correctional Educator**—is a correctional educator who teaches academic subjects.
Vocational Correctional Educator—is a correctional educator who teaches vocational education programs.

Experienced Correctional Educator—a correctional educator with more than 3 years experience in a correctional education setting.

Inexperienced Correctional Educator—a correctional educator with less than 3 years experience in a correctional education setting.

Correctional Inmate: "Is an individual who is incarcerated . . . in a correctional institution for having been convicted in a court of law of a felony or misdemeanor. The term is used synonymously with prisoner, criminal offender and inmate" (Friedman, 1978, p. 13).

Correctional Institution: Refers to a unit of a state's system of prisons (Friedman, 1978, p. 13).

Maximum Security Correctional Institution—is designated as the top security classification in the state corrections system. It is geared to the fullest possible supervision, control and surveillance of inmates.

Close Security Correctional Institution—is the second highest security classification. For the purpose of this study it is designated as being similar to maximum security classification.

Corrections: For the purpose of this study is "that segment of the criminal justice system in which society seeks to protect the public, punish offenders, change offender behavior and compensate victims is commonly known as corrections" (Snarr and Wolford, 1985, p. 41).

Inmate Learner: An inmate who attends the correctional education center on a full- or part-time basis to participate in education center programs.
Research Design

This study was descriptive in nature. The population studied was 73 correctional educators in maximum and close security prisons in the State of Ohio.

The instrument administered was composed of three sections. These are:

1. A semantic differential with the correctional inmate as the concept:

   The 13 adjective pairs were selected from the rotated factor loadings matrix of 50 bipolar adjective pairs. A panel of psychologists, correctional educators and correctional inmates narrowed an original list of 17 adjective pairs based on face validity, and item analysis after pilot testing eliminated 4 others as not having internal discriminative ability. The split-halves reliability coefficient \( r_{s-1} = .96, n = 21 \) and the Pearson product moment correlation coefficient \( r = .99, n = 15 \) of pilot test scores indicated reliability (Friedman and Bloom, p. 59).

2. Attitudes Toward Correctional Inmates (ATCI) Scale: "procedures similar to those described above for the semantic differential were used to test the scale \( r_{s-1} = .72, n = 21; r = .74, n = 15 \) scores on the nine items were totaled to derive the final ATCI score of a respondent" (Friedman and Bloom, 1980, p. 59).
3. The Demographic Section is composed of questions relating to sex, current position, years of experience as a correctional educator and security classification of the employing institution. This demographic section is based on a study by Darrel DeGraw titled, "A Study of Correctional Educators in Adult Correctional Institutions," published in the *Journal of Correctional Education*, Volume 38, Issue 1 March 1987.

The data were analyzed in relation to the research questions as presented in an earlier section. They were analyzed using the SPSSX computer program. The findings were limited to the 73 correctional educators in maximum and close security prisons in the State of Ohio.

**Assumptions**

There are five assumptions on which this research is based. First, that attitudes are important and do have an effect. Second, that attitudes can be measured. Third, that correctional educators do have attitudes toward inmates. Fourth, that inmates have some positive expectations of the education program, and, fifth, attitudes of correctional educators can be perceived by inmate learners.

**Limitations**

The design of the study has some limitations. First, by studying an intact group that consists of the total population, generalizability is limited to other correctional education settings. Second, this study is limited to the interpretation of data generated by the instrument. Thirdly, because the research is dealing with the sensitive issue of attitudes toward other people, the population may deliberately attempt to bias their responses.
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The literature related to this study is summarized in Chapter II. The related research areas include: history of correctional education in the United States, the concept of attitude, the measurement of attitude, and teacher attitudes, including the importance of attitudes and the effect on learners of teacher attitudes.

**History of Correctional Education in the United States**

In 1798 Philadelphia's Walnut Street Jail was the site of the first prison school in America (Cortez, 1982). Education, according to DeGraw (1984) was established here as a leisure time activity for the occupation of time by the inmates.

Prison education had its origin in the religious movement. This focused on bible studies, reading instruction from the Bible and was directed by chaplains and religious volunteers (Cortez, 1982; DeGraw, 1984; Wolford, in press). Reagen and Stoughton (1976) stated that early attempts at religious motivated education gathered impetus in 1825 with the creation of the Boston Prison Discipline Society by Louis Dwight. Dwight laid the foundation for rehabilitation concepts based on the complimentary principles of work and education, through his pioneering sabbath schools and promotion of congregate workshops such as at Auburn.
In 1844 a secular teacher was hired at Pennsylvania's Eastern Peniten­
tiary. Reagen and Stoughton (1976) contend that:

The most significant legal recognition of academic education as
being desirable in correctional institutions occurred with the
passage in 1847 of a New York State law providing for the appoint­
ment of secular teachers supervised by chaplains in the states
prisons. (pp. 36-37)

Eastern state penitentiaries went beyond the traditional "three R's"
in 1854, by offering such courses as bookkeeping, photography, and mathemat­
ics. A newly appointed teacher also offered instruction in Spanish and
German for volunteer inmate students.

The decade of the 1870s marks the culmination of the gradual
transition in correctional education from basic reading and writ­
ing to an organized system of formal academic, vocational and
social education with solid underlying principles. Zebulon R.
Brockway, the first warden at Elmira reformatory, developed an
industrial program at the Detroit House of Correction in 1861 that
was the first grading system based on prisoner attitudes rather
than purely administrative evaluations. (Reagen and Stoughton,
1976, p. 38)

The reformatory movement, according to Wolford (in press), began at
Elmira, New York (circa 1870). This included programming in the educational
and vocational areas. By 1876, Cortez (1980) states that Zebulon Brockway,
now superintendent at the Elmira reformatory, used services from a local
college to open a "school of letters" and a vocational trade school. DeGraw
(1984) reports that:

He introduced wages for production above a quota, organized a
Sunday school, and provided a chaplain and morning chapel ser­
vices. A motion at Elmira established an evening school for
women. Brockway made the first American classification of prison­
ers according to degree of potential reformation. Inmates were
graded according to behavior; serious misconduct could drop an
inmate to a lower classification which made earning promotion to
become eligible for parole more difficult.

Brockway hoped to create a school atmosphere conducive to self­
discipline by supporting the prestige of the honor grade through
grading privileges and better housing accommodations. College
professors, public school principals, and lawyers conducted classes in physical geography, geometry, bookkeeping, human physiology, Bible, psychology, history, natural science, economics, literature, and ethics. A trade school was also established for some inmates offering instruction in tailor-cutting, printing, telegraphy, and plumbing. In 1888 the efforts to restrict prison labor were successful and Brockway continued his efforts on behalf of the inmates by extending the rehabilitative aspects of the program. (pp. 14-15)

This reformatory movement was largely the outcome of the first American Prison Congress held in 1870 in Cincinnati, Ohio. One hundred and thirty delegates from 24 states met to formulate a "new penology." The Congress was led by some of the most eminent prison reformers of the day including Enoch Wines, Zebulon Brockway, Matthew Davenport Mill, and Joseph Sanford (Bartollas, 1981).

DeGraw (1984) found that:

Following New York's lead at Elmira most of the other states which had more than a single institution for males designated one of their prisons as a 'reformatory.' A younger population was sent to these prisons and a larger school program was established. In most other prisons, as work opportunities for inmates decreased, education programs were expanded to contribute to rehabilitation and to help fill the men's time. Reformatories tended to have a high ratio of paid teachers to inmates, while penitentiaries more often employed selected inmates as teachers. (p. 15)

By the turn of the century DeGraw (1984) stated that reformatories were established at the following places, "Ionia, Michigan; Concord, Massachusetts; Huntington, Pennsylvania; St. Cloud, Minnesota; Buena Vista, Colorado; Pontiac, Illinois; Hutchison, Kansas; Mansfield, Ohio; Jeffersonville, Indiana; Green Bay, Wisconsin; and Rahway (sic), New Jersey (p. 15). Eventually, reformatories based on the Elmira model, were to be constructed in 30 states (Gehring, 1981).

There were many hopeful innovations and programs associated with reformatories, however the reformatory period peaked by the last decade of the
nineteenth century, this occurred because of inmate violence, ineffective programs, and inadequate staffing. These components affected the total prison climate, a climate that in effect made reformatories little different from older penitentiaries (Bartollas, 1981; McGraw, 1984). "Indeed their high concrete and masonry walls and their multitiered cell blocks seemed even more severe and grim than many penitentiaries" (Bartollas, 1981, p. 21).

The first three decades of the twentieth century are, according to Bartollas (1981), known as the era of the industrial prison, they were stormy years with a series of investigations and adverse reactions from the labor unions.

The financial hardships of the depression in the 1930's led 33 states to pass laws that prohibited the sale of prison products on the open market. Finally, the enactment of two federal laws, the 1919 Mawes-Cooper Act and the 1935 Ashurst-Sumners Act, for all practical purposes put an end to the interstate transport of prison products. (Bartollas, 1981, p. 21)

Correctional education moved steadily forward during the thirties and forties. In 1929 Austin MacCormick was called to Washington, DC, to serve as the Assistant Director of the new Federal Bureau of Prisons. He had just completed visits to 110 institutions as part of a nation wide survey of correctional educators. Cortez (1982) states that in "1930 MacCormick was named chairman of the American Prison Association's new Standing Committee on Education (p. 11). Federal institutions at Atlanta, Leavenworth, Alderson, and Chillicothe planned for new correctional school programs during this year. Correctional education was given further prominence when New York Governor Franklin Roosevelt appointed Sam Lewisohn as chairman of a
special commission to study and promote correctional education (Cortez, 1982).

"In 1931 MacCormick's book, The Education of Adult Prisoners, was published by the National Society of Penal Information, an 'outside branch' of the inmate organization, the Mutual Welfare League" (Cortez, 1982, p. 11). In 1933 as a follow on from the Lewisohn Commission, New York Governor Lehman appointed Professor N. L. Englehardt to chair a committee. As a result of this committee Cortez (1982) found that a correctional education bureau was established in the Department of Correction.

By 1941 Cortez (1982) states that:

A survey of forty-four state prisons and seventeen state reformatories revealed that approximately twenty-five percent of the prison populations and fifty percent of the reformatory populations were involved in school, and ten percent and twenty percent, respectively, were enrolled full time.

Wolford (in press) believes the end of massive prison industry programs and the increasing population of institutions during the post World War II era gave rise to expanded educational programming. The most significant correctional education trends of the 1950's were identified by Dr. Glenn Kendall, a pioneer in New York's Correctional Education Bureau, as the development of social education because it promoted insight into personal attitudes and enhanced social adjustment, thereby helping inmates to learn and improve (Cortez, 1982).

During the 1960's and 1970's Wolford (in press) states that it was the application of federally supported programs to correctional settings which helped make education an essential component of nearly all institutions. Programming was expanded by (1) The Manpower Development Training Act (MDTA), 1963, (2) Adult Education Act, 1966, and (3) the Basic Education...
Opportunity Grant Program, 1972. Other significant corrections-specific legislation included: ECIA Chapter 1 Neglected Delinquent Program, Public Law 94-142, Education for all Handicapped Children Act, and The Carl Perkins Vocational Education Act, 1985. This period contained a number of other significant events as outlined by Cortez (1982):

1965: Prison colleges were established in Texas.

1969: Texas and Connecticut established correctional school districts.

1971: Lehigh University in Bethlehem, Pennsylvania, established the social restoration Education Teacher Training Program.


1973: Arkansas and Ohio established correctional school districts. Western Illinois University established the Corrections and Alternative Education Teacher Training Program. A Project Newgate study reported that two hundred eighteen American correctional institutions offered higher education programs.

1974: Virginia established an agency which functioned as a correctional school district.

1977: The Correctional Education Association reported that about twenty thousand people were involved in various correctional education jobs in the United States.

1978: Sam Houston State University established a correctional education teacher training program. Maryland's State Department of Education established a correctional education office that functions as a school district.

1980: The new United States Education Department established the Corrections Program to help coordinate federal correction efforts.
Dr. Terrell M. Bell made the following comment:

The drastic increase in crime in recent decades seems to have made the subject of educating prisoners as (sic) issue of low priority on the list of many people. Many reasons have been cited for the increase in crime, frequently in the form of laying blame. The blame falls broadly on poverty, racism, unemployment, disintegration of the family, decline in religious and moral values, and, more specifically, on both the criminal justice system and the public school system. We must ensure that those who wish to improve their education and prepare for a life of honest work have the opportunity to do so. Education must not stop at the prison gates; for some, that may even be where it can begin. We must build on the assumption that not even in prison have we exhausted the resources that might work, that might make a change. (pp. 12-13)

At present, according to Bureau of Justice statistics (1983), nearly 700 prisons in the United States accommodate over 500,000 men and women. Approximately 7,000 educators presently are employed in the nation's state and federal correctional institutions, making educators the largest non-custodial group employed in the United States prisons (Horvath, 1982; Rutherford, Nelson, and Wolford, 1984).

Summary. From its early roots of reading instruction from the Bible, correctional education received great impetus from law makers in New York state in 1847 when secular teachers were appointed to state prisons. The reformatory movement started at Elmira, New York (circa 1870), and spread to almost 30 states by the turn of the century. This reformatory movement finished around the turn of the century due largely to inmate violence, ineffective programs, and inadequate staffing.

Correctional education moved steadily forward during the thirties and forties due to the end of massive prison industry programs and increasing population of institutions during the post World War II era. The sixties
and seventies saw Federal funding give support and encouragement to programs in correctional settings.

With over 500,000 men and women incarcerated today, correctional educators play an important role within each correctional facility.

**The Concept of Attitude**

Fishbein (1967) records that Gordon Allport pointed out in 1935 that:

... attitude is probably the most distinctive and indispensable concept in contemporary American social psychology. Allport's words are as true today as they were in 1935. In addition, the attitude concept has come to play an increasingly important part in almost all of the behavioral sciences and many of the applied disciplines. (p. 5)

Rokeach (1972) also states that: "the concept of attitude is indispensable not only to social psychology as Allport in 1935 pointed out but also in the psychology of personality" (p. 109).

According to Triandis, Adamopoulos, and Brinbery (1984) scientific study concerning attitudes started in the middle of the nineteenth century in Germany with the use of a number of theoretical terms to designate a person's preparation to respond to a class of social stimuli. The word attitude often referred to such a state. Ajzen and Fishbein (1980) noted that in 1901 Baldwin defined attitude as readiness for attention or action of a definite sort. However, Thomas and Znaniecki (1927) must be credited with the first use of attitude as a concept to explain social behavior. The authors stated that "very early social scientists assumed that attitudes could be used to explain human action since they viewed attitudes as behavioral dispositions" (p. 13). With few exceptions this assumption went unchallenged until the late 1960's.
According to Allport (1967) three important facts emerge from a review of the history of attitude study:

(1) After the breakdown of intellectualistic psychology the phenomena of 'determination' came slowly but certainly to be admitted to unquestioned standing in experimental psychology. Attitudes came into fashion.

(2) Under the influence of psychoanalytic theory the dynamic and unconscious character of attitudes became more fully recognized.

(3) In sociological writing there was a gradual turning of interest to attitudes considered as the concrete representations of culture. (p. 7)

Canary and Siebold (1984) explain that two views have dominated contemporary understanding of attitude structure and process (i) The Tripartite View: this view holds that an attitude is composed of three components that play coextensive and/or substitutive roles in determining behavior. The three components are (a) affect (judgments or preferences), (b) cognition (or beliefs regarding the objects attitudes), and (c) connotation (or intention to act in ways relevant to the object), and (ii) The Expectancy Approach: this approach is also called expectancy value, instrumental or subjective expected utility. This approach holds that an attitude is composed of beliefs regarding possible rewards and costs that result from acting toward the attitude object in particular ways.

With such an enormous diversity of literature available on the subject of attitude let us now consider a cross-section of representative definitions and characterizations of attitude.

Thurstone (1931): Attitude is the affect for or against a psychological object.

Allport (1935): An attitude is a mutual and neutral state of readiness, organized through experience, exerting a directive or dynamic influence upon the individual's response to all objects and situations with which it is related.
Osgood, Suci, and Tannenbaum (1957): (Attitudes) are predispositions to respond, but are distinguished from other such states of readiness in that they predispose toward an evaluative response.

Sarnoff (1960): (An attitude is) a disposition to react favorably to a class of objects.

Sherif and Sherif (1965): Attitudes refer to the stands the individual upholds and cherishes about objects, issues, persons, groups or institutions (p. 4).

Wagner and Sherwood (1969): Attitudes are evaluations of objects, ideas and people (p. 1).

Zimbardo and Ebbeson (1970): Attitudes have generally been regarded as either verbal readiness or implicit predispositions which exert some general and consistent influence on a fairly large class of evaluative responses. These responses are usually directed toward some object, person, or group (p. 6).

Gagne and Briggs (1979): Attitudes . . . considered as a human capability, an attitude is a persisting state that modifies the individual’s choices of action" (p. 55). Attitudes are complex states of human beings which affect their behavior toward people, things and events" (p. 85).

Canary and Siebold (1984): Attitude has been defined as a set of evaluations of some object, and/or as predisposition to respond in a consistent manner toward an attitude object" (p. 8).

ERIC Thesaurus (1987): Attitudes are predispositions to react to certain persons, objects, situations, ideas, etc., in a particular manner—not always consciously held (as are beliefs) nor readily verbalized (as are opinions) they are characterized as either affective or valuative.

While definitions and concepts of attitudes focus on a broad range of components, it is not difficult to find common themes that draw the diverse range of concepts together. According to Halloran (1970), Allport thought attitudes have the following attributes: (1) An attitude is a state of readiness leading the individual to perceive things and people in certain ways, (2) Attitudes are not innate—they are learned, they develop, and they
are organized through experience and these states of readiness are relatively enduring but they are modifiable and subject to change, (3) Attitudes are dynamic, and (4) Attitude is not directly observable.

Sherif and Sherif (1967) enhance Allport's thoughts on the characteristics of the concept of attitude. These characteristics are: (1) attitudes are not innate, (2) attitudes are not temporary states but are more or less enduring once they are formed, (3) attitudes always imply a relationship between the person and the objects, (4) the relationship between person and object is not neutral but has motivational-affective properties—the linkage between self and the social environment is seldom neutral, and (5) the subject-object relationship is accomplished through the formation of categories both differentiating between the objects and between the person's positive or negative relation to objects in the various categories.

Kretch, Crutchfield and Ballachey (1962) also argue that attitude has three basic components: (1) cognitive, (2) affective, and (3) action tendency, or, as stated by Triandis, Adamopoulos and Brinbery (1984) the three components are (1) idea (cognitive component), (2) the emotion attached to it (affective component), and (3) predisposition to action (the behavioral component). Whatever the terminology "cognitive, affective, connotative division is however still apparent when we look at the various components of attitude" (Lemon, 1973, p. 17).

Summary. Researchers agree that the concept of attitude is indispensable not only to the area of social psychology but to many allied and applied disciplines as well.
Scientific study concerning attitudes started in the middle of the nineteenth century. This early research was expanded to include attitude as a concept to explain social behavior. This concept went largely unchallenged until the late 1960's. Two views (i) The Tripartite View, and (ii) The Expectancy Approach have dominated contemporary understanding of attitude structures and processes.

There are an enormous variety of definitions used by researchers, definitions have been used since the study of attitudes became a reality. Today there is some consensus that the attitude concept is composed of three elements—a cognitive element, an affective element, and an action element.

**Attitude Measurement**

In Chapter I it is stated that this study is based on the assumption that attitude can be measured. In 1955 Goldberg wrote:

> The study of attitudes and opinion is actually the work of past generations. It can be said to have begun with the research of Bogardus and Thurstone in the second decade of this century. Subsequent investigations have developed improved scaling techniques and various theoretical contexts and have drawn upon research in related fields such as psychology, anthropology, psychiatry, psychoanalysis, sociology, and education to formulate the purposes and functions of attitudes. (p. 4)

Gay (1981) states that, "Attitudes can be measured toward self, others and a variety of other activities, institutions, and situations."

Friedman (1978) found that the most logical way of organizing an overview of attitude measures was by following five general categories of attitude measurement technique devised by Kiesler, Collins and Miller (1964). Those five categories are:

1. **Self-report measures.** According to Friedman (1978): F. Allport and Hartman (1925) took the initial step in efforts to provide methods for
the quantification of attitude measurement. Rather than directly examining the underlying attitude of their subjects by means of for-or-against replies to specific questions, they asked the subjects to select from a listing of opinions those which best characterized their attitudes. The Allport-Hartman scale made it possible to rank order subjects into subgroups according to attitudinal dimension. It did not, however, adequately deal with the relative distances between subgroups (Kiesler, Collins, and Miller, 1969, p. 44).

Gay (1981) states that four basic types of attitude scales are used predominantly in today's attitude measurement research: (1) Thurstone scales, (2) Likert scales, (3) Guttman scales, and (4) Semantic differential scales.

The "first major technique of attitude measurement" (Zimbardo and Ebbeson, 1969, p. 123) was developed by Thurstone and Chave in 1929. Attitude scores could be assigned to individuals using their equal-appearing interval scales. Friedman (1978) found that:

A Thurstone-Chave scale was composed of a number of independent opinion statements pertaining to a certain issue. Each statement was assigned a scale value by a panel of judges, which showed the strength of an affirmative response to the item. Subjects were instructed to place a check next to those statements with which they agreed, and individual scores were determined by the mean scale value of agreement response. The most significant characteristic of such scales was that they were constructed so that intervals between items were approximately equal along an attitudinal continuum, a major weakness of the Allport-Hartman scale. (p. 44)

Likert (1932) developed a scale of attitude measurement that did not rely on a panel of experts. Likert scales ask individuals to respond to a series of statements by indicating whether they strongly agree, agree, are undecided, disagree, or strongly disagree with each statement. Each
response is awarded a point value and an individual's score is determined by summing the point value for each statement (Gay, 1981). A Likert scale was used in section 2 of the instrument for Friedman's study. Friedman (1978) stated that: "The Attitudes Toward Correctional Inmates scale is a Likert rating scale which consists of a group of statements about correctional inmates and a six-point forced choice scale" (p. 82).

Guttman (1950a, 1950b) formalized the scalogram or cumulative scale technique of attitude measurement.

A Guttman scale was composed of a set of homogeneous statements that were designed to be undimensional in nature. The items were ordered along a continuum of "difficulty of acceptance"; that is, the individual's acceptance of a statement implied acceptance of all items of a lesser magnitude. Respondent's scores were based upon the number of statements with which they agreed. The logic of Guttman's scalogram is analogous to that of the Stanford-Binet Intelligence test, where individuals also encounter "successive hurdles. . . ." (Friedman, 1978, p. 45)

Osgood, Suci, and Tannenbaum (1957) developed the semantic differential technique by which attitudes were examined by focusing on the psychological meaning of a concept. The semantic differential scale, according to Gay (1981), asks an individual to give a quantitative rating to the subject of the attitude scale on a number of bipolar adjectives such as good-bad, friendly-unfriendly, and positive-negative. The respondent indicates the point on the continuum between the extremes that represents her or his attitude. Ary, Jacobs, and Razavich (1985) also stated that:

The Semantic Differential is based on the assumption that objects have two different types of meaning for individuals, denotative and connotative, which can be rated independently. Denotative meaning refers to the dictionary meaning of a word while connotative meaning refers to the associations or suggestions a word calls up. One can more easily state the denotative meaning of an object than its connotative meaning. It is possible, however, to measure the connotative meaning of objects indirectly by asking individuals to rate the object using a number of bipolar adjectives. Thus the meaning of an object for an individual would be
the pattern of his or her ratings of that object on the bipolar adjective scales. (p. 202)

The semantic differential technique used in this study as section 1 of the instrument will be fully described in Chapter 3. Kerlinger (1973) has shown that the technique is sufficiently reliable and valid for many research purposes, including attitude measurement. Friedman (1978) states that: "Self-report measures, . . . have been, by far, the most prevalent form of attitude measurement. An examination of recent studies showed that the semantic differential and Likert scales were most widely used techniques" (p. 46).

2. Observation of overt behavior. In many cases Ary, Jacobs, and Razavich (1985) state: "systematic direct observation of behavior is the most desirable measurement method. An investigator identifies the behavior of interest and devises a systematic procedure for identifying, categorizing, and recording the behavior in either a natural or a contrived situation" (p. 206).

In direct contrast to the increasingly sophisticated methodological efforts in the area of self-report measures of attitude, behavioral measures remain relatively crude. Even in clinical psychology, for example, where behavior is the focus of attention, experimenters have generally relied upon self-reporting or the reports of observers for information about subject performance. (Friedman, 1978, p. 47)

3. Reaction to or interpretation of partially structured stimuli. This infrequently used technique has one unique characteristic as described by Cook and Selltiz (1964), "while there may be no attempt to disguise the reference to the attitudinal object, the subject is not asked to state his own actions directly; he is ostensibly describing a scene, a character, or the behavior of a third person" (p. 47).
4. **Performance on "objective" tasks.** In research based on this technique the respondent was given "specific tasks to be performed; they are presented as tests of information or ability, or simply as jobs that need to be done" (Cook and Sellitiz, 1964, p. 50). These authors considered the basic assumption to be that "performance may be influenced by attitude and that a systematic bias in performance reflects the influence of attitude" (p. 50).

Some techniques that have been used in this category are listed by Friedman (1978) as follows: Hammond's (1948) error-choice technique, Cook's plausibility technique (Brigham and Cook, 1970; Waly and Cook, 1965), and the bogus pipeline technique of Jones and Sigall (1971).

5. **Physiological reactions.** According to Friedman (1978), "Tests in this area have attempted to measure attitude by measuring bodily responses to stimuli in an experimental setting" (p. 48). The author also gives examples of tests in this area, "The studies of galvanic skin response by Rankin and Campbell (1955), vascular constriction in the finger by Westie and DeFleur (1959), and pupil dilation (Hess, 1967; Hess and Polt, 1960; Woodmansee, 1965) used the physiological approach."

Obviously the techniques mentioned above have a very restricted use for the overall area of attitude research. Efforts to use and implement these types of techniques are evidently at the most basic level.

In summary it is apparent that techniques have been developed that enable attitudes to be measured. There are, however, problems as pointed out by Insko (1967), "existing research leaves much to be desired, both from the standpoint of methodological rigor and from the standpoint of neglected
problem areas" (p. 345). Friedman (1978) briefly states the following problem areas:

Reluctance on the part of the investigators, despite uncertainty about pretest interactions, to use posttest-only designs; the use of sample sizes that are too small to make posttest scores statistically reliable; the obvious influence of experimenter bias in many studies; and the failure of investigators to use the most sophisticated means of statistical analysis and psychomatic techniques. . . . (pp. 48-49)

The two techniques used in this study are generally regarded as both valid and reliable in the measurement of attitude. As such they remain a good tool for measuring attitude.

**Teacher Attitudes**

Friedman (1978) found that "the literature on attitudes toward those incarcerated in correctional institutions was sparse" (p. 49). Because of this lack of information, the area of teacher attitudes in general and the effects these attitudes have on both the system and the individual learner were explored for this study.

There appears to be a definite need to study the attitudes of those who teach the disadvantaged and non-mainstream students. Skrtic, Sigler, and Lazar (1973) stated that "negative attitudes toward handicapped children among professionals serving exceptional persons can be more harmful and crippling than any mental or physical state inherent to the exceptional individuals" (p. 1). Combs (1965) also reported that "what a teacher believes . . . about the nature of his students will have a most important effect on how he behaves toward them" (p. 21).

Sherif and Sherif (1965) felt that:

Having an attitude means that the individual is no longer neutral toward the referents of an attitude. He is for or against, positively inclined or negatively disposed in some degree toward them
not just momentarily, but in a lasting way as long as the attitude in question is operative . . . once a class of objects or persons is thus charged with favorable or unfavorable value for the individual, he sees, things related to them in a selective way. (p. 5)

Attitudes of teachers toward learners, according to Bills (1975), must be of extreme concern to schools because they have such a profound influence on the behavior and learning ability of students. However improvement in education often falters because as Stern and Keislar (1975) state;

In the welter of effort to improve education, large scale programs are launched as an operation in which the various components, the resources of materials and people alike must be marshalled to create the success of the venture. While any program involving national concerns must deal with a broad picture it often happens the program falters because of a key factor, the human element, is not adequately considered. (p. 11)

In an update research review in 1977 the same authors wrote;

Basically, the effectiveness of the school depends upon the organizational environment, the competencies of the teaching staff, and the instructional resources. It also involves consideration of the predispositions of teachers, their affective reactions—their attitudes. This is the case because not only do such facets of the teachers make-up help determine how such resources are utilized in the classroom, but also they have a profound influence upon the student.

Often such programs fail to fulfill expectations because a key factor, the human element, is given inadequate consideration. (p. 63)

According to Reid (1984), "it is difficult to overestimate the potential importance of the child's teacher on his or her development" (p. 158). The teacher-learner relationship is crucial in the learners development, behavior, and overall achievement in the school situation. Teachers have a profound influence on the learners achievements, particularly so if the teacher holds a negative attitude toward the learner. Even so, little
research has been completed in this area (Bills, 1975; Friedman and Bloom, 1980; Jones, 1984; Jones and Guskin, 1984; Johnson and Johnson, 1984; Lundstrom, 1979; Overbeck, 1971; Sherif and Sherif, 1965; and Stern and Keislar, 1975, 1977).

In the area of special populations, Jones and Guskin (1984) suggest:

... that if a person is thought to be a member of a group considered relatively incompetent (e.g., the retarded) such strong expectations will be aroused in others that they will invariably make the person behave incompetently even if he or she has been mislabelled. (p. 5)

The authors also contend that in interactions with learners in special education settings that "we always assume that attitudes have consequences. More favorable attitudes lead to more desirable behavior" (p. 12). Johnson and Johnson (1984) in studying learning and attitudes involving handicapped students concluded that inappropriate attitudes are those that make for a more painful and troubled life through decreasing one's ability to maintain oneself to develop in constructive and healthy ways. Stern and Keislar (1975) pointed out that faculty attitudes assume even more significance in the cognitive and affective development of their students when those students possess special characteristics.

Lundstrom (1979) also believes that negative attitudes have adverse effects on disadvantaged and handicapped student's self-concepts and school performance. Thus in order to assist the students to fully reach their potential the teachers need to display a positive attitude. Thus Lundstrom (1979) states:

When teachers hold positive expectations of students, and students then live up to those expectations, a situation exists which is advantageous to the student. However when expectations are negative, a situation exists whereby students are prevented from reaching full potential. Unfortunately this is often the case for disadvantaged and handicapped students. (p. 6)
Overbeck (1971) also feels that "it is generally recognized that the attitudes and proficiencies of the ward staff represent a most crucial variable in the successful implementation of residential programming" (p. 8). In summing up, Lundstrom (1979) suggests that dealing with teacher attitudes is a crucial factor in providing special needs students with equal and non-restrictive environments for learning.

A fine-grained analysis to clarify the relationship between teacher attitudes and achievement seems to indicate that while a teacher with a positive attitude may have little influence, the teacher with a negative attitude can have an adverse effect (Aiken, 1970). Stern and Keislar (1975) agree that "it appears that an unfavorable attitude on the part of a teacher toward the subject is likely to induce negative student attitudes, it is less probable that a favorable teacher attitude will have positive effects" (p. 16).

Students behave according to expectations they perceive others have about them and this can have a bearing on school performance. Lundstrom (1979) contends:

These teacher expectations, triggered by any variables . . . begin the cycle. Teacher expectations of students determine in part how the teacher reacts toward those students. Studies by Alexander and Strain, 1978, showed that teachers acted differently when they were with students classified as high scholastic achievers than with students who were low scholastic achievers. They spent less time, interacted verbally in less positive and supportive ways, showed less instructional clarity, gave contradictory messages with regard to permitted behavior, used more sarcasm and threats, and were likely to accept poor performance and less likely to praise good performance when it occurred with students perceived to be low achievers. (p. 6)
Teacher expectations for the learner, the teacher's treatment of the learner and ultimately the child's self-expectation and performance are closely linked. Stern and Keislar (1977) believe that "most people would agree that teacher's attitudes toward students have an important impact on how students believe about themselves, as well as on the rate at which they acquire academic skills" (p. 66). It is not unreasonable to assume that because of their attitudes, teachers do act differently toward their students on an individual level. "One cannot help but recognize that teachers do have emotional reactions to certain attributes of students and that these feelings, or attitudes, predispose them to behave differentially toward them" (Stern and Keislar, 1977, p. 66).

In summary, it is true that teacher-learner relationships are very subtle and while some schools of thought discount the value of positive teacher attitudes toward students there can, according to the literature, be no doubt as to the importance of the attitudes of the teacher. Stern and Keislar (1975, 1977) who consulted over 5,000 references in their massive study of teacher attitudes in 1975 enumerated two most significant points that are directly relevant to this present study (i) that teacher attitudes do make a difference in the teaching-learning process, and (ii) attitudes assume even more significance in the cognitive and affective development of their students when those students possess special characteristics.
CHAPTER III
RESEARCH PROCEDURES

This research was focused on the correctional educators of Ohio’s maximum and close security prisons. This study sought answers to questions concerning the attitudes of correctional educators toward the inmate learner.

This chapter includes the research questions, a description of the population, research design, instrumentation, and data analysis.

Questions

This study was focused on correctional educators of Ohio’s maximum and close security prisons and will describe and analyze their attitudes toward inmate learners in those prisons.

This study sought information concerning the following questions:

1. What are the attitudes of the correctional educator toward the inmate learner in Ohio’s maximum and close security prisons?

2. Are the attitudes of experienced correctional educators toward the inmate learner different from those of inexperienced correctional educators?

3. Is there a difference between the attitudes of male and female correctional educators toward the inmate learner?

4. Is there a difference between the attitudes of academic and vocational correctional educators toward the inmate learner?

5. Is there a difference between the attitudes of correctional educators in maximum security prisons and close security prisons toward the inmate learner?
Population

The population studied was 73 correctional educators from maximum and close security prisons in the state of Ohio. The exact breakdown of correctional educators by prison is as follows: Marion Correctional Institution (16), Ohio State Reformatory at Mansfield (19), Lebanon Correctional Institution (25), and the Southern Ohio Correctional Facility (13). This population consists of the total available correctional educators within the frame. This enables the most complete and accurate information possible for a full analysis.

Research Design

This study assessed the attitudes of correctional educators in Ohio's maximum and close security prisons toward inmate learners. Descriptive research involves collecting data to answer questions concerning the current status of the subject of the study. A descriptive study determines and reports the way things are (Gay, 1981). Ary, Jacobs, and Razavich (1985) contend that "descriptive research studies are designed to obtain information concerning the current status of phenomena" (p. 322).

Gay (1981) states that "typical descriptive studies are concerned with the assessment of attitudes, opinions, demographic information, conditions and procedures" (p. 153).

To gain this assessment of attitudes this study used the survey method which according to Thiel (1987) has the advantage of "(1) providing a description of a field at a given time, (2) gathering a great deal of representative information, (3) identifying areas where other types of research
are needed, and (4) focusing on information about a specific, definable population" (p. 35).

There are, however, acknowledgements that weaknesses in survey research exist. Interest in weaknesses centers on concern for accurate responses by the participants, an adequate response rate, the amount of time, money and manpower required, and the cooperation of the individuals under study (Dillman, 1978).

To control for these weaknesses this research used the concepts developed by Dillman (1978). To maximize response rate and to control for nonresponse error, the writer adhered to a number of Dillman's principles. The researcher personally administered the instruments to all participants using clear verbal and written instructions. This had the effect of minimizing the cost of responding by reducing the time needed to complete the survey. The instrument was simple, easy to respond to and took very little time to complete, thus there was no direct cost to the participant and because of the guaranteed anonymity of the process the chance of personal risk and embarrassment was eliminated.

The method of collecting data was largely a control for nonresponse error. By the writer administering the instrument in person there was a very low nonresponse rate.

Any absentees or nonrespondents at the time of the data collection, were left instruments in addressed, stamped envelopes for the absentees to complete and forward by mail to the writer. If this follow up proved to be unsuccessful, a strategy to compare respondents to nonrespondents on known characteristics (demographics) was used. If there are no significant
differences in terms of demographics, then according to Miller and Smith (1983) it can be assumed that responses from nonrespondents would be the same as those who responded.

The purpose of this research was to describe the attitudes of correctional educators in Ohio's maximum and close security prisons toward inmate learners. To accomplish this, attitude scales were used, these were developed by Friedman (1978). Attitude scales, according to Gay (1981), attempt to determine what an individual believes, perceives, or feels. Attitudes can be measured toward self, others and a variety of other attitudes, institutions, and situations. There are four basic types of attitude scales: Likert, semantic differential, Thurstone, and Guttman scales.

**Instrumentation**

The following techniques was used in this study:

**Likert Scale**—this asks an individual to respond to a series of statements by indicating whether she or he strongly agrees, agrees, is undecided, disagrees, or strongly disagrees with each statement. Each response is associated with a point value and an individual’s score is determined by summing the point values for each statement. (Gay, 1981, p. 126)

**Semantic Differential Scale**—asks an individual to give a quantitative rating to the subject of the attitude scale on a number of bipolar adjectives such as good-bad, friendly-unfriendly, positive-negative. The respondent indicates the point on the continuum between the extremes that represents her or his attitude. (Gay, 1981, p. 126)

The instruments used in this study were developed by Dr. Arthur M. Friedman (1978). They will be used with the full written consent of Dr. Friedman. This consent is outlined in appendix A.

There are three sections to the instrument, they are as follows:

**The Semantic Differential.** The selection of scales for use in Friedman’s (1978) research problem, as suggested by Osgood et al. (1957), based upon: (a) factional composition, i.e., according to
evaluative activity, and potency dimensions; and (b) relevance to
the concept being judged, i.e., suitability to the research prob­
lem. Normally, approximately three scales have been selected to
represent each factor, using Osgood, Suci, and Tannenbaum's relat­
ed factor loadings matrix of 50 bipolar adjective pairs (1957,
p. 37) described above to choose maximum loadings on the most
significant factor and minimum loadings on the other factors.
For example, attitude studies have normally relied heavily on the
evaluative factor (Kerlinger, 1973).

The semantic differential technique has been shown to be suffi­
ciently reliable and valid for many research purposes, including
attitude measurement (Kerlinger, 1973). The final form of the
semantic differential used in this study was derived from the
results of pilot testing by Friedman.

First, three bipolar adjective pairs were selected from the
rotated factor loadings matrix. . . . Next, eight additional
adjective pairs were chosen for pilot-testing purposes. In addi­
tion to their factorial compositions, these adjectives were con­
sidered relevant to the concept used--"correctional inmate." The
order of adjectives on the pilot test form was determined random­
ly, and the order was reversed at random.

A technique developed by A. Edwards (1957) and followed by Yuker,
Block, and Young (1970) was used to select the adjective pairs
for the final semantic differential. As described by Yuker et
al.: 'First, high and low scoring groups were established on the
basis of the total score obtained on the preliminary scale. High
and low score was determined by dividing the group at the median
of the total score distribution. These high and low groups pro­
vided an internal criterion of the discriminative ability of each
item' (1970, p. 19). In addition, the scores of an effort to
eliminate those adjective pairs that failed to demonstrate the
ability to discriminate. Four adjective pairs--light-heavy,
large-small, cold-hot, active-passive--were eliminated by these
methods, yielding the final form of 13 adjective pairs.

The subjects for the pilot-testing phases described above were
nine faculty members from Corning Community College in Corning,
New York, and twelve students enrolled in a beginning graduate-
level course, Contemporary Issues in Education, at the College of
William and Mary in Williamsburg, Virginia.

The emphasis in determining the validity of pilot-test and final
form of the semantic differential was placed upon content validi­
y. A group of psychologists and correctional educators were
shown Osgood, Suci, and Tannenbaum's rotated factor loadings
matrix for suggestions in selecting appropriate adjective pairs to
be used. A consensus of the group that the pilot-test and final
form of the semantic differential were suitable for this study was
requested and obtained.
In addition, two reliability measurements were used. Using the questionnaires of the subjects described above, even-numbered items were placed in one group and odd-numbered items in another group (after one item was eliminated at random to force an even number of items). The split-halves reliability coefficient was then calculated:

\[ \text{IS-H} = .96 \ (n = 21) \]

Bruning and Kintz (1977) reported that 'a high reliability value (.70 or higher) shows that the test is reliably (accurately) measuring the characteristic it was designed to measure' (p. 210).

In order to measure the stability of the semantic differential, two different administrations of the test were given to 15 elementary school teachers from Enon Elementary School in Enon, Virginia, two weeks apart. Test-retest reliability was measured by calculating the Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient between the first and second tests:

\[ r = .99 \ (n = 15) \]

This measurement is also referred to as the coefficient of stability (Brunning & Kintz, 1977).

**Attitudes Toward Correctional Inmates Scale (ATCI).** The ATCI was developed by the investigator in an attempt to measure characteristics of the attitudes of community college faculty members toward correctional inmates... The ATCI is a Likert rating scale which consists of a group of statements about correctional inmates and a six-point forced choice scale. The investigator relied heavily on the techniques used by Yunker, Block, and Young in their development of the Attitudes Toward Disabled Persons (ATDP) scale, first published in 1960, and used similar testing methods as described earlier in deriving the final form of the semantic differential.

First, a list of statements, derived from the literature, personal experiences, and from suggestions made by inmates enrolled in the Associate of Applied Science in Business Management program offered at the Petersburg Federal Correctional Institution by John Tyler Community College, was compiled. The list was then presented to a panel of psychologists and correctional educators, who eliminated those lacking in face validity. The panel also modified other items. The remaining statements were then pilot-tested by the same subjects as those who pilot-tested the semantic differential. The statements were intended to elicit information in the areas of general opinion of the sample population toward correctional inmates and correctional education, stereotypes and
stigmas associated with prisoners, and the personal characteristics of inmates. The statements were ordered at random, and half were randomly selected to be phrased negatively.

Following the same procedures of item analysis as used in developing the final form of the semantic differential scale in order to gauge the discriminative ability of each item, the following changes were made to the pilot-test form of the ATCI in deriving the final form: items 5, 7, 9, 11, and 12 were eliminated for their failure to discriminate between low and high scores; item 10 was eliminated because it discriminated in the reverse direction than intended; item 14 proved to be difficult for respondents to understand and was eliminated; and item 6 was altered to reflect the comments added by pilot-test subjects. The final form of the ATCI thus consists of nine general statements (upon which a subject's score is computed). . . . As a final note on the composition of the ATCI, items 1, 2, 4, and 9 of the final form showed pilot-test tendencies toward a ceiling, or non-discriminative effect. However, because the intent of the scale included the hope that a faculty member profile might be developed, the items were included.

The split-halves reliability coefficient and the Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient were calculated as follows:

\[ r_{SH} = .72 \ (n = 21) \]
\[ r_{SH} = .74 \ (n = 15) \]

The directions used with the semantic differential were those suggested by Osgood et al. (1957), and those used with ATCI were revisions of those which accompany the ATDP of Yunker et al. (1970). . . . For both tests, negatively phased items were to be reversed before scoring and high scores would, thus, reflect positive attitudes. (Friedman, 1978, pp. 79-84)

Demographic Section. A range of demographic variables will be examined in this section. Including: sex, current position, years of experience as a correctional educator, and security classification of the prison where the teacher is currently situated.

These categories are based on those used by DeGraw (1987) in his study of correctional educators in adult correctional institutions.
Data Analysis

Data obtained from the correctional educators were coded and analyzed using the statistical program for the social sciences (SPSSX) available at the Information and Research Computing Center at The Ohio State University.

Coding

The Semantic Differential:
1. Negatively phrased items were to be reversed before scoring
2. If more than ten percent of the items were omitted, the instrument is to be considered unusable.
3. High scores reflect positive attitudes.
4. Range 0-78.
5. Scoring on the item scale of 0-6 with 0 indicating the negative end and 6 the positive
6. Ranges are 0-38 (negative) 39 (neutral) 40-78 (positive).

The ATCI:
1. If more than 10 percent of the items were omitted the instrument is to be considered unusable.
2. Negatively phrased items were to be reversed before scoring.
3. Responses were converted from the -3 to +3 continuum on the questionnaire to a scale of 0-6 (strongly disagree to strongly agree).
4. High scores reflect positive attitudes.
5. Ranges are: 0-26 (negative) 27 (neutral) 28-54 (positive).
The Demographic Section

1. Sections coded as follows:
   - Sex—Male (1), Female (2)
   - Current Position—Academic Teacher (1), Vocational Teacher (2)
   - Security Classification—Maximum (1), Close (2)

2. The number of years worked as it appears, e.g., 10

3. Additional comments are transcribed as they appear. The comments made by the respondents are then analyzed to reflect common themes, major statements concerning correctional education, and pertinent points regarding this research.

Frequencies, percentages, means, standard deviations, and crosstabulations were used to describe the variables associated with the study.

The response rate of correctional educators is presented in tables as follows: Response Rate of Correctional Educators in Ohio's Maximum and Close Security Prisons (1) and Response Rate of Correctional Educators by Institution (2). The following tables reflect the demographic information obtained from Section 3 of the instrument: Response Rate of Correctional Educators by Sex (3), Response Rate of Correctional Educators by Teaching Position (Academic or Vocational) (4), Response Rate of Correctional Educators by Type of Institution (Maximum or Close Security (5), Response Rate of Correctional Educators by the Variable: Years of Service in Correctional Education (6), and Years of Service in Correctional Education of Respondents (7).

The respondent's scores on the Semantic Differential test and the ATCI test are presented in tables Frequencies of Scores on the Semantic Differential (8), Respondent's Scores on the Semantic Differential (9), Frequencies of Scores on the ATCI (10), and Respondent's Scores on the ATCI (11).
The correlations between the scores on the Semantic Differential and the ATCI and the demographic variables will be described in table 12. Specifically, Spearman Rho was used to calculate the correlation between the variables mentioned. Davis (1971) gave the following indications as measures of association:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.70 or higher</td>
<td>Very strong association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.50 to .69</td>
<td>Substantial association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.30 to .49</td>
<td>Moderate association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.10 to .29</td>
<td>Low association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.01 to .09</td>
<td>Negligible association</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The cross-tabulation analysis of positive, negative, and neutral attitudes indicated by scores obtained from the semantic differential and the ATCI, and inexperienced/experienced correctional educators, male/female correctional educators, academic/vocational educators, and educators from maximum/close security institutions are displayed in tables 13-20.

The test of chi square, which according to Gay (1981), is "a non-parametric test of significance appropriate when the data are in the form of frequency counts; it compares proportions actually observed in a study with proportions expected to see if they are significantly different" (p. 430), will be used to test associations these data are displayed in tables 13-20 also.

A comparison of the scores of the Semantic Differential and the ATCI by each demographic variable using the T-Test are presented in tables 21-28.

The following tables reflect information from the respondents with a reduced set of scores: Adjusted Response Rate of Correctional Educators (29), Adjusted Scores on the Semantic Differential (N=49) (30), Adjusted
Scores on the ATCI (N=45) (31), Correlations for the Semantic Differential (N=49) and the ATCI (N=45) by Demographic Variables (32). A factor analysis was conducted on the Semantic Differential and the ATCI. These data are displayed in table 33.
CHAPTER IV
FINDINGS

The results and analysis of data obtained from the survey instrument are contained in this chapter. The purpose of the survey was to obtain information concerning the attitudes of correctional educators toward inmate learners in Ohio's maximum and close security prisons. The study also sought to determine if any differences in attitude existed between male and female correctional educators, between more experienced and less experienced correctional educators, between academic and vocational correctional educators, and between correctional educators at Ohio's maximum and close security prisons.

The survey also contained questions concerning selected demographic variables including, sex, type of institution, position currently held, and years of teaching in a correctional institution. An analysis to determine the nature of the relationship that exists between these demographic variables and the scores on the semantic differential and the ATCI is included in this study.

In addition to providing descriptive data regarding correctional educators in Ohio's maximum and close security prisons, personal insights into correctional educators who filled out the comments section are provided by the survey. Throughout this study an alpha level of .05 was used as the accepted level of significance.
The results reported in this chapter are based on data obtained from 64 (87.7%) of 73 correctional educators working in Ohio's maximum and close security prisons.

The findings are reported under four headings: (1) Response Data, (2) Descriptive Data, (3) Analysis of Data, and (4) Analysis of Comments.

Response Data

Correctional educators from Marion Correctional Institution, Ohio State Reformatory at Mansfield, Lebanon Correctional Institution, and the Southern Ohio Correctional Facility participated in this study. Tables 1-6 indicate response rates.

TABLE 1
RESPONSE RATE OF CORRECTIONAL EDUCATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number Possible</th>
<th>Number Completed</th>
<th>Percent Completed</th>
<th>Number Usable</th>
<th>Percentage Usable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>87.7</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>86.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of a 73 possible correctional educators 64 (87.7%) participated in the study. From these 64 correctional educators 63 (86.3%) usable instruments were obtained, as is indicated by the data in Table 1.
TABLE 2
RESPONSE RATE OF CORRECTIONAL EDUCATORS BY INSTITUTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Number Possible</th>
<th>Number Completed</th>
<th>Percent Completed</th>
<th>Number Usable</th>
<th>Percentage Usable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marion Correctional Institution</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>87.5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>87.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio State Reformatory at Mansfield</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>89.5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>89.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebanon Correctional Institution</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Ohio Correctional Facility</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>92.3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>92.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At Marion Correctional Institution there were 14 (87.5%) respondents. At the Ohio State Reformatory at Mansfield there were 19 (89.5%) respondents. At Lebanon Correctional Institution there were 21 (84%) respondents. At the Southern Ohio Correctional Facility there were 12 (92.3%) respondents.

Respondents were asked to indicate their sex. These data are reported in Table 3.
TABLE 3
RESPONSE RATE BY SEX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Cumulative Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>63.5</td>
<td>63.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data were provided by 63 correctional educators. These respondents indicated that 40 (63.5%) were males and 23 (36.5%) were females.

Respondents were asked to indicate the position they currently held at the correctional institution. These data are reported in Table 4.

TABLE 4
RESPONSE RATE BY TEACHING POSITION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Cumulative Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>63.5</td>
<td>63.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data were provided by 63 correctional educators. These respondents indicated (Table 4) that 40 (63.5%) were academic teachers and 23 (36.5%) were vocational teachers.
The 63 respondents were asked to indicate the type of institution at which they currently were employed. The institutions were classified according to security classification. These data are reported in Table 5.

**TABLE 5**

RESPONSE RATE BY TYPE OF INSTITUTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Cumulative Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Security</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close Security</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>77.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The respondents indicated (Table 5) that 14 (22.2%) of correctional educators surveyed were employed in a maximum security institution and 49 (77.8%) were employed in a close security institution.

Respondents were asked to indicate how many years of service they had attained in the field of correctional education. These data are reported in Tables 6 and 7.
### Table 6
**RESPONSE RATE BY THE VARIABLE: YEARS OF SERVICE IN CORRECTIONAL EDUCATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of Service</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Cumulative Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>36.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>38.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>42.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>50.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>69.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>73.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>77.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>81.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>84.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>88.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>93.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>95.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>96.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>98.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 7
**YEARS OF SERVICE IN CORRECTIONAL EDUCATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.68</td>
<td>5.70</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>1 - 28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 63
Data were provided by 63 correctional educators. The respondents indicated (Table 7) that the average length of service in correctional education was 7.68 years and the range was 1 year to 28 years.

**Descriptive Data**

Respondents were asked to complete the Semantic Differential section of the survey instrument. This instrument yields a raw score which was later used to determine if the respondent has a positive, negative, or neutral attitude. Data concerning these raw scores are contained in Table 8.

**TABLE 8**

**FREQUENCIES OF SCORES ON THE SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Cumulative Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>27.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>31.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>36.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>44.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>49.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>52.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>55.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>61.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>63.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>69.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>74.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>77.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>88.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>90.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>92.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>95.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>96.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>98.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 63 100.0 100.0
Respondents were scored on the Semantic Differential and these data are reported in Table 9.

**TABLE 9**

**SCORES ON THE SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>33.89</td>
<td>0-54</td>
<td>10.64</td>
<td>1.34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data were provided by 63 respondents. The respondents indicated (Table 9) that the average score on the Semantic Differential was 33.89 with a range of 0 to 54 and a standard deviation of 10.64. The range within one standard deviation was 23 to 44.

Respondents were asked to complete the ATCI section of the survey instrument. This instrument yielded a raw score which was later used to indicate whether the respondent had a positive, negative, or neutral attitude. Data concerning these raw scores are contained in Table 10.
TABLE 10
FREQUENCIES OF SCORES ON THE ATCI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Cumulative Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>30.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>36.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>44.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>47.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>49.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>55.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>58.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>60.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>61.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>65.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>68.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>69.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>79.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>81.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>82.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>87.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>88.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>90.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>92.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>95.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>96.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>98.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Respondents were scored on the ATCI and these data are reported in Table 11.

**TABLE 11**
SCORES ON THE ATCI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26.87</td>
<td>0-48</td>
<td>9.52</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data were provided by 63 respondents. The respondents indicated (Table 11) that the average score on the ATCI was 26.87 with a range of 0 to 48 and a standard deviation of 9.52. The range within one standard deviation was 17 to 36.

**Analysis of Data**

**Correlations**

Correlations indicate the degree of association between two variables. In this research the dependent variable of attitude of correctional educators, as indicated by a score on either the Semantic Differential or the ATCI was correlated with the independent variables of sex, position, institution, and service. The correlations are reported in Table 12. In addition to calculating correlations, a coefficient of significance was used to measure the extent of the association that existed between the dependent and independent variables.
The Spearman Rho correlation coefficient was used to calculate the relationship between the scores on the Semantic Differential, the ATCI, and (1) sex of the correctional educator, (2) position held by the correctional educator, (3) type of institution where the correctional educator works, and (4) the number of years the correctional educator has served in correctional education.

The relationship between these variables is described in Table 12.

**TABLE 12**

**CORRELATIONS FOR THE SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL AND THE ATCI SCORES BY DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instrument</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Semantic</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>.230</td>
<td>-.162</td>
<td>-.209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differential</td>
<td>N(=63)</td>
<td>N(=63)</td>
<td>N(=63)</td>
<td>N(=63)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
<td>Sig .365</td>
<td>Sig .035</td>
<td>Sig .102</td>
<td>Sig .050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATCI Score</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.265</td>
<td>.109</td>
<td>-.192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N(=63)</td>
<td>N(=63)</td>
<td>N(=63)</td>
<td>N(63)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig .475</td>
<td>Sig .018</td>
<td>Sig .197</td>
<td>Sig .066</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results of correlations between Semantic Differential scores, ATCI scores, and demographic variables are displayed in Table 12.

The scores on the Semantic Differential and the ATCI were not associated with the sex of the correctional educator. The association was very low in magnitude as was indicated by significance measures of .365 on the Semantic Differential and .475 on the ATCI.
The scores on the Semantic Differential and the ATCI were closely associated with the correctional educators position. This association was substantial in magnitude as indicated by significance measures of .035 on the Semantic Differential and .018 on the ATCI.

Semantic Differential and ATCI scores were not closely associated with the type of institution at which the correctional educator worked. The association was low in magnitude as indicated by a negative and negligible significance measure of .102 on the Semantic Differential. The association was low in magnitude as indicated by a significance measure of .197 on the ATCI.

The scores on the Semantic Differential and the ATCI were moderately associated with years of service. This relationship was moderate in magnitude and negative as indicated by a significance measure of .050 on the Semantic Differential. However the relationship was not significant at the .066 level as measured by the ATCI.

Summary of Correlations

Four Demographic variables were investigated in this research. They included: (1) sex, (2) position, (3) type of institution, and (4) years of service as a correctional educator. Two variables: position (academic or vocational) and years of service appear to have a meaningful association with the scores of correctional educators on the Semantic Differential and the ATCI instruments. This indicates that correctional educator's attitudes in this study are significantly associated with position held and years of service.
The two other variables: sex and type of institution appear not to have a significant association with the attitudes of correctional educators as measured by the Semantic Differential and ATCI.

**Cross-Tabulation Analysis**

Cross-tabulation analysis is a way of indicating an association between the "rows" and "columns" of the cross-tabulation table. In this section independent variables of sex, position, institution, and service are grouped with attitude (positive, neutral, or negative).

The cross-tabulations are reported in Tables 13-20. In addition to setting out cross-tabulations the following statistics—Chi-square, which according to Gravetter and Wallnau (1985) "may also be used to examine the extent to which two variables are related," degrees of freedom, and significance were calculated to aid in determining the level of association between the variables.
### TABLE 13

CROSS-TABULATION ANALYSIS OF NEGATIVE, NEUTRAL, AND POSITIVE ATTITUDES (AS MEASURED BY THE SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL) AND SEX OF CORRECTIONAL EDUCATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEX</th>
<th>MALE</th>
<th>FEMALE</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S.D. Attitude</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(26.7)</td>
<td>(15.3)</td>
<td></td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1.3)</td>
<td>(.7)</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(12.1)</td>
<td>(6.9)</td>
<td></td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLUMN TOTAL</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63.5%</td>
<td>36.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Expected values are listed within the brackets in the table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chi Square</th>
<th>Degrees of Freedom</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The relationship between attitude and sex (males and females) as indicated by data in Table 13 was not significant at the .05 level of significance.

The significance level of the cross-tabulation analysis (0.44) indicates that a low level of association exists between the two variables.
### TABLE 14

CROSS-TABULATION ANALYSIS OF NEGATIVE, NEUTRAL, AND POSITIVE ATTITUDES (AS MEASURED BY THE ATCI) AND SEX OF CORRECTIONAL EDUCATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEX</th>
<th>MALE</th>
<th>FEMALE</th>
<th>ROW TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ATCI Attitude</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>22 (22.2)</td>
<td>13 (12.8)</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>1 (1.3)</td>
<td>1 (0.7)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>17 (16.5)</td>
<td>9 (9.5)</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COLUMN</strong></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>63.5%</td>
<td>36.5%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Expected values are listed within the brackets in the table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chi Square</th>
<th>Degrees of Freedom</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A low level relationship was shown to exist between attitude and sex (males and females) as indicated by data in Table 14.

The significance level of the cross-tabulation analysis (0.90) indicates that a low level association exists between the two variables.
TABLE 15
CROSS-TABULATION ANALYSIS OF NEGATIVE, NEUTRAL, AND POSITIVE ATTITUDES (AS MEASURED BY THE SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL) AND ACADEMIC AND VOCATIONAL CORRECTIONAL EDUCATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POSITION</th>
<th>ACADEMIC</th>
<th>VOCATIONAL</th>
<th>ROW TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S.D. Attitude</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLUMN</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>63.5%</td>
<td>36.5%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Expected values are listed within the brackets in the table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chi Square</th>
<th>Degrees of Freedom</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.90</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A significant relationship was shown to exist between attitude and position (academic and vocational) as indicated by data in Table 15.

The significance level of the cross-tabulation analysis (0.01) does indicate a strong association between the variables.
### Table 16

**Cross-Tabulation Analysis of Negative, Neutral, and Positive Attitudes (As Measured by the ATCI) and Academic and Vocational Correctional Educators**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ATCI Attitude</th>
<th>Academic</th>
<th>Vocational</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
<td>24 (22.2)</td>
<td>11 (12.8)</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Neutral</strong></td>
<td>2 (1.3)</td>
<td>0 (.7)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Positive</strong></td>
<td>14 (16.5)</td>
<td>12 (9.5)</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COLUMN</strong></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>63.5%</td>
<td>36.5%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Expected values are listed within the brackets in the table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chi Square</th>
<th>Degrees of Freedom</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A low level relationship was shown to exist between attitude and position (academic and vocational) as indicated by Table 16.

The significance level of cross-tabulation analysis (0.27) indicated that a weak association exists between the two variables.
TABLE 17
CROSS-TABULATION ANALYSIS OF NEGATIVE, NEUTRAL, AND POSITIVE ATTITUDES (AS MEASURED BY THE SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL) AND TYPE OF INSTITUTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INSTITUTION</th>
<th>MAXIMUM</th>
<th>CLOSE</th>
<th>ROW TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S.D. Attitude</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(9.3)</td>
<td>(32.7)</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.4)</td>
<td>(1.6)</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(4.2)</td>
<td>(14.8)</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLUMN TOTAL</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>71.8%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Expected values are listed within the brackets in the table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chi Square</th>
<th>Degrees of Freedom</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A low level relationship was shown to exist between attitude and institution (maximum and close) as indicted by data in Table 17.

The significance level of cross-tabulation analysis (0.16) indicated that a low level association exists between the two variables at the accepted significance of .05 level.
TABLE 18
CROSS-TABULATION ANALYSIS OF NEGATIVE, NEUTRAL, AND POSITIVE ATTITUDES (AS MEASURED BY THE ATCI) AND TYPE OF INSTITUTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INSTITUTION</th>
<th>MAXIMUM</th>
<th>CLOSE</th>
<th>ROW TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ATCI Attitude</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(7.8)</td>
<td>(27.2)</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.4)</td>
<td>(1.6)</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(5.8)</td>
<td>(20.2)</td>
<td>41.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLUMN TOTAL</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>77.8%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Expected values are listed within the brackets in the table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chi Square</th>
<th>Degrees of Freedom</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.95298</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A low level relationship was shown to exist between attitude and institution (maximum and close) as shown by data in Table 18.

The significance level of cross-tabulation analysis (0.62) indicated that a low level of association existed between the two variables.
A moderate relationship was shown to exist between attitude and inexperienced and experienced correctional educators as indicated by data in Table 19.

The significance level of cross-tabulation analysis (0.06) indicated that a moderate association existed between the two variables.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ATCI Attitude</th>
<th>INEXPERIENCED</th>
<th>EXPERIENCED</th>
<th>ROW TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>8 (10.0)</td>
<td>27 (25.0)</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>0 (0.6)</td>
<td>2 (1.4)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>10 (7.4)</td>
<td>16 (18.6)</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLUMN TOTAL</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Expected values are listed within the brackets in the table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chi Square</th>
<th>Degrees of Freedom</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A low level relationship was shown to exist between attitude and inexperienced and experienced correctional educators as indicated by data in Table 20.

The significance level of cross-tabulation analysis (0.27) indicated that a low level association existed between the two variables.
Summary

Tables 13 through 20 summarize the results of cross-tabulations conducted and the statistics used.

Data in Table 15 (using the variables attitude and position) indicated that a strong association existed between the variables and Table 19 (using the variables attitude, experienced, and inexperienced correctional educators) indicated that a moderate association did exist for the variables in this table.

In all other tables (13, 14, 16-18, and 20) no significant association appeared to exist.
Comparison of scores on the Semantic Differential and the ATCI by the following variables: sex, position, security classification, and service of correctional educators using the T-Test.

**TABLE 21**

COMPARISON OF SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL BY SEX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>33.63</td>
<td>12.13</td>
<td>1.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>34.35</td>
<td>7.61</td>
<td>1.59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

T Value = -0.29  D F = 60.45  2 Tail  Probability = 0.77

Male and female respondents did not differ significantly (p = 0.77) in their scoring on the Semantic Differential as was indicated by data in Table 21.
Male and female respondents did not differ significantly ($p = 0.93$) in their scoring on the ATCI as indicated by data in Table 22.

Vocational correctional educators scored significantly higher ($p = 0.02$) on the Semantic Differential test than the academic correctional educators as indicated by data in Table 23.

A significant difference was shown to exist between the two groups on the evaluative criterion of attitude.
TABLE 24
COMPARISON OF ATCI BY POSITION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>25.08</td>
<td>9.68</td>
<td>1.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>30.00</td>
<td>8.57</td>
<td>1.79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

T Value = 2.03  D F = 61  2 Tail  Probability = 0.047

Vocational correctional educators scored significantly higher (p = 0.047) on the ATCI test than did academic correctional educators as indicated by data in Table 24.

A significance difference was shown to exist between the two groups on the evaluative criterion of attitude.
Respondents from maximum and close security institutions did not differ significantly (p = 0.13) in their scoring on the Semantic Differential as indicated by data in Table 25.

Respondents from maximum and close security institutions did not differ significantly (p = 0.41) in their scoring on the ATCI as indicated by data in Table 26.
### TABLE 27
COMPARISON OF SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL SCORES BY EXPERIENCED AND INEXPERIENCED CORRECTIONAL EDUCATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inexperienced</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>38.67</td>
<td>10.35</td>
<td>2.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experienced</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>31.97</td>
<td>10.24</td>
<td>1.53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

T Value = 2.33  DF = 61  2 Tail  Probability = .023

Inexperienced correctional educators scored significantly higher (p = 0.023) on the Semantic Differential test than did experienced correctional educators as shown by data in Table 27.

A significant difference exists between the two groups on the evaluative criterion of attitude.

### TABLE 28
COMPARISON OF ATCI SCORES BY EXPERIENCED AND INEXPERIENCED CORRECTIONAL EDUCATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inexperienced</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>28.28</td>
<td>9.76</td>
<td>2.299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experienced</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>26.31</td>
<td>9.48</td>
<td>1.413</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

T Value = 0.74  DF = 61  2 Tail  Probability = 0.463
Inexperienced and experienced correctional educators did not differ significantly (0.463) in their scoring on the ATCI as indicated by data in Table 28.

Summary

On the evaluative criteria of attitude, vocational educators had a significantly higher score on both the Semantic Differential and ATCI than did academic correctional educators as shown by the data in Tables 23 and 24.

The data in Table 27 indicated that inexperienced correctional educators scored significantly higher on the Semantic Differential. However, this finding was not supported when the ATCI scores were examined in Table 28.

No significant difference between males and females existed on the Semantic Differential and ATCI tests. Similarly in Tables 25 and 26 the type of institution appeared to show a lack of significant relationship on the scores of the Semantic Differential and the ATCI as indicated by the data in Tables 21 and 22.
In the analysis of the data many of the respondents' scores were clustered around the mid-point. To gain more variability and hence a clearer understanding of the data, the researcher adjusted the data by eliminating scores in the mid-range on both the ATCI and the Semantic Differential. Scores within the range 36 to 44, inclusive, were eliminated on the Semantic Differential. Scores within the range of 23 to 31, inclusive, were eliminated from the ATCI test. An analysis of scores and correlations was then carried out.

The data from the adjusted scores are contained in Tables 29 - 32. The readjusted rate of respondents are shown in Table 29.

**TABLE 29**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instrument Used</th>
<th>Number Possible</th>
<th>Number Completed</th>
<th>Number Usable</th>
<th>Adjusted Usable Number</th>
<th>Percent of Original Usables</th>
<th>Percent Reduced</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ATCI</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>64 (87.7%)</td>
<td>63 (86.3%)</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>71.43</td>
<td>28.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semantic Differential</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>64 (87.7%)</td>
<td>63 (86.3%)</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>77.78</td>
<td>22.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The original usable respondents were reduced by 28.57 percent to the new level of 45 on the ATCI and on the Semantic Differential the original usable respondents were reduced by 22.22 percent to the new level of 49 as indicated in Table 29.
TABLE 30

ADJUSTED SCORES ON THE SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>32.61</td>
<td>0 - 54</td>
<td>11.73</td>
<td>1.68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The average score on the Semantic Differential was 32.61 with a range of 0 to 54 and a standard deviation of 11.73. This was indicated by data in Table 30.

The 45 respondents completed the ATCI test and these data are reported in Table 31.

TABLE 31

ADJUSTED SCORES ON THE ATCI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27.33</td>
<td>0 - 48</td>
<td>11.17</td>
<td>1.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The average score by the 45 respondents on the ATCI was 27.33 with a range of 0 to 48 and a standard deviation of 11.17 as indicated by data in Table 31.
Correlations of the adjusted scores were computed in the identical way as the initial computations. The Spearman Rho correlation coefficient was used to calculate the relationship between the scores on the Semantic Differential, the ATCI, and (1) sex, (2) position, (3) type of institution, and (4) service. The relationship between these variables is described in Table 32.

**TABLE 32**

**CORRELATIONS FOR THE SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL AND THE ATCI SCORES BY DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instrument</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Semantic</td>
<td>.0571</td>
<td>.2405</td>
<td>-.1716</td>
<td>-.2099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differential</td>
<td>N(=49)</td>
<td>N(=49)</td>
<td>N(=49)</td>
<td>N(=49)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
<td>Sig .348</td>
<td>Sig .048</td>
<td>Sig .119</td>
<td>Sig .074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATCI Score</td>
<td>.0389</td>
<td>.3038</td>
<td>.1705</td>
<td>-.1826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N(=45)</td>
<td>N(=45)</td>
<td>N(=45)</td>
<td>N(=45)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig .400</td>
<td>Sig .021</td>
<td>Sig .131</td>
<td>Sig .115</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results of correlations between the Semantic Differential Scores, ATCI scores, and demographic variables are displayed in Table 32.

The scores on the Semantic Differential and the ATCI were not significantly associated with the sex of the correctional educator. The association was very low in magnitude as indicated by significance measures of .348 on the Semantic Differential and .400 on the ATCI.
The scores on the Semantic Differential and ATCI were closely associated with the correctional educator's position. This association was substantial in magnitude as indicated by significance measures of .048 on the Semantic Differential and .021 on the ATCI.

Semantic Differential and ATCI scores were not closely associated with institution type. The association was low in magnitude as indicated by a negative and negligible measure of .119 on the Semantic Differential. The association was low in magnitude as indicated by a significance measure of .131 on the ATCI.

The scores on the Semantic Differential and the ATCI were slightly associated with years of service. The relationship was slight in magnitude and negative as indicated by a significance measure of .074 on the Semantic Differential and .115 on the ATCI.

Summary

The same four demographic variables as studied earlier were investigated in this section of the study with a reduced set of scores. These were: (1) sex, (2) position, (3) type of institution, and (4) years of service as a correctional educator.

Two variables: position and years of service have an association with the scores of correctional educators on the Semantic Differential and the ATCI instruments. This indicates, as was stated in the correlations summary section, that correctional educator's attitudes in this study are associated with position (academic and vocational) held and moderately associated with years of service as measured by the Semantic Differential test and the ATCI test.
Factor Analysis

Factor analysis, according to Kerlinger (1973), is a method for determining the number and nature of the underlying variables among larger number of measures.

Kerlinger (1973) states that "a factor is a construct, a hypothetical entity, that is assumed to underlie tests, scales, items, and, indeed, measures of almost any kind.

Most factor analytic methods produce results that are often extremely difficult to interpret. Thurstone (1941) argued that it was necessary to rotate factor matrices if they are to be interpreted adequately.

Factor loadings range from -1.00 to +1.00, similar to correlation coefficients.

Both the Semantic Differential (Questions 1 to 13) and the ATCI (14 to 22) were factor analyzed and the rotated factor matrix is given in Table 33.
TABLE 33

ROTATED FACTOR MATRIX, SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL (SD)
AND ATCI TESTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
<th>Factor 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q13 (SD)</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 9 (SD)</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q11 (SD)</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 2 (SD)</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 4 (SD)</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 1 (SD)</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 9 (ATCI)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 1 (ATCI)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 2 (ATCI)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 4 (ATCI)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q12 (SD)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q10 (SD)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 3 (ATCI)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 5 (ATCI)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 7 (ATCI)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the information displayed in Table 33 it appears that certain questions are grouped, each factor represents a construct that underlies each group within the test.

On the Semantic Differential test the following questions appear grouped with a common factor variance: Questions 13, 9, 11, 2, 4, 1 and Questions 12, 10. On the ATCI test Questions 9, 1, 2, 4 and Questions 12 and 10 appear grouped.
Summary

Although the factors analysis of the Semantic Differential showed groupings existed, it is difficult to assume the nature of the underlying construct that groups these items together. The overall design of the Semantic Differential implies that each set of bipolar adjectives give equal weight to the overall concept of the "inmate."

The groupings for the ATCI test, however, clearly show two constructs or factors that underlie the test. They are:

A. The inmate as a criminal outside of the prison classroom setting.
   The following questions were grouped under this factor:
   Question 1. Most criminal offenders do not desire a useful place in society or to live a normal life.
   Question 2. I believe that rehabilitation is more effective than punishment.
   Question 4. If I were an employer, I would seriously consider hiring an ex-convict.
   Question 9. Once a criminal, always a criminal.

B. The inmate as a correctional education student. The following questions were grouped under this factor:
   Question 3. Correctional inmates in college programs are less academically prepared than on-campus community college students.
   Question 5. A major motive for inmate enrollment in college programs is avoidance of more strenuous and distasteful jobs.
Question 7. Most correctional inmates expect unusual treatment from their instructors.

The implications for this information in this study focuses on the respondents regarding the inmate as a bipolar individual, the inmate as a criminal and the inmate as a prisoner. The overall attitude of correctional instructors toward inmates as indicated by scores on the ATCI may be unaffected by this apparent dual role of the inmate because the total concept of inmates appears to be composed of a number of facets.

Analysis of Comments

As part of the procedures of administering the instrument the participants were encouraged to make comments in the section provided in Part 3 of the instrument. The participants were informed that comments could cover any topic pertaining to correctional education, including this study. Of the 63 respondents, 20 (31.74%) completed the comments section. Following are the comments as quoted. For a clearer perspective the comments have been organized into themes.

Correctional Education Program Areas

Inmates are created by their environment and the loss of parents who don't care. They need love, affection, someone who cares, ideas, and how to generate them. They need help!

I feel we fail miserably in that we try rehabilitation without recognizing the deep need to teach morals. We must establish right-wrong differences.

Our students need more basic education, math and reading skills, before we get them. We need some kind of testing/screening before they get to us.

A return to basics seem to be the only answer. Some of our students don't seem to realize that education is a building process.
College programs are productive and seem to be enjoyed by most of the inmates who participate, however because of the low levels of most of our students they will never get the opportunity to do them.

**Teaching in a Correctional Setting—Positive Impressions**

Teaching the individual who is incarcerated has always been an exciting challenge to me, one way or another.

If I can help an inmate become a more successful citizen I feel I have achieved my job.

Individuals should be regarded on an individual basis.

I believe in rehabilitation of an inmate and my job as a teacher.

I have always enjoyed my job as a teacher in prison, the work is rewarding, the security good, and the hours of work better than most jobs.

**Teaching in a Correctional Setting—Negative Impressions**

I am in a remedial program, so perhaps that is the reason I find inmates a little slow and dull.

Sometimes I hate my work. The reason involves more than inmates and their petty attitudes.

Correctional educators battle everyone to do their jobs! Security, the administration, and their own supervisors. There is no monies available for materials. Few are concerned if the men progress or not academically.

I am sick of fighting my supervisors for the smallest items. Items which would help me teach more effectively.

I don't like the way we are supposed to be officers first and teachers second. I don't like to write-up inmates but if I don't the administration complains.

I envy the public school teachers with their pay and particularly their summer vacation. When you think about it our pay is not good for teachers if it is spread out over 12 months.
Philosophy of Corrections

I strongly believe in rehabilitation for prisoners, but I also believe that placement and follow up for the prisoners is very important. Without placement and follow up we are unable to see the outcome of rehabilitation.

The environment the inmates come from and go back to will usually cause him to return or not return.

I think the whole system is too soft on some offenders. I'm fed up with teaching the same inmates year after year, who go out on parole and commit the same crime and are given light sentences.

I'm not sure rehabilitation works. I've seen too many cases of inmates playing games just to avoid hard work and just to get a parole hearing. Then when they get out they come back straight away.

Inmates

My feelings are so mixed that each question was difficult. You can't work with prisoners without having compassion toward some (there but for the grace of God go I) and hatred toward others.

I have mixed feelings. I try to judge each one individually but sometimes I just don't think they are nice people.

You get very colored by the experiences you have, in theory most inmates are decent enough individuals but when it gets to the reality of the classroom and the yards then I don't know if I can keep a proper attitude.

I'm never sorry to leave the prison each day and I'm never sorry to leave the inmates locked up.

Summary

This chapter contains information about the 63 respondents including: demographic information and information concerning their attitudes. This chapter used statistical techniques including: frequencies, means, standard deviations, standard error, Spearman Rho correlations, T-Tests, and factor
analysis. The group of 63 respondents was reduced to give greater variability and then rechecked for frequencies, means, standard deviations, standard error, and Spearman Rho correlations. Additionally, the comments correctional educators made were categorized and quoted.
CHAPTER V
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND DISCUSSION,
AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

According to the Bureau of Justice (1983) incarceration rates are increasing every year. Nearly 700 United States prisons presently contain over 500,000 men and women. Almost 3,500 jails in the United States also have an average daily population of over 200,000.

Historically, correctional education has existed since the first penitentiary opened. The initial focus of correctional education was on religious studies however with the reformatory movement of the late 1800's educational and vocational programming became the key elements of correctional education. With increasing populations through the post World War II era, correctional education expanded but it was not until the 1960's and 1970's, with the aid of federally supported funding, that education became an essential component of nearly all institutions. Today correctional educators make up the largest noncustodial group employed in the United States prisons (Horvath, 1982).

In studying schools and their effectiveness experts agree that teachers are the single most important element in schools. This is as true for teachers in corrections as it is for teachers in the community.
One element of the teaching process that appears to have an influence on the learning process is the area of teacher attitudes. Stern and Keislar (1977) support this position and claim that "most people would agree that teacher's attitudes toward students have an important impact on how students feel about themselves as well as on the rate at which they acquire academic skills" (p. 66).

Teacher attitudes do make an important difference in the teaching-learning relationship. If correctional educators gain an insight into the importance of attitudes in the learning situation and what their own attitudes are, then they will be better able to meet the challenges of the correctional classroom.

The purpose of this study was to determine the attitudes of prison educators to the inmates they teach. This study provided a description of those attitudes and an analysis of those attitudes in relation to four variables: (1) sex, (2) academic and vocational teaching position, (3) institution of employment, and (4) service of the correctional educator.

**Research Questions**

1. What are the attitudes of correctional educators toward inmate learners in Ohio's maximum and close security prisons?
2. What differences, if any, exist between the attitudes of male and female correctional educators toward the inmate learner?
3. What differences, if any, exist between the attitudes of academic and vocational correctional educators toward the inmate learner?
4. What differences, if any, exist between the attitudes of correctional educators in maximum security prisons and close security prisons toward the inmate learner?
5. Are the attitudes of experienced correctional educators toward the inmate learner different from those of inexperienced correctional educators?

**Procedures and Instrumentation**

The population for this study was 73 correctional educators from maximum and close security prisons in Ohio including: Marion Correctional Institution, Ohio State Reformatory at Mansfield, Lebanon Correctional Institution, and the Southern Ohio Correctional Facility.

The data were collected by a survey administered by the researcher who visited each institution. The survey had three sections:

1. The Semantic Differential using the correctional inmate as the concept had 13 adjective pairs. The respondent was asked to indicate how closely they identified with either term of each pair. The results were coded on a scale of 0 (negative) to 6 (positive). The result was a numerical representation of the respondent’s attitude to the concept.

2. The Attitudes Toward Correctional Inmates (ATCI) scale, was a forced choice Likert scale that asked respondents to state the degree to which they agreed or disagreed with each statement. The statements fall into two categories, (1) those that are designed to reflect on attitude about the personal characteristics of an inmate, i.e., Question 9—"Once a criminal always a criminal" and (2) those that are designed to reflect an attitude about teaching inmates, i.e., Question 7—"Most correctional inmates expect unusual treatment from their instructors." When taken in combination these two categories of statements reflect the overall attitude of the correctional educator to the inmates they teach. The results were then coded on a scale of 0 (negative) to 6 (positive). Similar to the
Semantic Differential, the result was a numerical representation of the respondent's attitude to the inmate.

3. Demographic Section, which asked the respondent for information regarding sex, position, experience, and institution. In addition respondents were provided the opportunity to share their comments concerning correctional education. This was designed to give insight into the numerical results from a correctional educator's perspective.

Surveys were completed in usable form by 63 correctional educators indicating a response rate of 86.3 percent.

**Analytical Procedures**

Data were coded and analyzed using the SPSSX program available at the Information and Research Computing Center at The Ohio State University. Frequencies, percentages, means, standard deviations, and ranges were used to describe the variables.

Correlations were used to calculate the degree of relationship between the independent variables of sex, academic or vocational teachers, institution, experience, and the dependent variable of attitude as measured by the Semantic Differential and the ATCI. The Spearman Rho correlation coefficient was used in this procedure.

Cross-tabulation analysis was used to determine if the nature of the association between positive, neutral or negative attitudes and the variables of sex, institution, position, and experience. The Chi-square statistic was used to indicate association.
The T-Test was applied to the means of the Semantic Differential scores and the ATCI scores in relation to the variables males and females, academic and vocational teachers, close and maximum security institution, and experienced and inexperienced correctional educators.

To further analyze the data and gain more variance the mid-range of scores on both the Semantic Differential and the ATCI were eliminated. The new data set was analyzed for frequencies, means, standard deviation, range, and also a new set of correlations was completed using the Spearman Rho correlation coefficient. A Factor Analysis was completed on the items of the tests.

Findings

The findings of the study were:

1. Correctional educators in Ohio's maximum and close security prisons who responded were found to have an overall negative attitude toward inmates. Respondents scored in the negative range on the Semantic Differential and slightly negative on the ATCI test.

2. No significant difference existed between male attitudes towards inmates and female attitude towards inmates. Both male and female attitudes were negative toward inmates as scored on the Semantic Differential test and both were neutral as scored on the ATCI. None of the analyses used indicated a significant degree of association between sex and attitude toward inmates.

3. Academic correctional educators have a more negative attitude toward inmates than do vocational correctional educators. This difference was found to be significant according to all measures used. A significant
degree of association between position and attitude toward inmates was found to exist.

4. No significant differences in attitude were found to exist among those correctional educators who teach in maximum security institutions and those who teach in close security institutions on any of the statistical measures used.

5. Correctional educators with more years of experience held more negative attitudes toward inmates than less experienced correctional educators. This difference in attitudes was significant on all measures involving the Semantic Differential scores, however, when the ATCI scores were used this association was minimal. Attitudes of correctional educators tended to be associated with the length of their service.

Conclusions and Discussion

1. In this study involving correctional educators in Ohio's maximum and close security prisons, males comprised 63.5 percent of the population, females 36.5 percent, academic educators comprised 63.5 percent, and vocational educators 36.5 percent, 22.2 percent of educators worked in a maximum security institution while 77.8 percent worked in a close security prison and the average length of service was 7.7 years. The profile of an average correctional educator for this study could read: experienced male working as an academic educator in a close security prison.

2. The attitudes of correctional educators have been shown on average to be negative towards the inmates they teach. This descriptive study only addresses the issues as they are now, we have no way of knowing what the educators entry level attitudes were (see Recommendations for Further
Research section). That issue aside, we do know that those correctional educators do have negative attitudes toward the inmates they teach. Many factors, as evidenced by the correctional educators' own comments in the previous chapter, could possibly influence this negativity including a personal reaction to systemic pressures that are enormous in a correctional institution. The correctional educator is caught in a pressure situation, having to deal with many issues from many directions, the administration impose restrictions, rules, regulations and perceived unrealistic expectations. The inmates demand attention, have expectations and need assistance. When safety needs and security demands are added the correctional educator may very well become negative in attitude and action. Unfortunately the only object for any feelings and actions are the inmates in the classroom. Thus, there may be a transfer of the negative systemic feelings to the inmate learner. In other situations the correctional educators may have developed negative feelings toward inmates due to the personal actions of some inmates. The correctional educator may also bring to the position an ingrained attitude that is the result of a general position on crime and criminals.

The correctional educator's attitude may be formed as a result of the system in which he or she works, it may be formed in response to inmate actions and behaviors, or it may be formed independently as a result of outside influences.

3. In this study males and females have essentially the same attitude toward inmate learners. This is consistent with the literature on teacher attitudes. Both sexes are believed under equal pressure from the same sources. When orders and regulations are issued from the administration
they are not sex biased. They are given to correctional educators not male or female correctional educators. Inmate behavior is rarely conditional upon the sex of the teacher.

4. Vocational correctional educators have a more favorable attitude to inmate learners than do academic correctional educators. Many factors may contribute to this difference in attitude.

Academic correctional educators work in a confined, bland atmosphere. They, in effect, have a double restriction: being confined in a prison and being confined in a classroom that is usually small, undecorated, and lacking most creature comforts. Academic educators often are resentful of their public school counterparts for the better conditions, higher salary, and longer vacation time.

Inmate attitudes can have an effect on the educator's own attitudes. Inmates are often unwilling and uncooperative students because of the compulsory nature of some of the basic courses. Courses are often attended because they are required to move through this section to the more attractive work areas.

Academic correctional educators are largely middle class men and women whose social experience is likely incompatible with that of the inmates they teach. Superior-inferior attitudes and relationships may result.

Academic correctional educators bring a combination of factors to bear on their attitudes toward inmate learners. These factors include—working conditions, compulsory nature of the subjects they teach, resentment against perceived superior public school environment and their social position. These factors singly—or in combination—are believed to contribute to the negativism of academic correctional educators.
Vocational correctional educators usually work in a large, nonconfining workshop with space to move around with interesting displays and equipment to lighten the atmosphere. The vocational programs in all the prisons under study are extremely difficult to gain entry to and have long waiting lists. The inmates who do get the opportunity to participate are for the most part eager and keen learners who are unwilling to risk being removed from the program. Vocational teachers in the prison system usually have no resentment toward the public education system because if they were to leave correctional education it would most likely be to a commercial venture, not another school situation. Vocational teachers have the capacity to earn extra money because of their trades. They have the situation of a secure job plus outside earning capacity. An "easy" atmosphere pervades most vocational workshops, the language is basic, and the inmates can act more naturally. This creates a much needed safety valve for the vocational educator. It is possible vocational teachers often come from a more similar strata of society as the inmates they teach, if they do not then they have some understanding because of their occupation in a labor oriented vocation.

Vocational educators have a favorable attitude toward their students because they are more satisfied in their positions, more at ease with their environment, and more attuned to the inmates they teach.

5. The attitudes of correctional educators who teach in maximum and close security prisons are similar as indicated by this study. This conclusion was to be expected because there is little difference in the operation of maximum and close security prisons. The inmates and environments are the same, the only difference being the designation and the location of "death
row" in the maximum security institution. Even this would have no effect on teacher's attitudes because the "death row" area is not serviced by education.

According to the Department of Corrections, the difference is so negligible that the institutions of this study will soon be redesignated with the same security classifications.

6. Inexperienced correctional educators have a more favorable attitude to inmate learners than do experienced correctional educators. Many factors are believed to influence this difference in attitude.

Inexperienced correctional educators bring to the job a fresh, often idealistic attitude. An attitude of help, excitement, and care. As time passes correctional educators become jaded, less enthused about who they are teaching, some even become disillusioned. Because of the extreme pressures from all sides facing the correctional educator, attitudes drift to the negative end of the spectrum. Inmates must take some responsibility for the attitudes that experienced correctional educators hold. Inmates, because of their isolated situation, often try to take advantage of the good nature of educators to gain small advantages. This often becomes a routine game that forces the correctional educator to be more suspicious in any dealings with inmates. The increased negativity of experienced correctional educators can be related to length of service, environment, and inmate contact.

In dealing with experienced and inexperienced teacher's attitudes toward inmates, all statistical procedures using the Semantic Differential scores showed definite association between attitude and service, however, when ATCI scores were used low association was recorded.
To account for this difference both tests have to be examined. The Semantic Differential has the capability in this study to more accurately reflect attitudes for the following reasons: (1) the intent is not clear cut, respondents feel they cannot be held accountable for an answer to a bipolar adjective; (2) respondents feel comfortable responding to adjectives whose meaning is capable of several definitions or reactions; (3) the scale is more of a nonthinking reaction one so real feelings are liable to be exposed.

The ACTI being a Likert scale puts the respondents in the situation of reaching to a statement that they may feel could be used against them. Despite assurances of anonymity from the researcher the respondents may not feel comfortable in giving a clear indication of their feelings to definitive statements for fear of some future repercussions. The ATCI tended to yield a great number of neutral responses.

Summary of Conclusions and Discussions

The attitudes of correctional educators toward inmate learners is an important element in the teaching-learning process. To gain an understanding of the attitudes of the correctional educator this study was undertaken and the following conclusions were reached.

The correctional educator's attitude toward the inmate learners is toward the negative end of the scale, this may occur as a result of the system in which they work, it may occur in response to inmate actions and behavior or it may be formed as a result of outside influences.
The variables of sex and institution were shown to be unrelated to the attitudes held by correctional educators. Males and females essentially perform exactly the same tasks and face the same daily pressures. Maximum and close security prisons are operationally identical with the same inmates and environment with which the correctional educator must deal.

Perhaps vocational correctional educators are more favorable in their attitudes toward the inmates they teach because they may be more satisfied in their positions, may be more at ease with their environment, and may be more attuned to the inmates they teach. Academic educators are less favorable in their attitude towards inmates they teach. Reasons for this may include: working conditions, compulsory nature of the subject they teach, resentment against public school practices, and their social position.

Correctional educators need to be aware of the importance of their attitude and how it relates to the learning process.

Recommendations

The following section contains recommendations for practice and recommendations for research.

Recommendations for Higher Education

1. Institutions of higher education should implement teacher education course work that focuses on correctional education. This course work should include adult learning characteristics and theory, basic adult education theory courses, as well as course work that reflects organizational practices and procedures of adult education agencies, and teaching practices in correctional institutions.
2. Institutions of higher education should consider offering a specialized degree with correctional education as its main focus.

**Recommendations for the Ohio Department of Education**

1. Certification of correctional educators should be in addition to the already established high school and vocational teacher's certificate.

**Recommendations for Further Research by the Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Corrections**

1. Further study is needed to determine if the correctional education environment is related to the negativity of teacher's attitudes.

2. Further study is needed to determine if teaching conditions, i.e., vacation time and salary, are related to the negativity of teacher's attitudes.

3. Further research is needed to determine if the teacher-officer role that requires educators to act as custodians has an adverse effect on the attitude of correctional educators.

4. Screen prospective correctional educators in regard to attitude toward inmates. Employ only those applicants who score in the neutral to positive range. This would restrict teachers with naturally negative attitudes towards inmates from entering into a career in correctional education.

If the Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Corrections find a significant number of teachers have negative attitudes toward inmates then a case can be made for provision of inservice training, study leaves, variations of teaching assignments, programs that would help teachers retain more positive attitudes.
5. Further research should be conducted on the role of the school coordinator and their effect on teacher attitudes.

**Recommendations for Correctional Educators**

1. Correctional educators need to be cognizant of the effect their attitude has on the learning environment of their students. If they display a negative attitude every effort must be made to alter it. Possible suggestions include; reassignment of teaching position, counseling, and inservice training.

2. If employment conditions, including financial rewards, are considered after research to have an effect on teacher attitudes then correctional educators need to lobby the corrections department and the state government for improved conditions and financial rewards.

**Recommendations for Further Research**

1. The Semantic Differential test and Attitudes Toward Correctional Inmates (ATCI) scale used in this study need to be tested more thoroughly. Further development and testing of instruments designed to measure correctional educators' attitudes toward inmate learners need to be undertaken.

2. Follow-up analyses need to be conducted after attitude measurement tests have been administered in order to determine the accuracy of test scores in predicting attitudes of correctional educators. Either a behavioral study or ethnographic study would be suitable for this purpose.
3. Studies designed to determine inmate/student evaluation of effective teaching methods and styles, need to be conducted. These studies would lead to a greater understanding of the effectiveness of the teacher from the learner's perspective.

4. Since this study examined the attitudes of correctional educators in Ohio's maximum and close security prisons, it should be replicated to include all maximum, close, medium, and minimum security prisons including female institutions, to allow for greater generalizability to other populations.

5. This study should be replicated in a nationwide study. Such a study would give greater insight into the status of teachers' attitudes as they presently are in prison systems across the nation.

6. This study only described the situation as it existed at the time of the survey. To gain a more complete picture of entry level attitudes and how they change over time, a longitudinal study is the method that would provide greater insight.

7. Race was not a variable included in this study but it is a variable that should be included in any future studies.

8. Future directions for correctional educators' attitude studies should compare teacher attitudes and learning outcomes of students. Learning outcomes need to be examined because the focus of attitude studies should be where the greatest effect is felt and in this case this is the learning outcomes of students.
9. This study should be replicated as a cross-cultural study using the data from this study and data collected from maximum security prisons of the Victorian Department of Corrections in Australia.

10. As an extension to this study, with the notion that attitudes of experienced correctional educators become more negative, research should be done to examine the question of institutionalization (taking on the persona of a structured and often highly formalized system) of correctional educators.

11. Future research should address the question of attitudes of entry level correctional educators. This research should examine if correctional educators have negative attitudes before becoming involved with corrections or whether the negative attitudes develop in the correctional atmosphere.

12. An investigation should be conducted to determine the background of correctional educators and their motivational factors for becoming correctional educators. Questions such as work experience, college level, and teaching experience need to be addressed to add to the body of knowledge concerning correctional educators and their profiles.

13. From this study it appeared that the correctional educators moved more toward the negative end of the attitude scale with increased experience. An investigation should be conducted to assess the possibility and frequency of burn-out of educators in correctional institutions. This investigation could be conducted as part of the longitudinal study suggested in Recommendation 6.
14. Research should be conducted to develop a screening instrument that would enable the corrections education bureau to determine the nature of attitudes toward inmates that prospective employees hold.
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Dear Gary:

Enclosed is a copy of my dissertation completed in 1978 at the College of William and Mary, two publications from the Human Resources Center of the Insurance Company of North America that I found quite helpful, and copies of the article you referenced and another by Dr. Bloom.

You have my permission to use any part of my work to assist in your research, including the instruments developed for my study. I am hopeful that they prove useful to you. Please use these documents for as long as you need them; afterwards, I would appreciate their return.

For your information, I taught at John Tyler Community College (Chester, VA) from 1974 - 1980 and then served as Chairman of the Division of Business Technology at J. Sargeant Reynolds Community College (Richmond, VA) from 1980 - 1984. In 1984, I left the Virginia Community College System to become Supervisor-Training Development at Virginia Power. I have since served as Director-Training (Power Operations) and Superintendent-Nuclear Training for the Company. My home address is 421 Hempstead Road, Williamsburg, VA 23185 and my telephone number is (804) 565-2537. My business phone is (804) 771-3194.

I wish you success with your research and would appreciate your keeping me updated on your progress. If I can be of assistance, please contact me.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Arthur H. Friedman  
Superintendent-Nuclear Training

AHF/tlm
APPENDIX B

APPROVAL FROM DR. J. MCGLONE TO CONDUCT RESEARCH IN MAXIMUM AND CLOSE CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTIONS IN THE STATE OF OHIO
May 3, 1988

Mr. Cary Dansie  
The Ohio State University  
116 Ramseyer Hall  
29 West Woodruff  
Columbus, Ohio 43210  

Dear Mr. Dansie:

This letter will serve as approval for the research you presented at the Regional Directors of Education meeting on April 29, 1988. Since the proposal does not involve inmates, approval by the Department of Rehabilitation and Correction's Human Research Committee is not required. The following schedule is a summary of your visits to our Close (formerly called Maximum Security) Prisons:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Contact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lebanon (LEC1)</td>
<td>May 3, 1988</td>
<td>Dr. Bobby Rice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mansfield (OSR)</td>
<td>May 5, 1988</td>
<td>Mr. Robert Race</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucasville (SOCF)</td>
<td>May 6, 1988</td>
<td>Mr. Harvey Howison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marion (MCI)</td>
<td>May 11, 1988</td>
<td>Mr. Timothy Phillians</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Should you need any further assistance, please contact me. Best of luck on your teacher surveys.

Sincerely,

Jerry McGlone, Ph.D., Director  
Bureau of Education and Training  

cc: Dr. William Dowling-OSU  
    James Hayers, TIE Chief  
    Dr. Rice  
    Mr. Race  
    Mr. Howison  
    Mr. Phillians  
    File
APPENDIX C
INTRODUCTORY COVER PAGE FOR THE
SURVEY INSTRUMENT
Dear participant,

Thank you very much for allowing me to take a few moments of your valuable time. This survey is part of a descriptive study to determine opinions teachers have about their students.

The data will be reported in groups so no one will be able to identify any individual who has responded to the instruments. To further protect your anonymity I request that you do not indicate your name on the instrument.

The instrument consists of three sections: (1) a Semantic Differential scale, (2) a Likert scale, and (3) a Demographic section. Please complete all three sections.

The results will be available through the office of Dr. J. McClone later in 1988 if you are interested in seeing them. Once again thank you for taking time to assist in this research.

Yours sincerely,

Gary Dansie.
APPENDIX D
EXPLANATION PAGE FOR THE SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL
The purpose of this section is to measure the meaning of a concept to various people by having them judge the concept against a series of descriptive scales. In taking this test, please make your judgments on the basis of what the concept means to you.

Here is how you are to use these scales:

If you feel that the concept is very closely related to one end of the scale, you should place your check-mark as follows:

fair: X: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: unfair

or

fair: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: X: unfair

If you feel that the concept is quite closely related to one or the other end of the scale (but not extremely), you should place your check-mark as follows:

fair: X: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: unfair

or

fair: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: X: _____: unfair

If the concept seems only slightly related to one side as opposed to the other side (but is not really neutral), then you should check as follows:

fair: _____: _____: X: _____: _____: _____: _____: unfair

or

fair: _____: _____: _____: _____: X: _____: _____: unfair

If you consider the concept to be neutral on the scale, both sides of the scale equally associated with the concept, or if the scale is completely irrelevant, unrelated to the concept, then you should place your check in the middle space:

fair: _____: _____: _____: X: _____: _____: _____: unfair

IMPORTANT: (1) Place marks in the middle of spaces, not on the boundaries:

this X, not this X

(2) Never put more than one check-mark on a single scale.
APPENDIX E
COMPLETE INSTRUMENT INCLUDING: COVER PAGE, SECTION I, SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL, SECTION II; ATCI SCALE AND SECTION III, DEMOGRAPHIC SECTION, ALSO THE EXPLANATION PAGE FOR THE SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL
Dear participant,

Thank you very much for allowing me to take a few moments of your valuable time. This survey is part of a descriptive study to determine opinions teachers have about their students.

The data will be reported in groups so no one will be able to identify any individual who has responded to the instrument. To further protect your anonymity I request that you do not indicate your name on the instrument.

The instrument consists of three sections: (1) a Semantic Differential scale, (2) a Likert scale, and (3) a Demographic section. Please complete all three sections.

The results will be available through the office of Dr. J. McClone later in 1988 if you are interested in seeing them. Once again thank you for taking time to assist in this research.

Yours sincerely,

Gary Dansie.
The purpose of this section is to measure the meaning of a concept to various people by having them judge the concept against a series of descriptive scales. In taking this test, please make your judgments on the basis of what the concept means to you.

Here is how you are to use these scales:

If you feel that the concept is very closely related to one end of the scale, you should place your check-mark as follows:

fair \( \underline{X} \) : \_\_\_\_\_\_ : \_\_\_\_\_\_ : \_\_\_\_\_\_ : \_\_\_\_\_\_ : unfair

or

fair \_\_\_\_\_\_ : \underline{X} : \_\_\_\_\_\_ : \_\_\_\_\_\_ : \_\_\_\_\_\_ : unfair

If you feel that the concept is quite closely related to one or the other end of the scale (but not extremely), you should place your check-mark as follows:

fair \_\_\_\_\_\_ : \underline{X} : \_\_\_\_\_\_ : \_\_\_\_\_\_ : \_\_\_\_\_\_ : unfair

or

fair \_\_\_\_\_\_: \underline{X} : \_\_\_\_\_\_ : \_\_\_\_\_\_: unfair

If the concept seems only slightly related to one side as opposed to the other side (but is not really neutral), then you should check as follows:

fair \_\_\_\_\_\_ : \_\_\_\_\_: \underline{X} : \_\_\_\_\_\_: \_\_\_\_\_: unfair

or

fair \_\_\_\_\_\_: \_\_\_\_\_: \underline{X} : \_\_\_\_\_: \_\_\_\_\_: unfair

If you consider the concept to be neutral on the scale, both sides of the scale equally associated with the concept, or if the scale is completely irrelevant, unrelated to the concept, then you should place your check in the middle space:

fair \_\_\_\_\_\_: \_\_\_\_\_: \_\_\_\_\_: \_\_\_\_\_: \_\_\_\_\_: unfair

IMPORTANT: (1) Place marks in the middle of spaces, not on the boundaries:

\[ \underline{X}, \text{ not } \underline{X} \]

(2) Never put more than one check-mark on a single scale.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adjective</th>
<th>Strong</th>
<th>Wide</th>
<th>Worthless</th>
<th>Peaceful</th>
<th>Cruel</th>
<th>Slow</th>
<th>Sharp</th>
<th>Dirty</th>
<th>Deep</th>
<th>Bad</th>
<th>Pleasant</th>
<th>Unfair</th>
<th>Nice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>strong</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wide</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>worthless</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>peaceful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cruel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>slow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sharp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dirty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deep</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pleasant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unfair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mark each statement in the left margin according to how much you agree or disagree with it. Please mark every one. Write +1, +2, +3, or -1, -2, -3, depending on how you feel in each case.

+3: I strongly agree
+2: I agree
+1: I slightly agree
-1: I slightly disagree
-2: I disagree
-3: I strongly disagree

1. Most criminal offenders do not desire a useful place in society or to live a normal life.

2. I believe that rehabilitation is more effective than punishment.

3. Correctional inmates in college programs are less prepared academically than on-campus community college students.

4. If I were an employer, I would seriously consider hiring an ex-convict.

5. A major motive for inmate enrollment in college programs is avoidance of more strenuous and distasteful jobs.

6. I would have a hard time not thinking about physical danger if I were teaching in a prison setting.

7. Most correctional inmates expect unusual treatment from their instructors.

8. An instructor has to be careful about what he (or she) says when teaching correctional inmates.

9. Once a criminal, always a criminal.
PLEASE CHECK ONLY ONE ANSWER IN EACH SECTION

SEX

MALE □
FEMALE □

CURRENT POSITION

ACADEMIC TEACHER □
VOCATIONAL TEACHER □

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF YOUR CURRENT INSTITUTION

MAXIMUM □
CLOSE □

HOW MANY YEARS HAVE YOU BEEN TEACHING IN AN ADULT CORRECTIONAL SETTING ?

--------YEARS.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

DO YOU HAVE ANY ADDITIONAL COMMENTS YOU WISH TO MAKE ?

---------------------------------------------------------------------------------
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------
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