

9-16-2009

College Students' Attitudes toward Prisoners and Prisoner Reentry

Sunyoung Park
Indiana University of Pennsylvania

Follow this and additional works at: <http://knowledge.library.iup.edu/etd>

Recommended Citation

Park, Sunyoung, "College Students' Attitudes toward Prisoners and Prisoner Reentry" (2009). *Theses and Dissertations (All)*. 896.
<http://knowledge.library.iup.edu/etd/896>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by Knowledge Repository @ IUP. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses and Dissertations (All) by an authorized administrator of Knowledge Repository @ IUP. For more information, please contact cclouser@iup.edu, sara.parme@iup.edu.

COLLEGE STUDENTS' ATTITUDES TOWARD
PRISONERS AND PRISONER REENTRY

A Dissertation

Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies and Research

In Partial Fulfillment of the

Requirements for the Degree

Doctor of Philosophy

Sunyoung Park

Indiana University of Pennsylvania

December 2009

© 2009 by Sunyoung Park
All Rights Reserved

Indiana University of Pennsylvania
The School of Graduate Studies and Research
Department of Criminology

We hereby approve the dissertation of

Sunyoung Park

Candidate for the degree of the Doctor of Philosophy

Alida V. Merlo, Ph.D.
Professor of Criminology, Chair

Rosemary L. Gido, Ph.D.
Professor of Criminology

Willard T. Austin, Ph.D.
Professor of Criminology

John A. Lewis, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor of Criminology

ACCEPTED

Michele S. Schwietz, Ph.D.
Assistant Dean for Research
The School of Graduate Studies and Research

Title: College Students' Attitudes toward Prisoners and Prisoner Reentry

Author: Sunyoung Park

Dissertation Chair: Dr. Alida V. Merlo

Dissertation Committee Members: Dr. Rosemary L. Gido
Dr. Willard T. Austin
Dr. John Lewis

Faced with high recidivism, prisoner reentry has become one of the most pressing issues in American corrections (Travis & Visher, 2005). According to the research on the public's attitude toward prisoner reentry, the public's negative attitude toward offenders is one of the major barriers to prisoners' successful reintegration into society. To improve the public's negative perceptions toward prisoners, it is useful to investigate the public's attitudes. Especially, as prospective policy makers and practitioners, it is important to study college students' attitudes (Mackey et al., 2006).

Using the survey method, the current study investigated college students' attitudes toward prisoners and prisoner reentry in one public university. In addition, based on previous research, academic level, gender, race, size of town, political party, major, religion, the religious value of forgiveness, victimization experience, and acquaintance with prisoners were examined as predictors for attitudes toward prisoners and prisoner reentry. Multiple regression analysis revealed that the religious value of forgiveness is the most powerful predictor in both attitudes toward prisoners and prisoner reentry. Religion, political party, and a close relationship with prisoners were also significant factors in attitudes toward prisoners and prisoner reentry. Educational programs aiming at improving college students' negative attitudes toward prisoners can be developed based on these research findings.

DEDICATION

I dedicate this work to my father Raehong Park (1925-1990). My generosity and kindness are legacies of my father.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Thank you God, without you nothing is possible. It has been seven and a half years that I have lived and studied in the United States. During that time, I did not visit Korea. Although I enjoyed my life in the United States, sometimes it was hard for me to live and study in a foreign country. However, God always listened to my prayers and gave me strength. It is my honor to say “God! Now, here I am. I am your servant. Send me to where I am needed.”

Emily! Whenever I call my daughter’s name, I feel something in my heart. She is my best friend. During the long journey in the United States, we grew up together academically and spiritually. She had to stay in the library for a long time with me. Furthermore, sometimes she had to be in my classes. Seven and a half years in America gave us a priceless gift: a strong mother and daughter relationship.

How blessed I am! God knows that I can be weak. Thus, He sent me numerous helpers. Without Dr. Merlo, I could not have completed my study. She has not only been a wonderful and patient dissertation chair, but my role model. Besides my dissertation, she has always been concerned about my life in Indiana, my family, and Emily. She was like my mother, my sister, and my friend. Her strong support, encouragement, concern, care, and love were precious sources for my dissertation.

I would also like to thank my committee members: Dr. Gido, Dr. Austin, and Dr. Lewis. My interest in prisoner reentry started in Dr. Gido’s policy class. Dr. Gido inspires students through her wide knowledge, humanity, and intelligence. Dr. Austin is also a wonderful professor. I did not have a chance to take his classes, but I have heard much about his amazing lectures and great personality. Whenever I talk with Dr. Austin, I feel

very comfortable; he is like talking to my father. Without Dr. Lewis' assistance, I could not have written the methodology and the analysis parts. Furthermore, he gave me valuable advice to run SPSS analyses and to interpret findings. He sincerely and patiently answered my questions. Thanks to warm-hearted and intelligent Dr. Lewis, my knowledge in research methods dramatically increased.

To my family, I have been a pain in their necks. My mother Jungki, my sister Sunhee, sister-in-law Seungmi, brother Sangho, and brother-in-law Kiman are always concerned about me. They treat me like a teenage girl! Without their love, concern, support (financial and emotional), and prayers, I could not completed my journey. From the bottom of my heart, I would like to say that I love you all.

My best friend Seunghee, I cannot describe in words how much you meant to me! You helped me get through the difficult times I had. I love you forever and always.

How can I thank enough another family, my Korean church members? They have prayed for me all the time. Their care and love gave me power. Especially, Jung Colen always listened to me and showed me the best way to live as a Christian. I am grateful to criminology master student Hyeonna. She helped me with coding the data.

How blessed I am to study criminology at IUP. It is unbelievable that all the criminology faculty members are so nice and kind. I cannot thank enough Dr. Giever, Dr. Randy Martin, Dr. Lee, Dr. Phaneuf, Mr. Fedorek, and Mr. Stinson who allowed me to administer surveys in their classes. Special thanks go to warm-hearted and thoughtful Dr. Giever. I am also very grateful for Dr. Bitna Kim. She encouraged and helped me a great deal with the statistics. I also thank the excellent professors whose classes I took: Dr. Gibbs, Dr. Myers, Dr. Jamie Martin, and Dr. Roberts. I would like to hug the wonderful

two women, the departmental secretaries Dottie and Karen. I cannot forget sharing God's love with Dottie. I will remember Dottie and Karen's kindness and beautiful smile. I also cannot forget the hospitality of my classmates; Cathy, Mari, Lisa, Alison, Toby, Mehmet, Phil, and Murat. These wonderful classmates helped me to focus on my study.

Now, I am going back to Korea. I will forever remember my journey with wonderful people in the United States.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	Page
I	INTRODUCTION1
	High Rates of Returning Inmates and Recidivism.....1
	Reentry Efforts.....2
	Public Support and Involvement.....3
	Theoretical Foundations.....4
	Reintegrative Shaming.....4
	Peacemaking Criminology.....6
	Restorative Justice7
	The Purpose of the Study.....10
II	LITERATURE REVIEW12
	Public’s Attitudes Toward Reentry.....13
	Reentry Roundtable Project14
	Returning Home Project16
	Public Opinion Data.....17
	2001 Hart Research Associates Public Opinion Survey ..17
	2005 Massachusetts Public Opinion Survey18
	2006 Zogby International Public Opinion Survey19
	2007 Gideon Public Opinion Survey20
	College Students’ Attitudes toward Prisoners21
	Research on Attitudes toward Prisoners in the United States.....22
	Cross-Cultural Data~ ATP Scores in Spain.....23
	Cross-Cultural Data~ ATP Scores in Norway24
	College Students’ Attitudes toward Punishment and Rehabilitation 26
	College Students’ Attitudes toward Punishment27
	College Students’ Attitudes toward Rehabilitation.....32
	Factors Affecting the Public’s Attitudes36
	Gender and the Public’s Punitiveness.....37
	Gender and College Students’ Punitiveness39
	Race and the Public’s Punitiveness.....39
	Race and College Students’ Punitiveness41
	Major and College Students’ Punitiveness42
	Education and the Public’s Punitiveness44
	Education and College Students’ Punitiveness.....45
	Religion and the Public’s Punitiveness.....46
	Religion and College Students’ Punitiveness48
	Victimization Experience and the Public’s Punitiveness.....49
	Acquaintance with Offenders and the Public’s Punitiveness51
	Political View and the Public’s Punitiveness.....52
	Political View and College Students’ Punitiveness53

	Size of Town and the Public’s Punitiveness	54
	Size of Town and College Students’ Punitiveness	55
III	METHODOLOGY	57
	Research Design.....	57
	Research Questions	58
	Demographic Factors	59
	Personal Preference Factors	60
	Personal Experience with Crimes and Criminals.....	61
	Sampling	62
	Measurement.....	64
	Dependent Variables	64
	Attitudes Toward Prisoner (ATP) Scale	64
	Attitudes Toward Prisoner Reentry (ATPR) Scale	65
	Independent Variables	72
	Demographic Factors	72
	Personal Preference Factors	73
	Personal Experience with Crimes and Criminals Factors	74
	Analysis Plan	76
	Human Subject Issue.....	77
IV	ANALYSIS AND RESULTS.....	79
	Frequencies and Descriptive Statistics.....	79
	Factor Analysis	83
	Scale Reliability	85
	Forgiveness	86
	Attitudes Toward Prisoners (ATP)	86
	Attitudes Toward Prisoner Reentry (ATPR).....	87
	Bivariate Correlations	87
	Multiple Regression	90
	Multiple Regression of ATP	91
	Multiple Regression of ATPR	92
	Summary	94
V	DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION.....	96
	Research Findings.....	96
	Attitudes Toward Prisoners (ATP)	96
	Attitudes Toward Prisoner Reentry (ATPR).....	97
	Independent Variables	98
	Theoretical Foundations.....	100
	Limitations	102
	ATPR Scale.....	103
	More Predictors.....	103

Type of Offenses.....	104
Limitations of the Sample Group.....	104
Involvement in Prisoner Reentry Efforts	105
Strengths	106
Policy Implications	107
Conclusion	110
REFERENCES	115
APPENDICES	132
Appendix A – Public’s Attitudes toward Reentry	132
Appendix B – College Students’ Attitudes toward Prisoners, Rehabilitation, and Punishment.....	134
Appendix C – Students’ Attitude Survey.....	140
Appendix D – Letter of Access.....	151
Appendix E – Letter of Permission to Use Survey Item.....	152
Appendix F – Informed Consent Form.....	155
Appendix G – Factor Analysis for ATPR Items.....	156
Appendix H	158
1.Item-Total Correlations and Cronbach’s Alpha for Forgiveness Scale	158
2.Item-Total Correlations and Cronbach’s Alpha for ATP Scale.....	158
3.Item-Total Correlations and Cronbach’s Alpha for ATPR Scale	159
Appendix I - Percentage for Each Item of ATPR.....	160

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1	Descriptive Statistics for Scale Variables.....	80
2	Frequencies and Percentages for Nine Variables.....	80
3	Bivariate Correlation Matrix.....	89
4	Multiple Regression of Attitudes Toward Prisoners.....	91
5	Multiple Regression for Attitude Toward Prisoner Reentry.....	93
6	Each Hypothesis Supported in Multiple Regression Model.....	95

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

High Rates of Returning Inmates and Recidivism

At midyear 2008, 2.4 million people were incarcerated in prison or jail (Sabol, Coutour, & Harrison, 2009). In addition, Travis and Visher (2005) estimate that every day 1,700 inmates are released from prison to return to society. Since 95% of all prison inmates eventually will be released, the number of returning inmates is expected to continue to increase (Travis & Visher). In the book, *When Prisoners Come Home*, Petersilia (2003) argues that the huge number of returning inmates is “one of the most profound challenges facing American society” (p. 3) and recommends that greater attention be focused on the prisoner reentry issue. Petersilia defines prisoner reentry as “all activities and programming conducted to prepare ex-convicts to return safely to the community and to live as law-abiding citizens” (Petersilia, p. 3). As noted by Petersilia, and Travis and Visher, prisoner reentry has become one of the most pressing issues in American corrections.

Prisoner reentry is discussed in the popular media as well as in academia. For example, in 2000, when *USA Today* examined the prisoner reentry issue, it described released inmates as “unready and unrehabilitated” (Johnson, 2000, p. 13). As the *USA Today* article noted, the majority of returning inmates are not prepared to re-enter society. According to the Bureau of Justice Statistics recidivism study, 30% of released prisoners were rearrested in the first six months following release, and 44% were rearrested within the first year (Langan & Levin, 2002). These recidivism rates indicate that inmates may

not be prepared to re-enter society as law-abiding citizens, and that prisoner rehabilitation and reentry programs are not as effective as they could be.

Reentry Efforts

Faced with this “revolving door” situation (Petersilia, 2003, p. 139), Cullen (2006) contends that under the current “get tough” crime policy, prisoners are never rehabilitated, nor are they prepared to return to society. In terms of preparing inmates, the importance of prison-based and community-based rehabilitation programs has been re-emphasized (Cullen). In addition, policymakers and prison administrators have begun to consider reentry issues (Travis & Visher, 2005). Historically, prisoner reentry had been ignored by policy makers and correctional administrators. In 2005, when Maryland Governor Ehrlich testified before Congress concerning the Second Chance Act, he emphasized the importance of the prisoner reentry issue, “offender reentry is not simply a public issue; it’s a human issue” (Committee on the Judiciary, 2006, p. 11). As Governor Ehrlich pointed out, prisoner reentry is an important issue not only for public safety, but also for the sake of released prisoners.

In 2000, the Reentry Roundtable, a public forum, was established by the Urban Institute. This public forum involves ex-prisoners, community leaders, family members, policy makers, and academics who discuss the reentry issue and publish annual research on the public’s attitude toward prisoner reentry (Immerwahr & Johnson, 2002). In 2001, the Urban Institute conducted research on barriers to prisoner reentry by investigating ex-prisoners’ experiences after their release (Visher, Vigne, & Travis, 2004). In 2003, the Reentry Policy Academy was established by the National Governors’ Association to solicit the cooperation of each state in developing prisoner reentry programs (Travis &

Visher, 2005). Most recently, former President Bush signed the Second Chance Act of 2008, which provides funds for reentry programs such as employment assistance, substance abuse treatment, housing, and mentoring in an effort to prevent released prisoners from committing additional crimes (Office of the Press Secretary, 2008).

Public Support and Involvement

Although reentry efforts have been growing recently, with limited resources and personnel, the more imperative issue is the effectiveness of these programs (Welsh & Harris, 2004; Wilson, Gallagher, & MacKenzie, 2000). Among several factors for enhancing effectiveness, the importance of public support and involvement in reentry programs have been noted by many researchers (Brooks, Visher, & Naser, 2006; Clear, Rose, & Ryder, 2001; Listwan, Cullen, & Lattassa, 2006; Petersilia, 2003; Travis, 2005; Travis & Visher, 2005).

In terms of gaining public support, prisoner reentry programs seem to be achieving their goal. According to recent public opinion polls by Hart Research Associates (2002) and Krisberg and Machionna (2006), the majority of the public supports prisoner reentry programs. However, the public has an ambivalent attitude toward the reentry issue. That is, even though the public supports rehabilitation and reentry programs to prevent further crimes, the public also has the propensity to shun returning inmates (Brooks et al., 2006; Clear et al., 2001; Helfgott, 1997). Reentry research identified the public's negative attitude toward ex-prisoners as one of the major barriers to reentry efforts (Brooks et al.; Clear et al.; Immerwahr & Johnson, 2002; Petersilia, 2003).

Cleveland reentry stakeholders (service providers, criminal justice practitioners, government officials, and civic leaders from various organizations) in the Visher, Palmer, and Roman (2007) qualitative research, and Florida residents who participated in focus group interviews in the Clear et al. (2001) research on public attitudes acknowledged their antipathy toward returning inmates. These participants recommended public education programs to improve their negative attitudes toward prisoners and promote public support and involvement in reentry efforts (Brooks et al., 2006; Clear et al., 2001). Petersilia (2003) also emphasized the importance of public support, noting “our most effective crime-fighting tools require community collaboration and active engagement” (p. 21). Other reentry researchers such as Travis (2005) and Golembeski and Fullilove (2005) recommend active community involvement and support as key elements for successful prisoner reentry.

Theoretical Foundations

In addition to reentry research, three criminological theories, reintegrative shaming, peacemaking criminology, and restorative justice, provide the theoretical basis for the importance of public support and involvement in reentry efforts. Research has been conducted to test the effect of reintegrative shaming and restorative justice on recidivism, and these research findings partially support these two theories.

Reintegrative Shaming

Reintegrative shaming theory is associated with the reentry issue in that it explores recidivism related to different forms of shaming. In the book, *Crime, Shame, and Reintegration*, Braithwaite (1989) emphasized the role of shaming as a way of controlling crime. He defined shaming as “social disapproval that has the intention or

effect of invoking remorse in the person being shamed and/or condemnation by others who become aware of the shaming” (p. 100). Braithwaite presented two different types of shaming: reintegrative shaming and disintegrative shaming. He argued that disintegrative shaming elicits no reconciliation between the shamed offender and the community, which leads to higher recidivism. On the other hand, reintegrative shaming enables offenders to realize their unacceptable behaviors and gives them the opportunity to reenter society (Braithwaite).

In explaining how reintegrative shaming occurs, Braithwaite (1989) proposed that the public’s words or gestures of forgiveness elicit reintegrative shaming. He contended that contrary to disintegrative shaming, reintegrative shaming eventually led to lower recidivism. Braithwaite’s reintegrative theory indicates that the words or gestures of forgiveness are the driving forces of lower recidivism, and they come from the public. It is apparent that the difference between reintegrative shaming and disintegrative shaming depends on the public’s attitudes toward criminals. Accordingly, in assessing Braithwaite’s reintegrative shaming theory, Williams and McShane (2004) contend that “the obvious policy implications are that acts can be strongly sanctioned, but a reformed offender can be treated in a forgiving fashion” (p. 293).

Braithwaite (1989) also proposed a new model for juvenile offenders based on his reintegrative shaming theory. In this new approach, the offender, the offender’s family, teachers, the victim, and the victim’s family meet in order to enable juvenile offenders to feel genuine remorse and to be reintegrated into society. Braithwaite’s juvenile justice model stresses the involvement of community members and victims, which became the central concept of restorative justice (Braithwaite & Mugfold, 1994).

Research conducted to test the effect of reintegrative shaming on recidivism has been inconsistent. Ahmed and Braithwaite (2005), and Murphy and Harris (2007) found a significant association between reintegrative shaming and recidivism among adult offenders. On the other hand, Tittle, Bratton, and Gertz (2003), and Zhang and Zhang (2004) failed to find any significant effect of reintegrative shaming on adult recidivism. Similarly, Hay's (2001) research on parents' reintegrative shaming in parenting did not find a significant relationship between parents who use reintegrative shaming and high school students' delinquent behaviors.

As previously mentioned, because Braithwaite's (1989) reintegrative shaming theory is strongly related to the prisoner reentry issue, it is reflected in the survey of the current study by examining how much a respondent supports prisoner reentry efforts.

Peacemaking Criminology

As Akers and Sellers (2004) indicate, peacemaking criminology is a philosophy calling for reformation of the current violence-based criminal justice system rather than a theory explaining causes of crimes. Peacemaking criminology emerged during the 1990s while criminologists were studying the negative consequences of the war on crime policy (Akers & Sellers, 2004).

The book, *Criminology as Peacemaking*, edited by Pepinsky and Quinney (1991), may provide the most comprehensive ideas of peacemaking criminologists. In this book, various contributors whose ideas are based on humanism, religion, feminism, and Marxism, argued that the current criminal justice system was not effective in reducing crime due to its use of violent crime policies. According to peacemaking criminology, crime is produced by the broken interpersonal cohesiveness among citizens (Pepinsky &

Quinney). Both people and social institutions should be attentive to each other's welfare and cooperate to meet each other's needs (Pepinsky & Quinney). Accordingly, peacemaking criminologists recommend mediation, conflict resolution, reconciliation, and reintegration of the offender into the community as crucial ways of solving problems (Pepinsky & Quinney).

Peacemaking criminology can be linked to the present study for two reasons. First, both peacemaking criminology and the current study emphasize the importance of the public's support and involvement to reduce crime. Peacemaking theorists argued that the community should be integrated into policing, judicial systems, and corrections, which create interpersonal cohesiveness to solve the crimes (Pepinsky & Quinney, 1991). Second, peacemaking criminologists noted the importance of paying attention to each other's welfare and needs. The survey in the present study includes items measuring how much a respondent is concerned about an ex-prisoner's welfare and needs. For example, concerns about an ex-prisoner's housing and his/her restrictions on legal rights are incorporated in the questionnaire. Accordingly, peacemaking criminology theory can be reflected in the survey when assessing college students' attitudes toward prisoners and prisoner reentry.

Restorative Justice

Along with reintegrative shaming and peacemaking criminology, restorative justice also provides an alternative approach to respond to crime (Akers & Sellers, 2004). Unlike other criminological theories such as Merton's strain theory and Hirschi's social bonding theory, restorative justice is not created by a single theorist. Instead, many criminologists have been involved in developing restorative justice theory. Restorative

justice was fully developed during the 1990s. However, beginning in the 1970s, one of the restorative justice's concepts, restitution, was proposed by Barnett (1977), and Eglash (1977). Zehr (1990), Umbreit (1996), Van Ness and Strong (1997), and Bazemore and Schiff (2001), developed and elaborated on restorative justice theory through their books and published research.

Restorative justice advocates distinguish between current retributive justice and restorative justice. The retributive model, with high control and low support, stigmatizes offenders, relies on harsh punishment, and excludes victims and community members in the process of achieving justice, which results in higher recidivism and an increase in the public's fear of crime (Bazemore & Schiff, 2001). According to restorative justice advocates, people's relationships are harmed by criminal incidents and this harm should be repaired by three stakeholders: the offender, the victim, and community members (Zehr, 1990). These three parties need to participate in face-to-face dialogues and cooperate to repair the harm and solve the problems (Bazemore & Schiff). Even though there are several different ways for this face-to-face meeting to occur, "victim offender mediation" is the most widely accepted (Van Ness & Strong, 1997). Restorative justice proponents argue that by being actively involved in reparative justice activities, community members are better able to solve social problems than government agents. As a result, the community environment will be improved, and, in the long term, crime will be prevented (Braithwaite & Mugford, 1994; Clear & Karp, 1999; Stuart, 1996; Van Ness & Strong, 1997).

The principles of restorative justice are reflected by specific programs such as victim offender mediation programs; and research has been conducted to evaluate these

programs. Although evaluation research findings are inconsistent, many researchers concluded that the restorative justice model is promising in reducing crime (Bonta, Rooney, & Mcanoy, 2002; Cormier, 2002; Dignan, 1992; Hayes, 2005; Hayes & Daly, 2004; Luke & Lind, 2002; Maxwell & Morris, 2001; McGarrel, Olivares, Crawford, & Kroovand, 2000; Warner, 1992).

Both the present study and restorative justice emphasize the importance of the public's support and involvement in the criminal justice system to reduce crime. In the restorative justice model, the community plays a significant role in ascertaining the offender's genuine remorse and accountability and in helping the victim's forgiving and healing process (Clear & Karp, 1999; Stuart, 1996; Van Ness & Strong, 1997). In addition, one of the hypotheses of the present study (that a student who has an acquaintance with prisoners is more likely to demonstrate a supportive attitude toward prisoners and prisoner reentry) was primarily constructed based on the evaluation research of victim-offender mediation programs. The evaluation research on victim offender mediation programs revealed that participants in victim offender mediation experienced a reduced fear of crime and an increased understanding of criminals through personal contacts with offenders (Ness & Strong; Umbreit, 1996, 1994, 1989; Umbreit, Coates, & Roberts, 1998; Van Roberts, 1995; Wright & Galaway, 1989).

In summary, the three contemporary criminology theories presented so far (reintegrative shaming, peacemaking criminology, and restorative justice) provide the theoretical foundations for the current study in that these theories advocate the importance of the public's support for rehabilitation/reentry efforts and active involvement in criminal justice system.

The Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to examine college students' attitudes toward prisoners and prisoner reentry. As previously discussed, criminologists, researchers, and the public are aware that public support and involvement are essential to successful prisoner reintegration into society. However, in reality, the public's negative attitudes toward prisoners are pervasive in our society (Travis, 2005). Regarding antipathy toward criminals, Zimring and Johnson (2006) pointed out that "antipathy toward offenders seems to be the usual condition in modern human society" (p. 270). However, reentry researchers suggested that antipathy toward offenders should be improved to enhance the effectiveness of reentry programs (Brooks et al., 2006; Clear et al., 2001; Golembeski & Fullilove, 2005; Petersilia, 2003; Travis, 2005).

To improve the public's negative perceptions toward prisoners, it is useful to investigate the public's attitudes. Although the research on the public's attitudes toward prisoner reentry has been growing, research on college students' attitudes toward prisoners and prisoner reentry has been rarely conducted. Because college students are prospective policy makers and practitioners, it is important to study college students' attitudes (Mackey, Courtright, & Packard, 2006). Therefore, investigating college students' attitudes may be an important step for developing effective reentry programs.

In addition to exploring college students' perceptions, this study will identify which factors influence college students' attitudes toward prisoners and prisoner reentry. These research findings will be useful in developing public educational programs aimed at creating supportive atmospheres as well as improving antipathy toward prisoners.

Colleges and universities are ideal environments in which educational programs can be effectively implemented.

In summary, there are two purposes of this study:

(1) To explore college students' attitudes toward prisoners and prisoner reentry.

(2) To identify which factors influence college students' attitudes toward prisoner reentry and prisoners.

In Chapter II, the public's attitudes toward prisoner reentry and prisoners are examined by reviewing the previous research. After reviewing the public opinion research, attention is focused on college students' attitudes. Last, factors related to the public's and college students' views on punishment and rehabilitation are discussed to predict factors associated with college students' attitudes toward prisoners and prisoner reentry. Based on this research review, independent variables for the current study were constructed. In Chapter III, the methodology of this study is presented, including the research questions, hypotheses, sampling method, dependent variables, independent variables, measurements, analysis plans, and the human subject issues. In Chapter IV, the results of the factor analysis test, scale reliability test, bivariate, and multiple regression analyses are provided. Finally in Chapter V, the conclusions are presented, including a discussion of the research findings, limitations, strengths, and policy implications of the study.

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

In research on correctional issues, public attitude research primarily has focused on measuring how much the public supports harsh punishment or rehabilitation ideals (Cullen & Gendreau, 2001; Sundt, Cullen, & Applegate, 1998). Through public opinion polls in the last twenty years, researchers often described the public as either punitive or less punitive (Applegate, Cullen, & Fisher, 1997; Cullen, Fisher, & Applegate, 2000; Zimbardo & Haney, 1998). Compared to the literature on punishment and rehabilitation, studies on the public's attitudes toward prisoner reentry are relatively limited because it is a new research topic. As previously mentioned, college students' opinions on prisoner reentry and prisoners rarely are studied.

In this section, previous research about prisoners and prisoner reentry will be reviewed in four ways. First, due to the lack of the research on college students' attitudes toward prisoner reentry, the public's attitudes toward prisoner reentry will be examined. These research findings may provide a blueprint for college students' opinions on prisoner reentry. Although interest in reentry is a recent phenomenon, research on this topic has been produced.

Second, college students' attitudes toward prisoners will be examined. Attitude toward prisoners is a relatively unknown research variable, but three studies compared attitudes toward prisoners among different groups, including a student group. Third, since research on college students' attitudes toward reentry and prisoners is limited, college students' perceptions of punishment and rehabilitation will be reviewed. These studies enable the researcher to try to predict college students' attitudes toward prisoners and

prisoner reentry. Fourth, factors associated with the college students' and the public's attitudes toward punishment and rehabilitation will be reviewed. These factors are expected to influence college students' attitudes toward prisoners and prisoner reentry in the same manner. Ten factors will be discussed to construct the independent variables.

Public's Attitudes toward Reentry

In a relatively short period of time, the volume of research on reentry has increased. Petersilia, the premier expert on this topic, authored *When Prisoners Come Home* (Travis & Visher, 2005). Travis also is dedicated to the reentry issue. In 2005, he authored *But They all Come Back*, and edited *Prisoner Reentry and Crime in America*. In addition, the Urban Institute and the National Governors' Association are conducting reentry research (Travis & Visher).

Three trends were identified in prisoner reentry research. First, the majority of reentry research has focused on uncovering barriers to prisoner reentry by investigating ex-prisoners' experiences in the community after they were released. Through these studies, the most commonly identified barriers are (1) housing, (2) employment, (3) medical care, (4) welfare services, and (5) public stigma (Berry & Eigenber, 2003; Petersilia, 2003; Solomon et al., 2004; Taxman, 2004). Compared to the research on ex-offenders' perspectives, public opinion research about the prisoner reentry issue is negligible. However, prisoner reentry researchers pointed out the importance of the public's perspectives (Brooks et al., 2006; Petersilia; Travis, 2005). Accordingly, the Urban Institute, through a public forum and longitudinal studies, has begun to investigate public opinion on prisoner reentry. Two public opinion research projects by the Urban Institute will be thoroughly discussed in the following section.

Second, due to the fact that the research on public's attitudes toward reentry has been conducted only recently, researchers tend to utilize qualitative interview methods for in-depth information. As previously mentioned, the Urban Institute primarily used focus group interviews for the research on public perceptions toward prisoner reentry. Clear et al. (2001) also employed interview methods to explore Florida residents' opinions on returning inmates. In addition to the qualitative studies, a large scale quantitative survey is needed to obtain a more comprehensive understanding of the public's perceptions toward returning inmates.

Third, in addition to this trend, public opinion polls, conducted by Hart Research Associates (2001), Roberts, Doble, Clawson, Selton, and Briker (2005) of the Criminal Justice Institute, and Krisberg and Machionna (2006) of Zogby International are more likely to include reentry-related questions in their surveys. The results of the public opinion polls by Hart Research Associates, Roberts et al., and Krisberg and Machionna will be presented in the following section.

Reentry Roundtable Project

In terms of prisoner reentry research, the Urban Institute has played a significant role. In 2000, the Urban Institute created a public forum, Reentry Roundtable, comprised of ex-prisoners, community leaders, family members, policy makers, and academics in order to discuss the reentry issue and publish annual research on the public's attitude toward prisoner reentry (Travis & Visher, 2005). These studies revealed that the public supported prisoner reentry and there was consensus that the community should play an important role in the reentry process (La Vigne et al, 2004; Visher et. al, 2004). However,

the researchers also found that the public still had negative views toward returning prisoners.

As a part of the Reentry Roundtable Project of the Urban Institute, in 2002, focus groups from Philadelphia were formed to examine the public's attitudes toward returning prisoners, and *The Revolving Door: Exploring Public Attitudes toward Prisoner Reentry* was published (Immerwahr & Johnson, 2002). Immerwahr and Johnson categorized the participants into three groups in order to explore different views among three different populations. The first focus group (Suburban group) consisted of residents of the Philadelphia suburb of Bensalem. Racially mixed, on average, the group's annual income was between \$25,000 and \$60,000. The second focus group (Inner-city group) was made up of residents of Philadelphia's inner city, most of whom were African Americans and Hispanics. The third focus group (Upscale urban group) was comprised of racially mixed wealthy residents (Immerwahr & Johnson).

The majority of the participants admitted that they had not thought about the prisoner reentry issue prior to this process. However, regardless of group, the majority of respondents supported prisoner reentry efforts. Approximately 80% of all participants favored allocating more money to post-release reentry programs. In spite of the strong support for rehabilitation and reentry for prisoners, focus group participants clearly stated that prisoners must be punished for their crimes and should not receive any benefits such as grants for college tuition (Immerwahr & Johnson, 2002).

Some group differences were identified. As a primary source of knowledge of crime and criminals, the suburban group used media resources while inner-city participants used first-hand knowledge through family members and acquaintances who

had prison experiences. By contrast, upscale urban residents were likely to gain knowledge through books, newspapers, and articles. The groups demonstrated different levels of support for prisoner reentry efforts. While the upscale urban group and inner city group demonstrated supportive attitudes for returning prisoners, the suburban residents were likely to show less sympathy for the difficulties of the ex-prisoners and more likely to support harsh punishment. The authors admitted that there are limitations in the qualitative research methods. To address the limited generalizations of their research findings, the authors recommended conducting more focus group interviews in various cities and states (Immerwahr & Johnson, 2002).

Returning Home Project

In 2001, the Urban Institute launched a project titled *Returning Home: Understanding the Challenges of Prisoner Reentry* in Maryland, Illinois, Ohio, and Texas. This longitudinal pilot study interviewed ex-prisoners and family members along with community members. As one of the four states of the Urban Institute's Returning Home project, in Ohio, Brooks, Visher, and Naser (2006) conducted 30- minute community focus group discussions in three Cleveland neighborhoods. Central, Hough, and Mt. Pleasant were selected as the three neighborhoods, and 69 residents participated in this research project.

Group discussion revealed that community members in Cleveland supported rehabilitation and reentry programs to prevent crimes. However, participants admitted that, in reality, they did not show supportive opinions toward returning prisoners. In addition, residents acknowledged that they were reluctant to become involved in reentry efforts. Instead of being involved in these efforts, participants believed that other

organizations such as community service agencies or churches could offer services and assistance to meet inmates' needs. Although community members were unwilling to engage in reentry efforts, when they were asked about the role of the community in reentry efforts, they recognized the importance of their "support, encouragement, and guidance to returning prisoners" (Brooks et al., 2006, p. 22).

Public Opinion Data

2001 Hart research associates public opinion survey. Recent public opinion polls are more likely to include prisoner reentry questions in their survey items. In 2001, Hart Research Associates conducted a public opinion survey to assess the public's attitudes toward the criminal justice system, using a telephone survey of 1,056 randomly selected adults. In terms of prisoner reentry, the public strongly supported prisoner reentry programs. Over 90% of the respondents supported prison-based job training and educational programs to enhance the successful reintegration of inmates into society. In addition, 88% of the respondents supported job training for released prisoners. Regarding early release programs as incentives to participants of prison-based rehabilitation programs, 78% of respondents favored early release as an incentive. The public also supported restoring felony offenders' lost rights. Sixty eight percent of the respondents favored restoring voting rights and drivers' licenses to felony convicts, while 26% of them did not (Hart Research Associates, 2001).

Based on their findings, researchers attempted to explain why the public's attitude changed between 1995 and 2001. Prior to 1995, through consecutive public opinion polls on punishment, Americans demonstrated strong support for harsh punishment (Applegate et al., 1997; Cullen et al, 2000; Rogers, 2004; Zimbardo & Haney, 1998), and they were

labeled as punitive (Zimbardo & Haney). By contrast, results of the Hart Research Associates' public opinion survey demonstrated significant changes in the public's attitudes toward punishment and reentry. Using two survey questions about the effectiveness of current crime policy, the authors asserted that the public did not believe that America's approach to crime was effective. That is, 54% of the respondents indicated that the current national crime policy is "off on the wrong track", while 35% considered the current crime policy "off on the right track". The public's fractured trust in national crime policy is more apparent in their views on policies associated with the war on drugs. Seventy percent of the respondents regarded the war on drugs as a failed policy, while 18% regarded it as successful. Researchers argued that the public lost faith in the current national crime policy, and that this resulted in the public altering its views. Faced with high recidivism, the majority of Americans is believed to support reentry efforts for preventing further crimes committed by ex-prisoners (Hart Research Associates, 2001).

2005 Massachusetts public opinion survey. Another public opinion survey conducted in Massachusetts included prisoner reentry items. In an attempt to assess the public's opinion in shaping criminal justice policy, in 2005, Roberts and his colleagues at the Criminal Justice Institute conducted a public opinion survey in Massachusetts. For the telephone survey, 411 Massachusetts adults, who resided outside of Boston and 337 adults in the city of Boston were randomly selected. Roberts et al. compared the opinions of Massachusetts residents to those of Boston residents. Although the respondents from Boston demonstrated more supportive attitudes toward rehabilitation and reentry, the difference was small. Boston residents showed more concern (20%) for crime issues than

Massachusetts residents as a whole. Reentry programs received strong support from all the study's participants (Roberts et al.).

Consistent with the results of the Hart public opinion poll in 2001, 78% of the sample of Massachusetts residents also favored early release for inmates who participate in prison-based rehabilitation programs, on one condition: those released prisoners should be placed in after-release services or under strict supervision. The majority (90%) of the respondents agreed to provide job training and housing assistance for the released inmates. Acknowledging the cost effectiveness of reentry programs, 77% of the Boston sample residents and 69% of the Massachusetts sample residents were willing to pay more taxes for increasing reentry programs (Roberts et al., 2005).

2006 Zogby International public opinion survey. Recent public opinion survey data confirmed the public's support for prisoner reentry. In 2006, 1,039 American voters were randomly selected for a telephone survey by Zogby International (Krisberg & Marchionna, 2006). Along with assessing the public's attitudes toward rehabilitation, this national public opinion survey specifically focused on the reentry issue. The public's support for prisoner reentry was so strong that the authors concluded that "Americans abandoned punishment-only attitudes in efforts to reduce crime" (Krisberg & Marchionna, p. 1).

First, 79% of the respondents expressed concern about the large number of returning prisoners, while 21% were not concerned about this situation. Nonetheless, the majority (93%) of the respondents supported reentry programs such as job training, drug treatment, mental health services, family support, mentoring, and housing to prevent released inmates from committing further crimes. When questioned about the proper time

for planning a prisoner's reentry into society, 91% of the respondents preferred adequate time for preparing inmates; 44% answered at sentencing, 27% indicated one year prior to release, 20% responded six months prior to release, and 7% answered upon release. Only 1% of the respondents did not acknowledge the importance of a preparation period for prisoner reentry. Last of all, the respondents were asked about using more money for reentry programs. Seventy eight percent of the respondents approved the government using more money by supporting the Second Chance Act which enables each state to allocate federal funds for reentry efforts (Krisberg & Marchionna, 2006).

2007 Gideon public opinion survey. More recently, Gideon (2008) examined public opinion on prisoner reentry. In 2007, Gideon selected 879 residents in New York City and the Tri-State area using quota sampling combined with snow ball sampling. Through the 99-item self-administered survey, Gideon investigated the public's attitudes toward rehabilitation and reentry. Consistent with the results of Zogby International's National Survey, 84.8 % of the respondents expressed concern about the large numbers of returning inmates. When questioned about the Second Chance Act which intends to allocate federal funds for reentry programs and elicit cooperation among the criminal justice system, public health, and social service systems, 83.1% of the respondents supported this Act. In this question, the researcher employed three different types of offenders: drug offenders, violent offenders, and sex offenders. The treatment of drug offenders through the Second Chance Act was most strongly supported and the treatment of sex offenders was the least supported (Gideon).

In summary, public opinion surveys revealed that the majority of the respondents supported prisoner reentry efforts, although the respondents still demonstrated negative

attitudes toward returning prisoners. Appendix A presents a summary of the studies of the public's attitudes toward prisoner reentry.

College Students' Attitudes toward Prisoners

Early researchers pointed out the importance of investigating the public's attitudes toward prisoners. Glaser (1969) argued that correctional officers' positive attitudes toward prisoners were one of the major factors that contributed to successful reintegration. Jacobi (1975) and Niederdoffer (1969) found that the law enforcement officers were likely to have the most negative attitudes toward prisoners. These studies also revealed that professionals with rehabilitative or criminal defense functions demonstrated the most positive attitudes toward prisoners, while students, correctional officers, and law enforcement officers were likely to demonstrate negative attitudes toward prisoners. Recently, researchers investigating prisoner reentry also emphasized the importance of exploring the public's perceptions on returning prisoners to improve negative attitudes and enhance the effectiveness of rehabilitation programs and reentry efforts (Kjelsberg, Skoglund, & Rustad, 2007).

However, as previously mentioned, attitudes toward prisoners have rarely been studied. Only three studies conducted by Melvin, Gramling, and Gardner (1985), Ortet-Fabregat, Perez, and Lewis (1993), and Kjelsberg et al. (2007) were identified. Using the Attitudes Toward Prisoners (ATP) scale, these three studies compared the ATP scores of different groups, including a student group. Because the developers of the ATP scale (Melvin et al.), conducted research in the United States, and Ortet-Fabregat et al. and Kjelsberg et al. replicated the Melvin et al. research in Spain and Norway respectively, a cross-country comparison is available. All three studies hypothesized that the student

group would demonstrate a lower ATP score. That is, students were expected to demonstrate negative attitudes toward prisoners. These three studies will be reviewed in this section.

Research on Attitudes toward Prisoners in the United States

Supporting Glaser's (1969) argument, Melvin et al. (1985) stressed the importance of positive attitudes of the public, criminal justice personnel, and policy makers toward prisoners. In 1985, they developed a 36- item ATP (Attitudes Toward Prisoners) scale to measure the public's attitudes toward prisoners. A five- category Likert scale was used for the responses: (1) Strongly Disagree, (2) Disagree, (3) Undecided, (4) Agree, and (5) Strongly Agree. A score of 1 represents the most negative attitude, and a 5 represents the most positive attitude toward prisoners. The ATP scale's test-retest reliability was .82. In addition, the ATP scale's internal consistency was verified through a split-half reliability test score ($r = .90$) (Melvin et al.).

From a total sample of 409, the researchers formed six different sample groups to compare their views. The first group was a prison reform/rehabilitation group consisting of 19 persons who were participating in prison reform projects and rehabilitation programs as volunteers. The second group, a prisoners' group, was composed of 157 prison inmates. The third group consisted of 90 students. For the fourth group, comprised of community members, 64 community members participated. The fifth group was the law enforcement officers' group: 23 law enforcement personnel from the FBI, Treasury Department, and the Tuscaloosa City Police Department were selected. The last group was a correctional officers' group, and 56 correctional officers were selected from the

Mississippi State Penitentiary. The higher the ATP score a group has, the more positive attitudes the group is considered to demonstrate (Melvin et al., 1985).

As the researchers predicted, the prisoners' group demonstrated the highest mean scores (109.5) and the rehabilitation/ reform group had the second highest mean scores (108.3). The law enforcement officers' group had the lowest mean score (67). The correctional officers' mean score was 90.7, the students' mean score was 90.5, and community members' mean score was 87.4. Contrary to the researchers' hypothesis, correctional officers demonstrated more positive attitudes toward prisoners than students and community members. Researchers interpreted this result as being related to the expanded rehabilitation programs in the Mississippi State Penitentiary. Melvin et al. (1985) contended that these programs could affect correctional officers' attitudes toward prisoners. To investigate demographic differences, researchers analyzed ATP scores by race and gender. Even though women and African-Americans were more likely to have higher ATP scores, these differences were not statistically significant (Melvin et al.).

Cross-Cultural Data: ATP Scores in Spain

The Melvin et al. (1985) research was replicated in Spain and research results were similar to the original findings. In 1993, Ortet-Fabregat et al. investigated attitudes toward prisoners in Spain. Along with the ATP scale, the researchers also employed the WPAI (Wilson-Patterson Attitude Inventory) Scale which Ortet-Fabregat and Perez developed. Consisting of 50 items demonstrating various social issues, the WPAI scale was developed to measure how conservative or liberal a person is on controversial social issues. If one has a higher WPAI score, he or she is considered more conservative. In order to compare different attitudes toward prisoners among various groups of people in

society, the authors formed one student group (n=191), and four criminal justice system professionals groups. The four criminal justice professional groups included a prison rehabilitation team (n=47), a defense attorneys' group (n=31), a law enforcement officers' group (n= 65) and a correctional officers' group (n=62).

This research also confirmed the reliability and validity of the ATP scale (Ortet-Fabregat et al.). In the test-retest for reliability, the Pearson correlation coefficient between the two surveys which had been conducted over a four-week period was .92. For the validity of the ATP scale, researchers examined a correlation with the WPAI. As the authors expected, there was a statistically significant negative relationship between ATP scores and WPAI scores (Ortet-Fabregat et al.).

With the exception of correctional officers' scores, the Ortet-Fabregat et al. (1993) research results were consistent with the Melvin et al. (1985) study. The prison rehabilitation team's mean score was the highest score. University students and law enforcement officers demonstrated similar negative attitudes toward prisoners. In the Melvin et al. research, the law enforcement officers' group demonstrated the most negative attitudes toward prisoners. However, in the Ortet-Fabregat et al. research, correctional officers' attitudes toward prisoners were the most negative. Consistent with the Melvin et al. research, these research findings also revealed that there were gender differences in attitudes toward prisoners. Women were less likely to demonstrate negative attitudes toward prisoners than men (Ortet-Fabregat et al.).

Cross-Cultural Data: ATP Scores in Norway

In Norway, Kjelsberg et al. (2007) explored different attitudes toward prisoners among three different groups: prison inmates, prison employees, and college students.

Kjelsberg et al. also used the 36-item Attitudes Toward Prisoners (ATP) scale and their results were consistent with the previous research of Melvin et al. (1985) and Ortet-Fabregat et al. (1993). For the sample group, 298 inmates from four Norwegian prisons, 387 employees in the same four prisons, and 184 college students were selected. Based on previous research, the researchers had hypothesized that students would have the most negative attitudes toward prisoners, that prison employees would show intermediate attitudes, and that the prisoners themselves would demonstrate the most positive attitudes. As they predicted, prison inmates showed the most positive attitudes toward prisoners with the mean score of 106. The mean score of the prison employees was 93. The prison employee group consisted of general prison employees and prison officers. Within their group, prison officers' attitudes were more negative ($M=90$) than those of general prison employees ($M=98$). Among the three sample groups, the prison officer group had the most negative attitudes (Kjelsberg et al.).

As expected, college students' attitudes toward prisoners were negative ($M=91$), and there were differences among majors. Students majoring in business/economics showed the most negative attitudes with the mean score of 82, while nursing students had a mean score of 96. History students ($M=95$) also showed less negative attitudes toward prisoners than business/economic majors. Gender differences also were demonstrated. Among all participants, male students' attitudes toward prisoners were the most negative with the mean score of 86; and for female students the mean score was 93 (Kjelsberg et al., 2007).

In the three studies, the student group demonstrated negative attitudes toward prisoners. However, the college students' ATP scores were not the lowest among the

sample groups. In the Melvin et al. (1985) research, college students demonstrated more positive attitudes than the community members' group and the law enforcement personnel group. In the Ortet-Fabregat et al. (1993) research, the Spanish college students' ATP scores were similar to those of the law enforcement group. However, the college students demonstrated less negative attitudes toward prisoners than the correctional officers' group.

The Norwegian college students' attitudes also were similar to the American and the Spanish students in the Kjelsberg et al. (2007) research. The ATP score of the students' group was higher than the prison officers' group and lower than the general prison employee group. However, because neither Ortet-Fabregat et al. (1993) nor Kjelsberg et al. included the general public in their sample groups, it is unknown whether the student group had a more positive attitude toward prisoners than the general public.

College Students' Attitudes toward Punishment and Rehabilitation

Compared to the research on college students' attitudes toward punishment, college students' attitudes toward reentry are rarely studied. The majority of the studies of college students' perceptions on correctional issues has focused on punishment (Courtright & Mackey, 2004; Farnworth, Longmire, & West, 1998; Selke, 1980), and the death penalty (Bohm, Clark, & Aveni, 1991; Farnworth et al., 1998; Lane, 1997; Miller, 2001; Payne & Coogle, 1998; Sandys & McGarrell, 1995). Recently, researchers have focused on the perceptions of criminal justice students, because they are the future practitioners and crime policy makers (Courtright, 2000; Falco, 2008; Farnworth et al., 1998; Hensley et al., 2003; Mackey & Lambert, 2004; Miller, Tewksbury, & Hensley, 2004).

The lack of research on college students' attitudes toward prisoner reentry necessitates reviewing research on college students' attitudes toward punishment and rehabilitation. In this section, research on college students' attitudes toward punishment and rehabilitation was reviewed. Based on these research findings, it was possible to anticipate college students' attitudes toward prisoner reentry.

College Students' Attitudes toward Punishment

Because college students are future practitioners and policy makers, the research on college students' attitudes toward punishment has been growing. In this section, research conducted by Lambert (2005), Mackey and Courtright (2000), Lambert (2004), and Falco (2008) on college students' attitudes toward punishment were reviewed. Specifically, Lambert (2005) focused on racially different views among college students. The other three studies compared attitudes of criminal justice students with non-criminal justice students.

With the hypothesis that race is a significant predictor of one's level of punitiveness, Lambert (2005) examined college students' attitudes toward punishment. Through a convenient sample, 302 undergraduate students were selected from two Midwestern public universities. Race, age, gender, academic level, and conservative/liberal ideology were included as independent variables. Race was coded as either white or minority. Sixty five questions were developed to measure the college students' attitudes toward crime, punishment, and the death penalty. A five-point Likert scale, ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree, was utilized for responses.

As Lambert (2005) predicted, there were different views between white students and minority students, and they were statistically significant. While 50% of the white

students supported the death penalty, 29% of the minority students supported the death penalty. Although 67% of the minority students regarded treatment as one of the primary goals of criminal justice system, 50% of the white students also held this belief.

Regarding the other independent variables, gender, age, and academic level were not significant factors, while being politically conservative/liberal was a statistically significant predictor for the college students' level of punitiveness. That is, respondents who identified themselves as having conservative political views were more likely to demonstrate punitive attitudes than their counterparts (Lambert).

Mackey and Courtright (2000) examined college students' attitudes toward criminal punishment with a hypothesis that criminal justice students are more likely to demonstrate punitive attitudes than non-criminal justice students. Through convenient sampling, 633 students were selected from five Northeastern universities. A 30-item scale was developed to measure the college students' support for rehabilitation and punishment. Respondents were asked to place a slash mark on the scale between strongly agree and strongly disagree indicating their level of agreement with the statements. Along with the primary variable major, gender, age, race, grade level, political ideology, and the size of the town where a respondent grew up also were examined (Mackey & Courtright).

Research findings were consistent with previous research. Older and female students were less likely to be punitive than younger and male students; however, these differences were not statistically significant. As Mackey and Courtright (2000) predicted, significant differences between criminal justice and the non-criminal justice students were identified. The criminal justice students demonstrated more punitive attitudes than the non-criminal justice students. The number of years in college also was a statistically

significant factor of college students' punitiveness. Seniors and juniors were less likely to demonstrate punitive attitudes than freshmen. Accordingly, the "liberalizing effect" that Bohm and Vogel (1994), Lane (1997), and McCorkle (1993) had noted, also was identified in this research. The liberalizing effect refers to the impact of college education on college students' attitudes and it will be discussed in more detail later. In addition, the political ideology and the size of the town were significant predictors. A student who identified himself/herself as having a conservative political view and a student who grew up in a small town with less than 25,000 people were more likely to be punitive (Mackey & Courtright).

Lambert (2004) also investigated different views on punishment between criminal justice students and non-criminal justice students. Through convenient sampling, 590 students were selected from two Midwestern universities. A 15-item survey measured students' opinions on crime, punishment, and the death penalty. A five-point Likert scale, ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree, was the response format. In addition to major, gender, race, academic standing, ideology, and age were included as predictors (Lambert).

As hypothesized, on the whole, the criminal justice students demonstrated more punitive attitudes toward crime and punishment than non-criminal justice students, which was statistically significant. Regarding rehabilitation, criminal justice students demonstrated less favorable attitudes toward rehabilitation. However, these two differences were not statistically significant. Race and political ideology were found to be significant predictors of college students' levels of punitiveness. That is, non-white students and politically liberal students were less likely to be punitive. Other variables -

age, gender, and academic level- were significant on several items related to punitiveness (Lambert, 2004).

The most recent research on the different levels of punitiveness between criminology and non-criminology students was conducted by Falco in 2008. Through probability sampling, 519 undergraduate college students were selected from one public university in the Northeast. To measure punitiveness, a 15- item Punitiveness scale developed by Mackey and Courtright (2000) was utilized. Along with major, eight other variables were included as predictors: academic level, gender, size of the town where a student grew up, political ideology, religiosity, fear of crime/victimization, prior criminal victimization, and causal attribution toward criminal behaviors (Falco).

Contrary to the previous research findings, it was found that criminology students were less likely to demonstrate punitive attitudes. Academic year also was found to be a significant predictor of punitiveness. Consistent with previous research, students who were more academically advanced were less likely to be punitive. However, gender and victimization experience were not statistically significant, although female students and students with victimization experiences were less likely to be punitive. The size of the student's hometown also was examined. Instead of asking the population of the town where a student grew up, the respondents were asked to identify their town as rural or urban/suburban. Consistent with the previous research, the students from rural locations were more likely to demonstrate punitive attitudes, but it was not statistically significant (Falco, 2008).

Regarding religious devotion and fear of crime, the results were similar to the size of the town. As predicted, a student with a higher level of religious devotion,

victimization experience, and fear of crime was more likely to be punitive, however these findings were not statistically significant. Political ideology was a statistically significant predictor of college students' attitudes toward punishment. As the researcher hypothesized, a student with a politically conservative view was more likely to be punitive than a student with a politically liberal view (Falco, 2008).

Falco (2008) also examined the relationship between causal attribution and punitiveness. Based on previous research, the researcher constructed the hypothesis that the respondents who support classical theory, social process theory, and subcultural theory are more likely to be punitive than respondents who favor structural positivism theory, labeling theory, and individual positivism theory. Falco found three statistically significant relationships between causal attribution and punitiveness. A respondent who supported labeling theory and structural positivism theory was less likely to be punitive, and a respondent who favored classical theory was more likely to demonstrate a punitive attitude (Falco).

In interpreting the different results from the previous research on student major, Falco (2008) presented several potential explanations. First of all, the researcher attributed different results to the improved research method. Instead of convenient sampling commonly utilized by other researchers, stratified cluster sampling was employed for this research. This sampling method is more representative than convenient sampling, which might lead to different results. The definition of criminology majors was also different. In other studies, the criminology major sample consisted of students from "Criminal Justice Administration" or "Criminal Justice", while for this research only "Criminology" program students were identified as criminology majors. The researcher

argued that compared to a criminal justice program, the criminology program provides more theory classes, which might reduce the college students' punitiveness. In addition, Falco noted the possibility that faculty members and the curricula in this particular university might be more liberal than other colleges.

College Students' Attitudes toward Rehabilitation

Applegate et al. (1997) noted the general public's simultaneous desire for punishment and rehabilitation of criminals in their public opinion studies. College students are not "monolithically punitive" (Applegate et al., 1997, p. 238). That is, college students have demonstrated support for punishment of criminals and rehabilitation of criminals at the same time. Hensley, Koscheski, and Tewksbury (2003), Lambert, Pasupuleti, and Allen (2005), and Mackey et al. (2006) investigated college students' views on rehabilitation and found that, on the whole, college students demonstrated supportive attitudes toward prisoner rehabilitation. These three studies will be reviewed in this section.

Hensley et al. (2003) selected 553 sociology and criminology students from a mid-size southern university by convenient sampling in order to investigate the extent to which college students support in-prison programs, services, and amenities. A list of 26 items such as psychological counseling, job training programs, GED classes, books, radios, R-rated movies, and conjugal visits were presented. Respondents were asked to select any programs that they supported. If the item had a higher score, the item was considered gaining more support. Age, gender, race, major, class standing, and political ideology of students also were examined to assess which factor predicted the level of

college students' support for programs, services, and amenities for inmates (Hensley et al).

Among 26 dependent variables, rehabilitation-related items such as counseling, job training, and educational programs were most supported by students. On the other hand, comfort-related items such as cable television and R-rated movies were least favored. The five most favored items were psychological counseling (M=4.34), basic literacy programs (M=4.26), supervised visits with family (M=4.21), books (M=4.14) and HIV/AIDS treatment (M=4.13). The five least supported items were pornography (M=1.62), cable television (M=1.87), boxing and martial arts (M=1.90), R-rated movies (M=2.12), and conjugal visits (M=2.49). Among six independent variables, four variables, gender, race, age, and political ideology, were statistically significant predictors for college students' attitudes. They also found that female students, non-white students, older students, and politically liberal students were more likely to support in-prison programs, services, and amenities than their counterparts. Researchers concluded that, on the whole, college students supported prison-based rehabilitation programs and services (Hensley et al., 2003).

Mackey et al. (2006) examined college students' levels of support for rehabilitation. They selected 633 students through non-probability sampling from three medium to large-size state universities and two small Catholic colleges in the Northeast. Mackey et al. developed a 30-item scale to assess students' punitiveness and support for rehabilitation. The researchers hypothesized that gender, major, empathy, occupational attractiveness of correctional counselor, political ideology, the size of town where the students were raised, and academic year were associated with the college students'

support for rehabilitation. Consistent with the previous research, female students were more likely to support rehabilitation than male students. Regarding major, unlike the previous research, their study revealed that there was a slight difference between criminal justice majors and non-criminal justice majors. However, the difference was not statistically significant. Regarding academic year, students who were juniors and seniors (criminology and non-criminology) demonstrated more support for rehabilitation than freshmen and sophomores. However, their findings were not statistically significant (Mackey et al., 2006).

With the hypothesis that there is an association between empathy and support for rehabilitation, students' empathy levels were also examined. According to Stotland (1969), "empathy is an individual's vicarious emotional responses to perceived emotional experiences of others" (p.127). A 30-item Emotional Empathy scale created by psychologist Mehrabian (1996) was utilized. In the regression analysis, it was found that empathy was strongly related to one's level of support for rehabilitation. As predicted, a student with a higher empathy level was more likely to demonstrate support for rehabilitation, and it was statistically significant (Mackey et al., 2006).

Regarding the occupational attractiveness of the correctional counselor variable, the researchers hypothesized that a person's plan to become a correctional counselor would be related to his/her level of support for rehabilitation. This variable was a significant predictor for one's level of support for rehabilitation. Political ideology also was associated with the rehabilitation ideal. The unstandardized slope coefficient (-0.20) indicated that the more a student adopted a conservative political ideology, the less likely a student would show support for rehabilitation. This difference was statistically

significant. Finally, in regard to the size of the town, a town with less than 25,000 residents was coded as a small town, and a town with more than 25,000 residents was considered a large town. For support for rehabilitation, the mean score of students from small towns was 73.3, and the mean score of students from large towns was 76.8. As predicted, students from larger towns were likely to support rehabilitation ideals and it was statistically significant (Mackey et al., 2006).

Lambert et al. (2005) examined college students' level of punitiveness and support for rehabilitation. The researchers compared views of social work major students with non-social work students. Through convenient sampling, 172 social work majors and 234 non-social work majors were selected from a large public Midwestern University. The researchers had hypothesized that because the social work curriculum contains more rehabilitative ideas than punishment of offenders, social work major students are more likely to be supportive of rehabilitation ideas. In addition to major, gender, race, college level, political party, importance of religion, and fear of victimization were included as independent variables based on the previous research.

As predicted, social work major students were more likely to support rehabilitation than non-social work major students. When controlling other independent variables, the differences between the two groups were statistically significant. Among the eight independent variables, age, race, academic level, and the importance of religion were not statistically associated with students' views on rehabilitation and punishment. However, the gender difference was statistically significant. Female students were more likely to support rehabilitation than male students. Racial differences also were identified. Although white students demonstrated more punitive attitudes, both white students and

non-white students showed similar levels of support for rehabilitation. Consistent with previous research, political party was a significant factor as well. Students who identified themselves as Republicans were more likely to be supportive of punishment and less likely to support rehabilitation. Victimization experience also was a statistically significant factor. It was found that the more a student feared victimization, the more s/he was likely to support punishment rather than rehabilitation (Lambert et al., 2005).

The researchers attributed the high level of support for rehabilitation among social work major students to the fact that women, non-whites, and students who identified themselves as Democrats have a propensity to choose the social work major. In addition, educational programs and experiences that the social work curriculum provided can be one potential explanation of the supportive attitudes of social work major students. Lambert et al. (2005) recommended more research in various universities to find general patterns of college students' attitudes toward rehabilitation. This research also can be viewed as evidence of education's ability to enhance college students' support for the rehabilitation ideal (Lambert et al.). Appendix B presents a summary of the studies of college students' attitudes toward prisoners, rehabilitation, and punishment.

Factors Affecting the Public's Attitudes

Factors which influence the public's attitudes toward punishment have been investigated. Gender, age, race, education level, political affiliation, victimization experience, fear of crime, and socioeconomic status have been found to be associated with the public's attitudes toward punishment (Applegate et al., 1997; Brown, 1999; Cullen, Clark, Cullen, & Mathers, 1985; Herman & Wasserman, 2001; Levenson et al., 2007; Sundt et al., 1998; Unnever & Cullen, 2007; Wilson & Dunham, 2001).

Conversely, Langworthy and Whitehead (1986), and Maruna and King (2004) argued that the relationship between demographic characteristics and public attitudes is not clear, and it is difficult to explain. In this section, based on the previous research findings, ten factors which are expected to be associated with attitudes toward prisoners and prisoner reentry were examined. These ten factors were used as independent variables for the current study.

Gender and the Public's Punitiveness

Gender is one of the most explored factors and it has been found to be a significant predictor of the public's view on punishment by many researchers (Applegate, Cullen, & Fisher, 2002; Harris, 1986; Lambert, 2005; Sprott, 1999; Sundt et al., 1998). However, the research findings about gender differences were inconsistent. Some researchers found that men were less likely to be punitive than women (Cohn, Barkan, & Halteman, 1991; Farnworth et al., 1998; Haghghi & Lopez, 1998; Hurwitz & Smithey, 1998; Kelley & Braithwaite, 1990; McCorkle, 1993; Miller, Rossi, & Simpson, 1986), while other researchers found that women were less likely to be punitive than men (Applegate et al., 2002; Barkan & Cohn, 1994; Blumstein & Cohen, 1980; Borg, 1997; Cullen et al., 1985; Evans & Adams, 2003; MacDonald & Erickson, 1999; Rossi & Berk, 1997; Schwartz, Guo, & Kerbs, 1993; Sprott, 1999). Other researchers found no relationship between gender and punitiveness (Applegate, Cullen, Turner, & Sundt, 1996; Chiricos, Welch, & Gertz, 2004; Gideon, 2008; Grasmick, Davenport, Chamlin, & Bursik, 1992; Grasmick, Robert, Bursik, Jr., & Blackwell., 1993; Halim & Stiles, 2001; Hurwitz & Smithey, 1998; Johnson, 2001; McCorkle, 1993; Sims, 2003; Sprott, 1999; Taylor & Kleinke, 1992; Warr & Stafford, 1984).

Applegate et al. (2002) investigated gender differences in views toward crime and correctional policies with a random sample of 559 Ohio residents. With the hypothesis that women were less likely to be punitive than men, questionnaires were mailed to assess the public's support for rehabilitation and punishment. In particular, the researchers utilized various scenarios, which randomly included various attributes such as the offenders' race, gender, age, and criminal history (Applegate et al.).

As predicted, gender differences were identified. After controlling for age, race, political ideology, political party, and education level, women were more likely to support rehabilitation and were less favorable to punishment. These results were statistically significant. Specifically, there were prominent gender differences in support for the death penalty and rehabilitation. In addition, women were more likely to be influenced by the gender of the offender. Female respondents were more likely to demonstrate supportive attitudes toward female offenders; however, male respondents did not demonstrate different attitudes based on the gender of the offenders (Applegate et al., 2002).

Other independent variables, victimization experience and fear of crime, were also examined. It was found that the victimization experience affected men's and women's attitudes differently. Although both men's and women's support for rehabilitation were reduced by their victimization experience, its impact on women was greater than on men. The fear of crime was related to both men and women's reduced support for rehabilitation and increased support for the death penalty (Applegate et al., 2002). However, contrary to the Applegate et al. research, the previously reviewed

research by Gideon (2008) found no significant differences in views between men and women toward rehabilitation and prisoner reentry.

Gender and College Students' Punitiveness

Among the previously mentioned studies on college students' attitudes, several studies found a statistically significant association between gender and punitiveness. In Lambert's (2004) research, it was found that female students were more likely to support rehabilitation than male students; and male students were more likely to support the death penalty than female students. These findings were statistically significant. However, in Lambert's subsequent 2005 research, gender was not a significant factor for support of punitive punishment. Hensley et al. (2003), Mackey et al. (2006), and Lambert et al. (2005) also found that female college students were more likely to support rehabilitation, while Mackey and Courtright (2000) and Falco (2008) found no significant differences.

Race and the Public's Punitiveness

Along with gender, race also is identified frequently as a factor to predict one's level of punitiveness (Barkan & Cohn, 1994; Cohn et al., 1991; Kennedy, 1997; Mauer, 1999; Tonry, 1995; Unnever & Cullen, 2007; Wilson & Dunham, 2001). However, similar to other factors, the research findings were not consistent.

Tsoudis' (2000) survey of 200 Midwestern university students revealed that there was no significant association between race and punitiveness. Sims (2003) found that race was not a statistically significant factor for punitiveness and rehabilitation in his analysis of the data from the National Opinion Survey on Crime and Justice of 1996, which assessed the public's attitudes toward crime and criminal justice.

In spite of the inconclusive research findings, some studies found that non-whites were more likely to support rehabilitation and less likely to be punitive (Evans & Adams, 2003; McCorkle, 1993). In explaining minority groups' less punitive attitudes, researchers attributed their less punitive attitudes to the assumption that minorities were more likely to experience racial discrimination in the criminal justice system (Flanagan & Longmire, 1996; Gabbidon, Penn, & Richards, 2003).

Cohn et al. (1991) also examined racially different attitudes toward punishment by analyzing the data from the 1987 National Opinion Research Center General Social Survey. A telephone survey of 1,466 respondents revealed that race was a statistically significant predictor of one's level of punitiveness. The difference was not great, but non-whites were less likely to be punitive and more supportive of rehabilitation. Cohn et al. (1991) also found that whites and non-whites had different origins for punitive attitudes. The fear of crime was strongly associated with non-whites' level of punitiveness, while racial prejudice was a primary source of whites' punitiveness. Meanwhile, the respective relationships between punitiveness and fear of crime, gender, age, and racial prejudice were weak, but they were statistically significant (Cohn et al.). McCorkle (1993) also found results similar to the Cohn et al. research.

The previously mentioned research also indicated that non-whites were more likely to support rehabilitation and less likely to be punitive. In the Hart Research Associates 2001 national survey, regarding the question of what is the number one goal of criminal justice, the majority of African Americans supported prevention (72%) rather than punishment (25%). On the other hand, whites demonstrated similar attitudes toward

both approaches: 49% of whites favored prevention, while 42 % of them supported punishment (Hart Research Associates, 2001).

A public opinion telephone survey of Massachusetts residents uncovered racially different views on rehabilitation and reentry. While 77% of minority group members supported post-release programs for released inmates, 59% of whites supported them. Gideon's (2008) research also found that whites were more likely to be punitive and less likely to support rehabilitation and reentry than African Americans. When education interacted with race, the results were different. Whites with higher education levels demonstrated the least punitive attitudes among all the respondents.

Race and College Students' Punitiveness

Studies on college students' attitudes also examined racial differences. Lambert (2004, 2005), Lambert et al. (2005), and Hensley et al. (2003) included race as an independent variable. In his 2004 research comparing criminal justice students and non-criminal justice students' punitiveness, Lambert found that racial differences were significant in all 15 items. Non-whites were more likely to support rehabilitation, were less favorable to the death penalty, and were less punitive. In his subsequent 2005 research on college students' attitudes toward punishment, Lambert focused on racial differences; and he found that race was a statistically significant predictor of students' punitiveness. Moreover, the Hensley et al. (2003) research about college students' attitudes toward inmate programs, services, and amenities also revealed that non-white college students were more likely to support prison-based services and programs than white students. Finally, the Lambert et al. (2005) research found a statistically significant relationship between race and college students' attitudes toward punishment and

rehabilitation. White students were more likely to support harsh punishment and less likely to support rehabilitation.

Major and College Students' Punitiveness

In research on college students' attitudes toward punishment and rehabilitation, major has become one of the most frequently explored variables. Many researchers pointed out the importance of understanding attitudes and views of criminal justice students, because they are future correctional practitioners and crime policy makers (Falco, 2008; Farnworth et al., 1998; Lambert, 2004; Mackey & Courtright, 2000; Tsoudis, 2000). Criminal justice students' higher levels of punitiveness were commonly discussed among researchers, but empirical research demonstrated inconclusive results. Early researchers, such as Fabianic (1979) and McCarthy and McCarthy (1981) found that criminal justice students were more supportive of the rehabilitation of offenders. Tsoudis' (2000) research in a large urban Midwestern university also revealed that criminal justice students were more likely to support the criminal defendant's rights and less likely to support harsh sentences.

The previously reviewed studies on college students' attitudes produced mixed results. Mackey et al. (2006), Hensley et al. (2003), Mackey and Courtright (2000), Lambert (2004), and Falco (2008) compared attitudes toward punishment or rehabilitation between criminal justice students and non-criminal justice students. The Mackey et al. (2006) research on support for the rehabilitation ideal indicates that criminal justice students were less likely to support rehabilitation than non-criminal justice students. However, this difference was very slight and not statistically significant.

The Hensley et al. (2003) study on college students' attitudes toward inmate programs, services, and amenities produced similar results. Although criminology students were less likely to support prison programs and services, the findings were not statistically significant.

On the other hand, Mackey and Courtright (2000), and Lambert (2004) found that criminal justice students were more likely to be punitive than non-criminal justice students. In an attempt to explain criminal justice students' higher level of punitiveness, the researchers noted the fact that historically, criminal justice students tend to pursue law-enforcement related jobs. Accordingly, due to this occupational preference, the primary goal of the curricula offered by criminal justice courses has been to prepare students as law enforcement personnel (Hensley et al., 2002; Lambert, 2004; Mackey & Courtright).

However, recent research by Falco (2008) demonstrated different results. In her study, criminology students were less likely to demonstrate punitive attitudes. As previously mentioned, Falco (2008) pointed out that other researchers used criminal justice students, while she utilized criminology students as a sample. She argued that the differences in these two programs might influence criminology majors' attitudes toward punishment. She used the required theory class in criminology as an example of the difference.

For the current study, the hypothesis of major was constructed based on Falco's (2008) research results, because students from the same university were selected as a sample group. In addition, it is expected that compared to the previous samples of criminal justice students, contemporary criminology major students are well aware of the

importance of the prisoner reentry issue. The current emphasis on the emerging issue of prisoner reentry may influence criminology students' attitudes toward prisoners and prisoner reentry.

Education and the Public's Punitiveness

Education is also an influential factor in the public's views on punishment (Chiricos et al., 2004; Costelloe, Chiricos, Burianek, Gertz, & Maier-Katkin, 2002; Grasmic & McGrill, 1994; Hogan, Chiricos, Gertz, 2005; McCorkle, 1993). Research on the education level also produced mixed results; however, the majority of the research revealed that individuals with higher education levels are less likely to be punitive and more likely to support the rehabilitation of offenders (Barkan & Cohn, 1994; Baumer, Rosenfeld, & Messner, 2000; Berk, 1997; Borg, 1997; Britt, 1998; Hans, 1986; Rossi & McCorkle, 1993; Sims, 2003; Tyler & Boeckmann, 1997).

The Tyler and Boeckmann (1997) research also found that a respondent with a higher education level tends to be less punitive. In looking at education, Tyler and Boeckmann focused on assessing the public's support for the three strikes initiatives, which impose a life in prison sentence to those who have three felony convictions. A telephone survey of 166 randomly selected residents of the East Bay area of Northern California was conducted. Among the demographic factors, age, and education level were found to be significant predictors. That is, younger people were more likely to support the three strikes initiatives and demonstrated more punitive attitudes than older people. An individual with a higher education level was less likely to favor the three strikes initiatives (Tyler & Boeckmann).

The previously reviewed McCorkle (1993) and Gideon (2008) research also examined the effect of education on the views toward punishment and rehabilitation. McCorkle found that an individual with a higher education level was less likely to be punitive, which was statistically significant. Although an individual with a higher education level demonstrated more support for the rehabilitation ideal, it was not statistically significant. In Gideon's research, the education effect was apparent. Although whites were more likely to have punitive attitudes, whites with higher education levels were likely to demonstrate lower levels of punitiveness than whites with less education. On the other hand, Cullen et al. (1985), Cohn et al. (1991), and Unnever, Cullen, & Applegate et al. (2005) found no significant relationship between education level and punitiveness.

Education and College Students' Punitiveness

In research about college students' attitudes, an education variable is measured as a student's academic level. Researchers hypothesized that along with an aging effect and a liberalizing effect, a student's punitiveness is likely to decrease as his/her academic year increases. Early researchers such as Astin (1977), Weiner and Eckland (1979), and Zimbardo et al. (1977) noted a liberalizing effect among college students. As previously discussed, the liberalizing effect refers to the impact of college education on college students' attitudes.

The liberalizing effect of the college experience was confirmed by the research of Farnworth et al. (1998). In their study, Farnworth et al. examined 683 college students' attitudes toward the death penalty and criminal sanctions, and the war on drugs. The researchers found that as academic status progressed, students' punitive attitudes

decreased. It was statistically significant. The previously mentioned Mackey et al. (2006) research also revealed that as the academic years increased, the level of college students' support for rehabilitation also increased. Mackey and Courtright (2000), and Falco (2008) also confirmed the negative relationship between academic level and college students' level of punitiveness.

On the other hand, Hensley et al. (2003), Lambert (2005), and Lambert et al. (2005) did not find any attitudinal changes among students as the academic years increased.

Religion and the Public's Punitiveness

A substantial body of research has investigated the relationship between religion and punitiveness (Applegate et al., 1997; Applegate, Cullen, Fisher, & Ven, 2000; Barkan & Cohn, 1994; Bohm & Vogel, 1994; Borg, 1998; Ellison & Sherkat, 1993; Grasmick et al., 1992; 1993; Harris, 1986; Howells, Flanagan, & Hagan, 1995; Lane, 1997; Myers, 1988; Young & Thompson, 1995), and the results are inconsistent. While Applegate et al., (1997), Barkan and Cohn (1994), Bohm et al. (1991), and Durham, Elrod, and Kinkade (1996) found no relationship between religion and attitudes toward punishment, other researchers found that fundamentalist Christians were more likely to be punitive (Britt, 1998; Evans & Adams, 2003; Grasmick & McGill, 1994; Young & Thompson, 1995).

Evans and Adams (2003) investigated the relationship between religion and correctional ideology. To measure the public's support for rehabilitation and punishment, 600 adult residents of a southeastern county were randomly drawn from the telephone directory. For the religiosity variable, religious activities, religious salience, and

fundamentalism were examined. Age, race, gender, marital status, education, income, fear of crime, victimization experience, and causal attribution also were measured. As predicted, fundamentalists were more likely to be punitive, which was statistically significant. Although fundamentalists were less likely to support rehabilitation, these findings were not significant. It also was found that religious salience reduced punitiveness and increased the support for rehabilitation; but the results were not significant. Religious activities reduced both punitive attitudes and support for rehabilitation, but these findings were not significant.

Regarding other factors, race, marital status, fear of crime, and causal attribution were significant factors for punitiveness. Whites, married respondents, respondents who had victimization experience, and respondents who attributed crime to individual causes were likely to be more punitive than their counterparts. Regarding the support for rehabilitation, age and causal attribution were significant; older respondents and respondents who attributed crime to situational causes were more likely to support rehabilitation (Evans & Adams, 2003).

Contrary to the Evans and Adams (2003) research, Grasmick and McGill (1994) found that a person with a higher level of religiosity is less likely to be punitive. In addition, several researchers attempted to expand the concept of religiosity by investigating other facets of religion (Britt, 1996; Grasmick et al., 1993). Baumer et al. (2000) examined the relationship between the frequency of church attendance and punitiveness. They found that the more an individual attended church, the less he or she was likely to be punitive. Applegate et al. (2000) also examined other features of religion to investigate the association between religion and punitiveness.

Although Applegate et al. (1997) found no association between religion and the level of punitiveness in their 1997 research, they obtained different results by adding the religious value of forgiveness in their 2000 research. They hypothesized that a respondent with a higher value of religious forgiveness will be more supportive of rehabilitation and a fundamentalist who holds a perception of a punitive God will be more likely to be punitive and less likely to support rehabilitation. Applegate et al. (2000) randomly selected 559 Ohio residents, and conducted a survey by mail. Support for rehabilitation and punishment (including the death penalty) were measured as dependent variables. The religious scale consisted of four parts: Forgiveness Index, Biblical Literalism, Punitive God, and Religious Salience.

As Applegate et al. (2000) predicted, fundamental Christians with a higher level of punitive God perceptions and biblical literalism were significantly more likely to support harsh punishment and less likely to support rehabilitation ideals. On the other hand, a respondent with a higher level of the religious value of forgiveness was more likely to support rehabilitation and less likely to be punitive, which was statistically significant (Applegate et al., 2000).

Religion and College Students' Punitiveness

Among the previous mentioned research on college students' attitudes, only two studies examined religion as a predictor of students' punitiveness. Lambert et al. (2005) used one question to measure how important religion is to the respondent's life. A student who placed a higher level of importance on religion was less likely to be punitive and more likely to support rehabilitation. However, these findings were not statistically significant.

Falco (2008) also examined the impact of religion on a student's punitiveness. Along with the religious background, she measured how strongly a respondent commits to religious belief. Inconsistent with the research findings of Lambert et al. (2005), a student with a higher religious devotion was more likely to be punitive, but the results were not statistically significant.

Victimization Experience and the Public's Punitiveness

Victimization experience also is a possible predictor of punitiveness (Applegate et al., 2000; Cullen et al., 1985; Doob, 1997; Evans & Adams, 2003; Herman & Wasserman, 2001; Langworthy & Whitehead, 1986; Sprott & Taylor, 1999). While Blumstein and Cohen (1980), Borg (1997), and Sprott and Doob found a positive association between punitiveness and the victimization experience, the majority of the research did not find a significant relationship (Baron & Hartnagel, 1996; Bohm & Vogel, 1994; Costelloe et al., 2000; Falco, 2008; Rossi & Berk, 1997). Similarly, the previously mentioned research of Evans and Adams and Applegate et al. (2000) did not find a significant relationship between victimization experience and punitiveness.

The Dull and Wint (1997) research also found no significant relationship between victimization experience and punitiveness. Dull and Wint conducted a longitudinal study to investigate the impact of the victimization experience on fear of crime and attitudes toward the criminal justice system. Through convenient sampling, 1,000 freshmen were selected from one Californian university. In the pretest, 557 students participated, and after four years, 271 students of the original 557 students completed the survey. The fear of crime, and attitudes toward capital punishment of the two groups (the non-victim group and the victim group) were compared. Regarding the fear of crime, the

victimization group demonstrated a significantly increased fear of property crime, but little increased fear of personal crime (rape and assault). On the other hand, the non-victimization group indicated little or no increase in fear of crime. Support for the death penalty was examined as a way of assessing students' punitiveness. It was found that there were no statistical differences between the non-victimization and the victimization group (Dull and Wint).

Sprott and Doob (1997) attempted to explain why the majority of research failed to reveal an association between the victimization experience and punitiveness. Using their 1993 Canadian survey results, they argued that the victims of different types of crimes demonstrated different attitudes toward punishment. For example, the victims of sexual assaults were more likely to be punitive than victims of robbery. Accordingly, Sprott and Doob recommended that the various types of offenses should be examined in investigating the victims' attitudes toward punishment.

Other researchers found a negative relationship between victimization experience and punitiveness (Blumstein & Cohen, 1980; Keli & Vito, 1992; McCorkle, 1993; Ouimet & Coyle, 1991; Stinchcombe et al., 1980; Tyler & Weber, 1982). The previously reviewed Falco (2008) research also found a negative relationship. She presented six crimes (car stolen, burglary, robbery, rape, assault, and murder) and later dichotomized responses into a no victimization experience or one or more victimization experiences for the analysis. Falco found that the college students' victimization experience reduced the level of their punitiveness, although it was not statistically significant.

Acquaintance with Offenders and the Public's Punitiveness

In research on the public's attitudes toward punishment and rehabilitation, one's acquaintance with offenders is a rarely examined predictor. The previously mentioned victim offender mediation programs may be the most valuable source to understand the influence of personal contact with offenders on the public's attitude. The victim offender mediation program is a face-to-face dialogue where the three stakeholders (the offender, the victim, and community members) in crime incidents participate in and cooperate to repair the harm and solve the problems (Bazemore & Schiff, 2001). The evaluation research on victim offender mediation programs revealed that participants in victim offender mediation experienced a reduced fear of crime and an increased understanding of criminals through personal contacts with offenders (Roberts, 1995; Umbreit, 1989, 1994, 1996; Umbreit et al., 1998; Van Ness & Strong, 1997; Wright & Galaway, 1989). Because researchers found that the fear of crime is significantly associated with the public's punitiveness (Hough, Lewis, & Walker, 1988; Rossi, Simpson, & Miller, 1985; Taylor, Scheppele, & Stinchombe, 1979), victim offender mediation evaluation research findings indicate that personal contact with criminals may indirectly affect one's level of punitiveness by reducing the fear of crime.

In addition, the previously mentioned Gideon (2008) and Applegate et al. (2000) studies examined the relationship between punitiveness and personal contact with offenders. In assessing the public's support for punishment and rehabilitation, Applegate et al. (2000) explored whether a respondent's contact with criminals affected his/her level of punitiveness. The research findings indicated that the more a respondent had contact with criminals, the less s/he was likely to be punitive, which was statistically significant.

Regarding support for rehabilitation, a respondent with more contact with criminals was more likely to support the rehabilitation ideal, but it was not statistically significant (Applegate et al., 2000).

Gideon (2008) also investigated the effect of one's acquaintance with offenders on support for rehabilitation and reentry. Consistent with the Applegate et al. (2000) research findings, a statistically significant relationship between "knowledge/ familiarity with offenders" and support for rehabilitation was found. That is, if a respondent has knowledge about an inmate or a personal acquaintance with an offender, that person is more likely to demonstrate support for rehabilitation. As an emerging predictor of support for rehabilitation, the effect of "acquaintance with offenders" on college students' attitudes toward prisoners and prisoner reentry will be examined in the present study.

Political Views and the Public's Punitiveness

In examining the association between political views and punitiveness, researchers have utilized two different methods. Some researchers examine one's political party; others measure one's level of political conservatism. For political party, whether a respondent identifies himself or herself as a Democrat, Republican, or Independent has been examined (Applegate et al., 2000; Grasmick et al., 1993). On the other hand, for the level of political conservatism, some researchers assessed how much a respondent has adopted politically conservative views (Chiricos et al., 2004; Hogan et al., 2005; Scheingold, 1984; Unnever et al., 2005).

Although Farnworth et al. (1998) and McCorkle (1993) did not find any significant relationship between political views and punitiveness, most of the research on public attitudes toward punishment found that political ideology or political party is a

significant predictor of punitiveness (Applegate et al., 2000; Britt, 1998; Lambert, 2004; Lambert et al., 2005; Sandys & McGarrell, 1995). Rossi and Berk (1997), Barkan and Cohn (1994), and Baumer et al. (2000) found that politically conservative respondents were more likely to demonstrate punitive attitudes. In addition, Baron and Hartnagel (1996) found that respondents with more politically conservative views tended to demonstrate more negative attitudes toward prison amenities.

The previously reviewed research also examined the influence of political views on one's punitiveness and support for rehabilitation. Gideon (2008) examined political affiliations in his research on the public's punitiveness and attitude toward rehabilitation/reentry. It was revealed that Republicans were more likely to be punitive and less likely to be supportive of rehabilitation, which was statistically significant. Democrats showed more supportive attitudes toward rehabilitation and less punitive attitudes; however, this relationship was not statistically significant (Gideon). The previously discussed Applegate et al. (2000) research produced similar results. Their research findings indicate that Democrats were more likely to support rehabilitation.

Political Views and College Students' Punitiveness

Political views also were significant in research on college students' attitudes. Hensley et al. (2003) investigated the extent to which college students support in-prison programs, services, and amenities. Along with gender, race, and age, political ideology was a significant predictor of students' support for prison programs, services, and amenities. A student with a more politically liberal view was more likely to support all kinds of services and amenities than a student with a more politically conservative attitude. Mackey and Courtright (2000) also found that a student with more liberal views

was less punitive than a student with more conservative ones. In the Mackey et al. (2006) research on college students' attitudes toward rehabilitation, as the researchers expected, a student with a conservative view was less likely to support rehabilitation. These findings were statistically significant.

Two studies conducted by Lambert also confirmed the significant relationship between political views and college students' punitiveness. In 2004, Lambert found that politically conservative students were more likely to support punitive sanctions, and it was statistically significant. Lambert's 2005 research substantiated his previous work. Falco (2008) also examined students' political ideology and found that a student with a liberal political ideology was less likely to be punitive than a politically conservative student; and it was statistically significant.

For the current study, the relationship between political views and students' attitudes toward prisoners and prisoner reentry will be investigated by examining each student's political party (Democrat, Republican, Independent, and other). As the 2008 presidential election was held in the fall prior to conducting this research, it is expected that students will know with which party they identify.

Size of Town and the Public's Punitiveness

One's area of residence also can be a predictor of punitiveness. In examining a respondent's residential area, geographic region and the size of the town are primarily measured. For the geographic region, whether a respondent resides in the north, east, west, or south was examined (Baumer et al., 2000; Ellison, 1991; Harris, 1986; Taylor et al., 1979; Young & Thompson, 1995). Other researchers examined the size of the town where a respondent currently resides or grew up (Ellison, 1991; Ellison & Sherkat, 1993;

Hamm, 1989; Young & Thompson, 1995). For the size of town variable, researchers have used a population of less than or more than 25,000 for a large town or a small town category (e.g., Mackey & Courtright, 2000), while another researcher employed a population of less than or more than 50,000 to categorize the residence as an urban area or rural area (e.g., Borg, 1997).

Studies on the impact of geographic region on an individual's punitiveness have been inconsistent, but many researchers found that respondents who lived in the South were more likely to be punitive (Barkan & Cohn, 1994; Baumer et al., 2000; Borg, 1997; Ellison, 1991; Rossi & Berk, 1997; Taylor et al., 1979; Unnever et al., 2005). Regarding the size of the town, the research findings also have been inconsistent. Some studies demonstrated that the residents of urban areas were likely to be less punitive and more supportive of rehabilitation (Baumer et al., 2000; Hamm, 1989; Rossi & Berk, 1997).

Among the previously mentioned studies, different views of residents from different sizes of towns also were identified. Philadelphia residents' interviews revealed that urban residents demonstrated more supportive attitudes for returning prisoners, while suburban residents were likely to show less sympathy for the difficulties of the ex-prisoners (Immerwahr & Johnson, 2002). Roberts et al. (2005) compared the opinions of Boston residents to the rest of Massachusetts residents. The respondents who lived in Boston demonstrated more supportive attitudes toward rehabilitation and reentry than respondents in other places of the Massachusetts. However, the difference was small.

Size of Town and College Students' Punitiveness

The size of town also was examined in the college students' attitudes studies. Mackey and Courtright (2000) examined the size of town where a student was raised to

assess his/her level of punitiveness and support for rehabilitation. Towns with populations of more than 25,000 were categorized as large towns, and towns with the population of less than 25,000 were considered small towns. As the researchers predicted, it was found that students from large towns were less likely to demonstrate punitive attitudes, and it was statistically significant (Mackey & Courtright, 2000). The Mackey et al. (2006) research on college students' attitudes toward rehabilitation produced the same results. Mackey et al. found that a student from a large town (population over 25,000) was more likely to support rehabilitation, and it was statistically significant.

Falco (2008) also included the size of town variable in her study on college students' punitiveness. Students were asked in which area they grew up. Rural, urban, and suburban were given as the three response categories; and they were later collapsed into rural or suburban/urban for analysis. Consistent with Mackey and Courtright (2000) and the Mackey et al. (2006) research findings, it was found that students from rural areas were more likely to be punitive. However, it was not statistically significant.

For the current research, the size of the town where a student lives was examined by using urban and rural categories. Since students in this sample are from cities and towns of various sizes, the size of the town where a respondent grew up is expected to be a significant predictor of students' attitudes toward prisoners and prisoner reentry.

CHAPTER III
METHODOLOGY
Research Design

The purpose of the current study was to investigate college students' attitudes toward prisoners and prisoner reentry. In order to identify the factors that influence their perceptions, a self-administered anonymous survey was administered to 529 undergraduate students enrolled in one university located in the northeastern U. S. According to Maxwell (1996), for a relatively unknown research question, a qualitative research method is more appropriate to explore in-depth information than a quantitative research method. In fact, qualitative interview methods have been employed for numerous reentry studies (e.g., Cleveland Focus group interview, 2007; Florida Residents interviews, 2000; Reentry Round Table, 2002).

However, the focus of this study was to identify the factors associated with college students' attitudes toward prisoners and prisoner reentry. Thus, a large scale quantitative research method was more appropriate. By using a quantitative research method, the researcher was able to verify the previously identified variables (Frankfort-Nachmias & Nachmias, 2000). Since several factors related to the public's attitudes toward punishment and rehabilitation had been identified, these factors were tested in the current study. In addition, a quantitative research method enables the researcher to identify general patterns in individuals of the specific population. Therefore, for the current study, a quantitative research method was considered most appropriate.

Among the quantitative research methods, a self-administered group survey was utilized. According to Babbie (2001), using a survey is the most effective method to

measure “attitudes and orientations in a large population” (p. 238). The survey method was expected to produce a large amount of data on college students’ perceptions toward prisoners and prisoner reentry. The survey was administered in the classroom setting by the researcher. This self-administered group survey method provided advantages such as lower cost, decreased data collection time, lack of interviewer bias, anonymity, standardization of the data collected, privacy to elicit candid responses, and a reduced misunderstanding of questions (Babbie, 2001; Dillman, 2007;). The survey method, however, is not without limitations. Bachman and Schutt (2007) point out the coercive aspect of the self-administered survey. As Maxfield and Babbie (2005) recommend, this issue was addressed by emphasizing the voluntary participation explained in the informed consent form.

Research Questions

Previous research on the public’s attitudes toward punishment and rehabilitation identified several factors that influence the public’s opinions on these topics. These factors include gender, age, race, political affiliation, religiosity, education level, socio-economic status, geographic region, and victimization experience (Applegate et al., 2002; Chiricos et al., 2004; Costelloe et al., 2002; Evans & Adams, 2003; Grasmick & McGill, 1994; Hensley et al., 2003; Hogan et al., 2005; Lambert, 2005; Lambert et al., 2005; Mackey et al., 2006; McCorkle, 1993; Schwartz et al., 1993; Sprott, 1999; Tyler & Boeckmann, 1997). However, these studies produced mixed results, and further research is needed. Under the assumption that similar factors might impact college students’ attitudes toward prisoners and prisoner reentry, ten independent variables were selected from the previous research. These ten independent variables were categorized into three

groups: demographic factors (gender, race, academic year, and size of town), personal preferences (major, religion, religious value of forgiveness, and political party), and personal experience with crimes and criminals (victimization experience and personal acquaintance with prisoners). The following three research questions were developed to be tested based on the three categorized independent variables:

- (1) Are there demographic factors (gender, race, academic year, and size of town), associated with college students' attitudes toward prisoners and prisoner reentry?
- (2) Are the factors of personal preference (major, religion, religious value of forgiveness, and political party) associated with college students' attitudes toward prisoners and prisoner reentry?
- (3) Are personal experiences with crimes and criminals (victimization experience and personal acquaintance with prisoners) associated with college students' attitudes toward prisoners and prisoner reentry?

Ten alternative hypotheses were developed. The null hypothesis is intended to show no significant relationship between the independent variables and the dependent variables. On the other hand, the alternative hypothesis assumes that there are significant relationships among two or more variables (Bachman & Paternoster, 2004).

Demographic Factors

Since gender, race, academic year, and the size of town were categorized as demographic factors, four alternative hypotheses were formulated for the first research question.

- Ha (1) A female student is more likely to demonstrate a supportive attitude toward prisoners and prisoner reentry than a male student.

Ha (2) A non-white student is more likely to demonstrate a supportive attitude toward prisoners and prisoner reentry than a white student.

Ha (3) A student who is more advanced academically is more likely to have a supportive attitude toward prisoners and prisoner reentry.

Ha (4) A student who grew up in a large town is more likely to have a supportive attitude toward prisoners and prisoner reentry.

Personal Preference Factors

In the current study, college major, religion, the religious value of forgiveness and political party were categorized as factors that reflect personal preferences. The majority of the previous studies revealed that criminology majors were more likely to demonstrate punitive attitudes. However, unlike the previous research, for the current study, criminology students were assumed to demonstrate more supportive attitudes toward prisoners and prisoner reentry. There are three reasons for constructing a different hypothesis.

First, Falco (2008) found that criminology students were less likely to be punitive than students in other majors. This research result indicates that criminology students' perceptions toward crimes and criminals may have changed. Second, as previously discussed, there is a possibility that attitudes toward punishment and attitudes toward prisoners/prisoner reentry may not conflict with one another. That is, an individual with a higher level of punitiveness might not demonstrate a lower level of support for prisoners and prisoner reentry. This absence of monolithic attitudes was noted by Applegate et al. (1997) and Cullen et al. (1988). Third, current criminology programs emphasize the importance of prisoner reentry in corrections courses. Consequently, students in this field

may become aware of the value of prisoner reentry programs through the curriculum offered by the university.

However, for the political party, religion, and religious value of forgiveness variables, the hypotheses were constructed based on previous research. Accordingly, the alternative hypotheses of major, religiosity, and political party were constructed as follows:

Ha (5) A criminology student is more likely to demonstrate a supportive attitude toward prisoners and prisoner reentry than a non-criminology student.

Ha (6) A student who identifies himself or herself as a Democrat is more likely to demonstrate a supportive attitude toward prisoners and prisoner reentry than a student who identifies himself or herself as a Republican.

Ha (7) A student who identifies himself or herself as a Christian is less likely to demonstrate a supportive attitude toward prisoners and prisoner reentry than a non-Christian.

Ha (8) A student with a higher value of forgiveness is more likely to support prisoners and prisoner reentry.

Personal Experience with Crimes and Criminals

The third research question was intended to examine whether personal experience with criminal victimization and criminals affect college students' attitudes toward prisoners and prisoner reentry. Victimization experience was assumed to have a negative influence on college students' attitudes toward prisoners and prisoner reentry while personal acquaintance with criminals was expected to have a positive influence.

Evaluation research on victim-offender mediation sessions (Umbreit, 1989, 1994, 1996; Umbreit & Coates, 1992; Van Ness & Strong, 1997; Wright, 1991; Wright & Galaway, 1989) and the Gideon (2008) research demonstrated that personal contact or acquaintance with prisoners had a positive influence on the college students' attitudes toward prisoners and prisoner reentry. The alternative hypotheses are:

Ha (9) A student with a victimization experience is more likely to demonstrate a negative attitude toward prisoners and prisoner reentry.

Ha (10) A student who is acquainted with prisoners is more likely to demonstrate a supportive attitude toward prisoners and prisoner reentry.

Sampling

Stratified cluster sampling was used. The sample was selected from undergraduate students enrolled at a mid-sized university in the northeast during the spring 2009 academic term. First of all, a list of all offered courses was obtained. Secondly, all the courses were stratified by class level under the assumption that 100 level classes are for freshmen, 200 for sophomores, 300 for juniors, and 400 for seniors. Thirdly, from each stratum, a sub-sample of classes was selected.

In selecting sub-sample classes for freshmen and sophomores, random sampling was used. However, for the sub-sample classes for juniors and seniors, convenient sampling was utilized for two reasons. First, for an academic level variable, junior and senior level classes were needed. For the major variable, participants' majors needed to be varied. However, there was a limitation in randomly selecting junior and senior level classes that consisted of students in various majors. Accordingly, to obtain junior and

senior participants from various majors, a convenient sample was deemed most appropriate.

For the current study, the sample size was 529. According to Mertler & Vannatta (2006), each independent variable requires 15 cases for statistical analysis. As the current study has ten independent variables, a desirable minimum sample size was 150.

However, if a researcher utilizes a larger sample, s/he can reduce standard errors, gain more reliable data through narrowing confidence intervals, and remove incomplete surveys (Meyers et al., 2006). Due to the advantages of a large sample and the possibility of the selected students' withdrawals, a sample size of over 500 was selected.

In order to draw a representative sample, the proportion of each stratum was considered. According to the Institutional Research Planning and Assessment of this university (2008), there were 11,928 undergraduate students who were enrolled in the fall semester of 2008. Among them, 4,578 were freshmen, 2,457 were sophomores, 2,512 were juniors, and 2,381 were seniors. Accordingly, the proportion of each stratum is 38% freshmen, 21% sophomores, 21% juniors, and 20% seniors. As 177 freshmen (33.5%), 134 sophomores (25.3%), 74 juniors (14.0%), and 144 seniors (27.2%) participated in this research, it was assumed that a proportionate sample selection was achieved.

After IRB (Institutional Review Board) approval, the researcher gained permission from the faculty members of each selected course. A formal letter was sent to the faculty members of these courses via electronic mail. A copy of the letter is in Appendix D.

Regarding the participants in this research, two issues should be addressed prior to administering the survey. First, due to the issue of obtaining permission from parents

of the participants, students under 18 could not participate in this research project. In the informed consent form, it was clearly stated that “If you are under 18, you cannot participate in this research. Do not take the survey.” Second, there was a possibility that a student would be enrolled in several classes which were chosen for the sample. To address this dilemma, there was a notice in the informed consent form that stated, “If you already have completed this survey in another course, do not participate again.” In addition to written notices for these issues, prior to conducting the survey, the researcher announced these conditions once again. The students who fell under these two categories were asked to write “Withdraw” on the first page of the survey, sit quietly during the survey, and submit the survey instrument when other students had completed it.

Measurement

A survey was developed to examine the relationship between specific factors and college students’ attitudes toward prisoners and prisoner reentry. The current study has ten independent variables and two dependent variables. As for the dependent variables, each student’s level of support for prisoners and prisoner reentry was measured using an existing scale and a newly constructed scale.

Dependent Variables

The present study includes two dependent variables: (1) college students’ attitudes toward prisoners and (2) college students’ attitudes toward prisoner reentry.

Attitudes Toward Prisoners (ATP) Scale. For measuring attitudes toward prisoners, the Melvin et al. (1985) Attitudes Toward Prisoners (ATP) scale was employed. The ATP (Attitudes Toward Prisoners) scale is a 36-item Likert scale with moderate to high split-half reliability ($r=.84$ to $.92$) and test-retest reliability ($r=.82$). With

the .47 factor analysis result, 36 items are considered to be correlated. The results of the item loading factor analysis indicates that the ATP scale reflected positive or negative attitudes toward prisoners (Melvin et al., 1985).

Accordingly, a respondent with a higher ATP score is considered to have a more positive attitude toward prisoners. S/he is likely to believe that prisoners are normal people who can change. On the contrary, a respondent with a lower ATP score is likely to have a more negative attitude toward prisoners. S/he is likely to believe that prisoners are unchangeable, deviant people. The original 36 items were used to measure college students' attitudes toward prisoners. A respondent was asked to select one answer which indicated his/her level of agreement with each statement. The answer categories were: (1) strongly disagree, (2) disagree, (3) undecided, (4) agree, and (5) strongly agree. Strongly disagree was coded as 0, disagree as 1, undecided as 2, agree as 3 and strongly agree as 4. The codes also are the scores that respondents are assigned for each item.

To calculate each respondent's ATP score, the scores for all items were summed. Among 36 items, 19 statements were negative and 17 items were positive. Thus, the scores of the negative items (item 22, 24, 27, 30, 31, 33, 34, 35, 37, 38, 40, 43, 45, 46, 48, 50, 51, 52, and 56) were reversed. Accordingly, scores range from 0 to 144. Zero indicates the most negative attitude, and 144 is the most positive attitude toward prisoners.

Attitudes Toward Prisoner Reentry (ATPR) Scale. Another dependent variable in this study is prisoner reentry. As mentioned in the introduction section, the definition of prisoner reentry followed Petersilia's definition. Petersilia (2003) defined prisoner reentry as "all activities and programming conducted to prepare ex-convicts to return safely to

the community and to live as law-abiding citizens” (p. 3). Accordingly, by using a comprehensive perspective, prisoner reentry can include efforts to abolish legal barriers to prisoner reentry as well as prison-based rehabilitation programs, pre-release programs, and post-release programs.

Eighteen items were developed to measure the level of support for prisoner reentry by the researcher because there is no published instrument measuring attitudes toward prisoner reentry. As discussed in the literature review, several public opinion surveys had contained reentry items, from which twelve questions were selected. The Attitude Toward Prisoner Reentry scale consists of five sub-scales: 1) the public’s concern with a large number of returning prisoners (2 items), 2) general support for reentry programs (7 items), 3) attitudes toward ex-prisoners’ housing (2 items), 4) attitudes toward ex-prisoners’ employment (2 items), and 5) opinions on ex-prisoners’ restrictions on legal rights (5 items).

For the analysis, the original categories were modified. Following the ATP scale’s response categories, a 5-category Likert scale was used for all of the 18 items. Like the ATP (Attitudes Toward Prisoners) scale, each item produced a score. To calculate each respondent’s attitude toward prisoner reentry score, the scores of all items were totaled. Among 18 items, 6 statements were negative and 12 items were positive. Thus, the scores of the negative items (item 58, 59, 67, 73, 74, and 75) were reversed. Accordingly, scores range from 0 to 72. A zero indicates the most negative attitude and 72 indicates the most positive attitude toward prisoner reentry.

The first sub-scale explored the public’s concern with a large number of returning prisoners and it contains two items. Item 58 was intended to examine the public’s

concern with the large number of returning inmates. This item was developed by Zogby International for the 2006 public opinion survey, and it also was used by Gideon's 2008 public opinion survey. The original question was "In 2006, 700,000 prisoners in all categories will be released from prison to their home communities. How do you feel about this situation?" This item was modified from a question into a statement; "In 2009, approximately 700,000 prisoners in all categories will be released from prison to their home communities. I am fearful about this situation."

Respondents were asked to express their level of agreement with the given statement by selecting one answer. For the answers, the 5 category Likert scale was used: (1) strongly disagree, (2) disagree, (3) undecided, (4) agree, and (5) strongly agree. Strongly disagree will be coded as 0, disagree 1, undecided 2, agree 3, and strongly agree will be coded as 4. Code numbers indicate the scores of this item, which was applied to all 18 items. The researcher had constructed item 59 to investigate the level of concern that a respondent has about the potential public safety threat created by returning prisoners. A respondent was asked to indicate his or her level of agreement with the following statement: "Most released prisoners will be a risk to public safety".

The second sub-scale included seven items to measure how strongly a respondent supports prison-based and community-based reentry programs aiming at preparing inmates for their successful reintegration into society. Among seven items, five items were selected from Hart Research Associates' 2002 public opinion survey, and one item was developed by the researcher. One question about the Second Chance Act was developed by Krisberg and Marchionna of Zogby International (2006).

Items 60, 61, and 62 were intended to measure how strongly a respondent supports prison-based rehabilitation programs as pre-release efforts. Item 60 and 61 were modified from one original question in the survey by Hart Research Associates. The original item was, “requiring prisoners to work and receive job training in prison so that they have job skills when they are released from prison”. From this one item, work in prison and job training in prison were split into two items; “prisoners should work in prison so that they have job skills when they are released from prison” (Item 60) and “prisoners should receive job training in prison so that they have employment opportunities when they are released from prison” (Item 61). Item 62 was a question about early release as an incentive for the inmates who participate in prison-based rehabilitation programs. A respondent was asked to indicate his or her level of agreement with the following statement, “prisoners should be eligible to obtain early release after they participate in prison-based rehabilitation programs.”

Item 63 and 64 dealt with post-release care for ex-prisoners such as providing job training and drug treatment. Through these items, how strongly the students support post-release programs was measured. Item 65 measured whether the students favor reentry programs as a cost-effective strategy. Stephen et al. (2004), Pearson and Lipton (1999), and Wilson et al. (2000) found out that the public demands cost-effective crime prevention rather than punishment-only crime policy. In their public opinion research, Hart Research Associates (2001) and Gideon (2008) asked whether a respondent was willing to pay more taxes for prisoner reentry programs as a cost-effective crime prevention strategy. They found that the public was willing to pay more taxes for cost-effective prisoner reentry programs. The original item was modified from question form

to a statement. Respondents were asked to indicate their level of the agreement with the following statement, “I am willing to pay more taxes for prisoner reentry programs.”

Item 66 measured college students’ opinions about the Second Chance Act. The Second Chance Act enables each state to use more funds to implement prisoner reentry programs. This question was developed by Zogby International (2006), and it was expected to reflect students’ level of support for prisoner reentry programs. The item was, “There is a law, the Second Chance Act, which funds programs and services for prisoners reentering the community. Please indicate your level of agreement with this Act”. The response categories were the same as those for the other items previously mentioned.

The third sub-scale contained two items to examine college students’ attitudes toward ex-prisoners as potential neighbors and tenants. The research on barriers to prisoner reentry revealed that housing was the very first issue that released prisoners confront (Berry & Eigenber, 2003; Petersilia, 2003; Solomon et al., 2004; Taxman, 2004). Consequently, measuring respondents’ opinions about housing for ex-prisoners would be a useful indicator in assessing how strongly respondents support ex-prisoners’ reentry efforts.

Helfgott (1997) examined attitudes of community members, landlords, and employers toward ex-prisoners and concluded that they had negative attitudes toward ex-prisoners. Two items were selected from Helfgott’s (1997) survey research to examine whether a respondent is willing to accept ex-prisoners as potential neighbors and tenants. Item 67 measured how likely a respondent was to object to having an ex-prisoner as a neighbor. The original item was modified to: “Suppose you have become aware that an ex-offender, who was recently released from a period of incarceration, has just moved

into your neighborhood. Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statement by selecting one answer: This situation bothers me and I would definitely take action.” Item 68 measured whether a respondent would accept an ex-prisoner as a potential tenant. The original item was modified from a question to a statement. The new item was “If I own rental property, I am willing to rent my property to an ex-prisoner.”

The fourth sub-scale dealt with opinions about ex-prisoners’ employment. According to the prisoner reentry research, employment is the most crucial factor for prisoners’ successful reintegration into society (Berry & Eigenberg, 2003; Lipsey, 1995; Petersilia, 2003; Solomon et al., 2004; Taxman, 2004). Thus, several studies about the potential of hiring ex-prisoners have been conducted (e.g., Fahey et al., 2006; Helfgott, 1997; Holzer et al., 2003). These studies indicated that potential employers were unwilling to hire ex-prisoners.

To measure college students’ support for hiring ex-prisoners, item 69 from Helfgott’s research was modified and stated as the following, “If I am an employer, I am willing to hire an ex-prisoner.” Item 70 was developed by the researcher to examine the extent to which a respondent is willing to accept an ex-prisoner as a co-worker in the work place. It was stated as, “If my colleague at work is an ex-prisoner, it does not bother me.” The respondents were asked to express their level of agreement with this statement by selecting only one answer among strongly disagree, disagree, undecided, agree, and strongly agree.

The last sub-scale of the attitude toward prisoner reentry scale consisted of five items. These items were intended to investigate college students’ opinions about ex-prisoners’ restrictions of legal rights, which had been identified as one of the critical

barriers to prisoner reentry (Berry & Eigenberg, 2003; Petersilia, 2003; Solomon et al., 2004; Taxman, 2004). Five legal questions were asked. Two legal questions (item 71 and 72) were developed by Hart Research Associates (2002) to measure how much a respondent agrees with restoring ex-prisoners' rights to vote and obtain a driver's license.

In terms of ex-prisoners' legal rights, three questions were developed by the researcher based on previous research about barriers to prisoner reentry. The level of agreement with three laws was measured. Item 73 was about "The Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996," which prohibits the state from providing public housing to anyone in violation of his or her parole or probation. Item 74 was about "The Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996," which includes a lifetime ban on eligibility for food stamps and cash benefits under the Temporary Assistance for Needy Family (TANF) program for anyone convicted of a drug-related felony. Item 75 was about "The Higher Education Act of 1998," which makes students convicted of drug-related offenses ineligible for any grants, loans, or work assistance. Lower levels of agreement with these laws were expected to reflect respondents' higher levels of support for prisoner reentry efforts.

For the survey items which were developed by other researchers, this researcher contacted and gained permission from all the researchers, including Professor Melvin, Cullen, Applegate, Helfgott, Krisberg, and Hart Research Associates. Their authorizations are provided in Appendix E.

To assess the reliability of the Attitudes Toward Prisoner Reentry (ATPR) scale, factor analysis were conducted. According to Bryman and Cramer (2004), "indices that measure the same construct are grouped together to form a factor" (p. 26). They argued

that each item in the same sub-scale should be loaded onto one factor. That is, in the attitude prisoner reentry scale, five items in the second sub-scale “general support for the reentry programs” should assess “opinion on the reentry programs” in the same manner. Factor analysis enables the researcher to assess how well the items in the same sub-scale are related one another. Factor loadings of each item should be .35 or greater to be maintained in the scale. Even though five sub-scales were constructed for the attitude toward prisoner reentry scale, factor analysis may produce a different number of sub-scales. With the results of the factor analysis, exclusion of the items with weak factor loadings was considered. For this decision, along with factor analysis, Cronbach’s alpha score and item-total correlation score also were considered.

Independent Variables

Demographic factors. As discussed in the literature review, demographic factors are significantly associated with college students’ level of punitiveness (Adams, 2003; Applegate et al., 2002; Chiricos, et al., 2004; Costelloe et al., 2002; Grasmick & McGill, 1994; Hensley et al., 2003; Hogan et al., 2005; Lambert, 2005; Lambert et al., 2005; Mackey et al., 2006; McCorkle, 1993; Schwartz et al., 1993; Sprott, 1999; Tyler & Boeckmann, 1997). With the assumption that the same factors would affect college students’ level of support for prisoners and prisoner reentry, four demographic factors, gender, race, academic year, and size of town where a student is from were selected.

For the gender variable, “female” was coded as 0 and “male” was coded as 1. In terms of the race variable, students were asked to identify their racial background and select only one response. Four categories were listed: “White,” “African-American,” “Asian,” and “Other”. However, since great racial diversity among participants was not

expected, examining the sample's racial or ethnic backgrounds was not significant. Thus, for the analysis, three categories were collapsed into "Non-white" to be coded as 0, and "White" was coded as 1.

To test the effect of education on the level of support for prisoners and prisoner reentry, academic year was measured. Participants were asked to select their current class level status. Freshmen were coded as 1, sophomores as 2, juniors as 3, and seniors as 4. For the size of the town variable, respondents were asked to indicate whether they grew up in a rural or urban area. For this study, a rural area is a community with a population of less than 25,000 and an urban area is a community with a population of more than 25,000. Rural was coded as 0 and urban was coded as 1.

Personal preference factors. In the current study, major, religion, religious value of forgiveness, and political party were the factors that reflected a respondent's personal preferences. Major is the most frequently tested variable in research on college students' level of punitiveness (e.g., Courtright et al., 2005; Farnworth et al., 1998; Lambert, 2004; Mackey & Courtright, 2000; Mackey et al., 2006, Selke, 1980). The research of Mackey and Courtright (2000), and Courtright et al. (2005) revealed that criminology majors were more likely to demonstrate punitive attitudes, while Falco's (2008) research findings contradicted the previous studies.

For the major variable, students were asked to write only one primary major. Criminology was coded as 1 and other majors were collapsed into one category to be coded as 0. For political party, whether a respondent identifies himself or herself as a Republican, Democrat, Independent, or other was examined. For the analysis,

Independent and other were collapsed into one category. A Republican was coded as 0, Independent/other as 1, and a Democrat as 2.

For the religion variable, a respondent's religious background was examined. Six categories were given: Christian, Jewish, Muslim, Buddhist, Other, and None. For analysis, except for Christian, the other five categories were collapsed into one category, non-Christian. Non-Christian was coded as 0 and Christian was coded as 1.

To measure individual levels of the religious value of forgiveness, three items were used from the Applegate et al. (2000) forgiveness scale. The forgiveness scale is made up of three items which reflect the importance of the religious value of forgiveness. The forgiveness items were intended to measure how much a respondent applied these stipulations to his/her views on criminals. The forgiveness issue may be related to the public's attitudes toward criminals. Thus, it is a useful indicator to assess college students' willingness to accept persons who committed crimes back into the community. For responses, a 10 cm visual analog scale was used. Respondents were asked to place a slash on the scale between strongly agree and strongly disagree, indicating their level of agreement with the statements. With three items, each respondent's religious value of forgiveness score ranged from 0 to 30.

Personal experience with crimes and criminals factors. For the variable of personal experience with crime and criminals, both positive and negative experiences were measured. Positive experience was the respondent's personal acquaintance with prisoners, while negative experiences were the victimization experience of the respondent. For the personal experience of victimization, whether a respondent had a victimization experience was measured. According to Sprott and Doob (1997), Cullen et

al. (1985), and Herman and Wasserman (2001), victimization experience negatively influences support for prisoner rehabilitation. For this item, the Cullen et al. (1985) victimization scale was employed. In the original item, a list of six crimes was provided, and the respondents were asked to check off the crimes that they experienced. However, for the current study, the original items were modified. First, in addition to the six crimes listed, one more crime was added. Respondents were asked if they had been victimized by any other serious crimes. Second, the one year time frame was omitted, because the impact of the victimization experience was expected to have a longer duration. Third, instead of examining the number of victimization experiences of a specific crime, only whether or not the respondent had been a victim of those seven crimes was measured. Accordingly, the answers were “Yes” or “No”. No was coded as 0, and yes was coded as 1.

To measure positive experience with criminals, a participant’s acquaintance with prisoners was examined. According to the evaluation research on victim offender mediation, victims and community members who participated in victim offender mediation sessions experienced a reduced fear of crime and an increased understanding of and support for criminals through personal contact with criminals (Umbreit, 1996, 1994, 1989; Umbreit & Coates, 1992; Van Ness & Strong, 1997; Wright, 1991; Wright & Galaway, 1989). Gideon’s latest research (2008) confirmed the positive relationship between personal acquaintance with prisoners and level of support for rehabilitation.

Two questions were asked. The question, “Do you have any family members, friends, or relatives who are/were in prison” measured a respondent’s intimate relationships with prisoners. Another question, “Do you personally know anyone in

prison excluding family members, friends, and relatives?” measured whether casual acquaintance with prisoners affects the respondent’s level of support for prisoners and prisoner reentry. The answers were “Yes” or “No”. No was coded as 0, and yes was coded as 1.

Since these negative and positive experiences with crime and criminals are relatively unexamined variables, the results can provide valuable insight for identifying predictors in college students’ level of support for prisoners and prisoner reentry.

Analysis Plan

Data analysis consisted of four stages. The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) was utilized to obtain the results of these four analyses. First, descriptive statistics would explain the characteristics of the sample. In the second stage, scale reliability was examined. To assess the reliability of each scale (religious value of forgiveness, ATP, and ATPR), a coefficient alpha was utilized. In addition, as mentioned above, for the newly developed ATPR (Attitudes Toward Prisoner Reentry) scale, a factor analysis test was conducted. Third, a bivariate analysis was employed to examine statistical relationships among all the variables. As it is the most widely accepted bivariate correlation statistic (Meyers et al., 2006), the Pearson correlation (symbolized as r) was utilized. Following the standardized rule, an r score of .1 to .3 was considered a weak correlation, .3 to .5 medium, and .5 to 1.00 strong (Cohen et al., 2003).

The last step was to estimate the impact of the independent variables on the dependent variables by using a multiple regression model. While the bivariate model examines the effect of one independent variable on one dependent variable, a multiple regression model enables the researcher to examine the impact of several independent

variables on a dependent variable (Bachman & Paternoster, 2004). As the current study includes ten independent variables, multiple regression modeling was appropriate. Through multivariate analysis, the researcher examined the impact of ten independent variables on each of the two dependent variables.

Human Subject Issue

As the current study has human participants, potential harm to the research participants should be addressed prior to conducting research. Following Institutional Review Board (IRB) regulations, an Informed Consent Form was developed, which included the following: (1) the nature of the research, (2) the process of research, (3) the purpose of research, (4) the participant's right to not answer questions or withdraw participation, (5) potential risks of the research, (6) benefits of the research, and (7) the importance of confidentiality. An informed consent form was attached to the survey. Participants were asked to read this form to fully understand their rights and duties. Specifically, three issues were thoroughly addressed: age, anonymity, and voluntary participation.

First, regarding age, there was a possibility that a student under 18 would be included in the sample. For participants under 18, parental permission is needed. To avoid this process, the student who was under 18 was asked to refrain from participating in this research project. As previously mentioned, the notice "If you are under 18, you cannot participate in this research. Do not take the survey" was included in the Informed Consent Form and reiterated prior to surveys being distributed.

Second, anonymity of the participants was thoroughly maintained. The survey for the current study was an anonymous survey. The participants were informed of the fact

that no item would reveal the participant's identity. Following federal regulations, all completed surveys will be kept confidential in the advisor's locked cabinet for three years.

Third, voluntary participation in this study was thoroughly emphasized through the informed consent form along with the researcher's verbal announcements. Participants were asked to read the informed consent form. Even though a student agrees to participate in this research project, if a participant requests to withdraw during the survey, that request would be honored. The possibility of this option was announced prior to distributing the survey. Through these processes, the participants of this study are expected to be protected from potential harms. In the next chapter, the analyses of these data and the results will be discussed.

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

In this chapter, results from the analysis of the survey data are presented. The current study utilized a survey method to investigate college students' attitudes toward prisoners and prisoner reentry. During February and March 2009, a 75-item survey was administered to 548 undergraduate students in one public university in the Northeast. Among the 548 administered questionnaires, nine surveys were returned because the students already had completed the survey in another class (n=539). Six students decided to withdraw and returned the questionnaire during the administration of the survey. Among the collected questionnaires, four questionnaires were found to be incomplete. Accordingly, with the overall response rate of 98.9%, the final sample size was 529.

Based on the data from 529 surveys, the findings are presented in four stages. First, the frequencies and the descriptive data of 12 variables are presented. Second, the results of the three scales' reliability tests including the forgiveness scale, the ATP (Attitudes Toward Prisoners) scale, and the ATPR (Attitudes Toward Prisoner Reentry) scale as well as the factor analysis test of ATPR scale, are provided. Third, the results of the bivariate correlations among all variables are presented. Fourth, the multivariate analysis using multiple regression are provided.

Frequencies and Descriptive Statistics

This study includes ten independent variables and two dependent variables. The independent variables are: academic level, race, gender, size of town where a respondent was raised, major, political party, religion, the religious value of forgiveness, victimization experience, and acquaintance with prisoners. The two dependent variables

are attitudes toward prisoners and attitudes toward prisoner reentry. Table 1 presents descriptive statistics for the value of forgiveness, attitudes toward prisoners (ATP), and attitudes toward prisoner reentry (ATPR), and Table 2 presents frequencies and percentages for the other nine variables.

Table 1

Descriptive Statistics for Scale Variables (n=529)

Variable	n	Mean	Std.Dev.	Min.	Max.
Forgiveness	529	17.46	8.29	.00	30.00
Attitudes Toward Prisoners	529	118.20	19.88	.00	144.00
Attitudes Toward Prisoner Reentry	529	60.59	10.53	.00	72.00

Table 2

Frequencies and Percentages for Nine Variables (n=529)

Variable	Valid n	Valid %	Variable	Valid n	Valid %
Academic Level			Race		
Freshmen	177	33.5	White	435	82.2
Sophomores	134	25.3	African-American	64	12.1
Juniors	74	14.0	Asian	11	2.1
Seniors	144	27.2	Other	19	3.6
Gender			Size of Town		
Female	256	48.4	Rural	332	62.8
Male	273	51.6	Urban	197	37.2
Major			Victimization Experience		
Criminology	257	48.6	Yes	254	48.0
Non-Criminology	272	51.4	No	275	52.0
Political Party			Religion		
Republican	186	35.2	Christian	441	83.4
Democrats	230	43.5	Jewish	4	0.8
Independent	63	11.9	Muslim	2	0.4
Other	50	9.5	Buddhist	3	0.6
			Other	26	4.9
			None	53	10.0
Close Relationship With Inmates			Casual Relationship with Inmates		
Yes	220	41.6	Yes	192	36.3
No	309	58.4	No	337	63.7

Regarding the forgiveness variable, a respondent's religious value of forgiveness was examined using three items. A factor analysis test on the three items produced one factor. Furthermore, with high factor loadings (.858, .774, and .684) and an .892 Cronbach's alpha, these three items were considered strongly related. Accordingly, the scores of the three items were totaled to generate an individual level of forgiveness. On these three items, the scores range from 0 to 30. As shown in Table 1, the mean score of forgiveness is 17.468 and 4.7% of the respondents have a minimum score of 0 and 6.8% of the respondents have a maximum score of 30.

For college students' attitudes toward prisoners, a 36-item ATP (Attitude Toward Prisoners) scale was used. Two respondents have a maximum score of 144 and one respondent has a minimum score of 0. The mean score of the ATP is 82.206. For another dependent variable, an 18-item ATPR (Attitude Toward Prisoner Reentry) scale was utilized to measure the college students' attitudes toward prisoner reentry. To assess each respondent's level of support for prisoner reentry, the scores for each item were totaled. Although the factor analysis test of ATPR produced four factors, these four sub-scales can be combined to produce one index of Attitude Toward Prisoner Reentry (ATPR) for two reasons.

First, these four areas contain factors that are commonly identified as the primary barriers to prisoners' successful reintegration into society. In the literature review chapter, these four areas were discussed in depth as the major factors of prisoner reentry. Second, the scale reliability test indicates that 18 items from four sub-scales are strongly related to one another and produce a high Cronbach's alpha score (.875). Accordingly, items from four sub-scales can be combined to generate one index. With 18 items, scores ranged

from 0 to 72. One respondent has a minimum score of 0 and two respondents have a maximum score of 72. The mean score is 42.597.

As shown in Table 2, the freshmen total 177 (33.5%), the sophomores total 134 (25.3%), and the juniors/seniors total 218 (41.2%). With regard to the race variables, as expected, racial diversity was not found. The majority of the participants (82.2%) were white. In this study, more male students participated (51.6%). Size of town where a respondent was raised was measured using two categories: rural and urban. A somewhat sizable portion of the survey respondents were from a rural area (62.8%) while 37.2 % of the respondents were raised in an urban area.

For the major variable, slightly more non-criminology students (51.4%) were included in this sample than criminology students (48.6%). Respondent's political party was measured to examine a respondent's political view using four categories. Table 2 showed that slightly more respondents were identified as Democrats: 43.5% categorized themselves as Democrats, 35.2% Republicans, 11.9% Independents, and 9.5% categorized themselves as Other. For the analysis, Independent and Other were collapsed into one category.

With regard to the religion variable, each respondent's religious background was examined. As expected, the majority of the respondents (83.4%) is Christian. For the comparison of attitudes between Christians and non-Christians, except for Christian, the other five categories were collapsed into one category, non-Christian. Table 2 demonstrated that 52% of the respondents had no victimization experience while 48% of the respondents had at least one victimization experience from the seven listed crimes.

Last of all, over half of the respondents (58.4%) had no close relationship with prisoners, and 63.7% of the respondents did not know anyone in prison.

In summary, the frequencies and the descriptive statistics of twelve variables were presented in this section. All twelve variables in this study are considered to have normal distribution, since all the variables met the criteria of an acceptable level of skewness and kurtosis. As commonly accepted, this researcher followed the criteria of the absolute value below 3.0 for skewness and the absolute value below 10.0 for kurtosis (Hardy & Bryman, 2004).

Factor Analysis

In this section, the results of the factor analysis of the ATPR scale are presented. As prisoner reentry is an emerging issue in corrections, no standardized prisoner reentry instrument has been developed. Instead, the trend is that public opinion surveys on punishment and rehabilitation include prisoner reentry items. Thus, based on previous research about barriers to prisoners' successful reintegration into society and recent public opinion surveys, an 18-item Attitude Toward Prisoner Reentry (APTR) scale was developed by the researcher. Initially, the researcher assumed that the ATPR scale consisted of five sub-scales: 1) the public's concern with the large number of returning prisoners (2 items); 2) general support for reentry programs (7 items); 3) attitudes toward ex-prisoners' housing (2 items); 4) attitudes toward ex-prisoners' employment (2 items); and 5) opinions on ex-prisoners' restrictions on legal rights (5 items).

In the decision to maintain items within each factor, it was determined that a factor loading over .35 would be utilized. If an item's factor loading is below .35, that item was deleted. A principal component factor analysis using Varimax rotation was

conducted on the 18-item ATPR scale and 4 factors were produced. The results of the factor analysis are presented in Appendix G. As shown in Appendix G, each factor loading of the 18 items was over .35. Thus, all the items in each factor are retained. However, since five factors were expected, the theoretical argument about these newly formed four factors was needed. An analysis of the four factors identified four common themes.

The first factor consists of eight items. The first factor was generated by combining the items of the initial three factors: the public's concern with a large number of returning prisoners (2 items); attitudes toward ex-prisoners' housing (2 items); and attitudes toward ex-prisoners' employment (2 items). Two items from general support for prisoner reentry also were added to factor 1. These two items are: support for early release as an incentive for participating in the prison rehabilitation program and the willingness to pay more taxes for the reentry program.

A further examination of these items revealed that factor 1 with eight items reflects a respondent's concerns about the consequences of prisoner release and concerns about the prisoner release issue itself. That is, two items measure a respondent's concern about public safety caused by returning prisoners. Two items examined the ex-prisoner's housing issue as a respondent's neighbor as well as a respondent's potential tenant. Two items investigated a respondent's concern about ex-prisoner's employment as a colleague as well as a potential employee of the respondent. One item about early release examined whether a respondent accepts the possibility that motivated prisoners can return to society earlier than their sentence length in the parole system. Finally, one item examined the willingness of a respondent to pay more taxes for prisoner reentry programs.

Accordingly, eight items in factor 1 dealt with the practical and actual concerns occurring when inmates are released and reenter society.

Factor 2 consists of five items, all of which came from one sub-scale of general support for prisoner reentry. Four items dealt with pre-release and post-release job training and drug treatment programs. One item was about the Second Chance Act which enables each state to use more funds for prisoner reentry programs. Accordingly, the items of factor 2 reflect how much a respondent supports preparing prisoners for their successful reintegration into society.

Factors 3 and 4 were generated by dividing an initial factor regarding opinions about ex-prisoners' restrictions on legal rights (5 items) into two factors. Meanwhile, restoring voting rights and drivers' licenses formed one factor (factor 3) and three legislative restrictions on a specific group of ex-prisoners formed another factor (factor 4).

Although the factor analysis test of the ATPR produced four factors, items of each sub-scale can be combined to generate one index of attitudes toward prisoner reentry. As discussed in the frequency and descriptive statistics section, these four areas are commonly identified as the primary barriers to prisoners' successful reintegration into society. In addition, the scale reliability test of an 18-item ATPR index indicates that 18 items are strongly related to form one index. Thus, the scores from 18 items are totaled to generate each respondent's ATPR score.

Scale Reliability

The three variables of the current study – the religious value of forgiveness, ATP, and ATPR- utilized several items in measuring each concept. Thus, using a coefficient

alpha, a reliability test was conducted to assess the reliability of each scale. For the scale reliability test, the most commonly used Cronbach's alpha was employed. Following DeVellis' (2003) standard, a Cronbach's alpha over .70 is considered as an acceptable score. In addition, each item's item-total correlation also was examined. As Bearden, Hardesty, and Rose (2001) recommended, .35 is considered an acceptable item-total correlation. In this section, each scale's Cronbach's alpha and item-total correlations are presented to assess each scale's reliability.

Forgiveness

To measure a respondent's religious value of forgiveness, three items were used. As shown in Appendix H-1, each item's item-total correlation is over .35 and the overall Cronbach's alpha (.892) is high enough to consider the forgiveness scale reliable.

Attitudes Toward Prisoners (ATP)

To measure the college students' attitudes toward prisoners, the Melvin et al. (1985) Attitudes Toward Prisoners (ATP) scale was employed. Appendix H-2 presents 18 items' item-total correlations and the overall Cronbach's alpha of the ATP scale. The ATP scale is considered reliable with a Cronbach's alpha score of .940. Each item's item-total correlation score ranges from .373 to .700 except for one item. The item-total correlation score of Item 8 (Bad prison conditions just make a prisoner more bitter) is .315, which is not within an acceptable range.

However, after further examination, the researcher decided to retain this item in the ATP scale. First, the factor analysis test revealed that Item 8 loaded well onto the ATP scale with a .746 factor loading. Second, if this item is removed from the ATP scale, the Cronbach's alpha increases by a small amount from .940 to .941. Furthermore, even if

Item 8 is included in the ATP scale, the ATP scale is still reliable with a Cronbach's alpha value of .940. Thus, Item 8 was maintained to measure attitudes toward prisoners.

Attitudes Toward Prisoner Reentry (ATPR)

To measure college students' attitudes toward prisoner reentry, an 18-item Attitude Toward Prisoner Reentry (ATPR) scale was utilized. Appendix H-3 provides each item's item-total correlation and ATPR's Cronbach's alpha score. The scale reliability test indicates that since the Cronbach's alpha score was .875, the ATPR can be considered reliable. Furthermore, except for Item 3 and Item 16, the sixteen items' item total correlation scores were between .371 and .676, which fall within an acceptable range. The item-total correlation scores of two items (Item 3 and Item 16) are under .35. However, after further examination, a decision was made to retain these two items in the ATPR scale for two reasons. First, if both of the items are deleted from the ATPR, the increased Cronbach's alpha is minimal. Furthermore, even though the ATPR contains these two items, the Cronbach's alpha score was high enough to be reliable. Second, the factor analysis test revealed that item 3 and item 16 loaded well onto each sub-scale with .632 and .733 factor loading respectively. Thus, these two items were retained in the ATPR.

Bivariate Correlations

In this section, the correlations among variables are discussed. Since the bivariate model is used to examine the effect of one independent variable on one dependent variable, the bivariate analysis was conducted to examine the statistical relationships among all the variables. For this analysis, the most widely accepted bivariate correlation statistic, the Pearson correlation (symbolized as r) was utilized. Following the

standardized rule, an r score of .1 to .3 is considered a weak correlation, .3 to .5 medium, and .5 to 1.00 strong (Cohen et al., 2003). Table 3 presents the correlations among all the variables in this study.

As shown in the correlation matrix, eight independent variables have significant relationships with the ATP. That is, non-whites, respondents from urban areas, Democrats, and non-Christians are more likely to demonstrate positive attitudes toward prisoners. A respondent who has both a close relationship and a casual relationship with prisoners, and has a higher value of forgiveness level is more likely to have a positive attitude toward prisoners. For attitudes toward prisoner reentry, nine independent variables were found to be significant. That is, respondents who are at a higher academic level, non-white, from an urban area, Democrat, and non-Christian were more likely to support prisoner reentry. Respondents with a close relationship with prisoners, a higher level of the value of forgiveness, and a victimization experience are more likely to support prisoner reentry.

Regarding relationships among independent variables, it was found that several independent variables are significantly related. These correlations among the independent variables can cause multicollinearity which hinders the ability to produce accurate analysis (Bachman & Paternoster, 2004). According to Cohen et al. (2002), if correlations are higher than .50, multicollinearity can be a problem. For the current study, based on the standard of Cohen et al. the correlations among independent variables were not viewed as causing multicollinearity.

Table 3

Bivariate Correlation Matrix

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
(1) Academic level	1.00													
(2) Gender	.012	1.00												
(3) Race	.002	.203**	1.00											
(4) Townsize	.049	-.068	-.460*	1.00										
(5) Major	-.004	.215**	-.023	.120**	1.00									
(6) Democrat	.027	-.204**	-.271**	.137**	-.044	1.00								
(7) Republican	-.025	.087*	.239**	-.166*	.068	-.646**	1.00							
(8) Close Relationship	-.009	-.142**	-.310**	.183**	.024	.142**	-.107*	1.00						
(9) Casual Relationship	.069	-.048	-.122**	.102*	.132**	.083	-.062	.209**	1.00					
(10) Victimization	.111*	.181**	-.048	.011	.103*	-.003	-.010	.087*	.140*	1.00				
(11) Religion	-.025	-.006	.098*	-.023	.058	-.038	.169**	-.004	.000	-.028	1.00			
(12) Forgiveness	.003	-.136**	-.183*	.132**	-.006	.003	.111*	.159**	.079	-.032	.437**	1.00		
(13) ATP	.056	-.085	-.193**	.105*	-.013	.176**	-.241**	.195**	.150**	.052	-.115**	.150**	1.00	
(14) ATPR	.122**	.002	-.150**	.134*	.046	.132**	-.205**	.177**	.080	.090*	-.126**	.113**	.800*	1.00

NOTE: ** $p < .01$, * $p < .05$

Multiple Regression

In this section, the results of the multiple regression are discussed. The previous section provided the results of the bivariate analysis among all the variables in this study. Although the bivariate model enables the researcher to examine the effect of one independent variable on one dependent variable, it does not allow an examination of the impact of several independent variables on a dependent variable (Bachman & Paternoster, 2004). Accordingly, a multiple regression model is needed to investigate the impact of ten independent variables on each of the two dependent variables, controlling for the impact of other independent variables on the dependent variable.

For the regression model, twelve variables were included. As political party is not a dichotomous variable, with three categories, two dummy variables were constructed. Making the independent/other category as a reference category, one dummy variable (Democrat) was constructed by coding Democrat as 1 and the other categories as 0. Another dummy variable (Republican) was made by coding Republican as 1 and the other categories as 0. In addition to the political party variable, another variable, the acquaintance with prisoners variable was split into two variables. That is, from the acquaintance with prisoners variable, the close relationship with prisoners and the casual relationship with prisoners were separately included in the multiple regression model. Accordingly, for each dependent variable, twelve factors were included for the multiple regression model.

In reporting the results of the multiple regression, R^2 , F value, the unstandardized coefficient (slope), the standard error, the standardized coefficient (beta weight), and the t value are provided. To estimate the proportion of the variation in the dependent variable

explained by the independent variables and the prediction error, R^2 is discussed. The F value was calculated for the significance of this multiple regression model. To assess the amount and direction of the absolute impact of each independent variable on each dependent variable, the unstandardized coefficient (slope) is analyzed. In addition, to compare the impact of each independent variable, the standardized coefficient (beta weight) is examined.

Multiple Regression of ATP

For the attitudes toward prisoners, a multiple regression model with 12 independent variables was constructed. Table 4 indicates how each variable impacted the regression model.

Table 4

Multiple Regression of Attitudes Toward Prisoners (n = 529)

Independent Variables	Unstandardized Coefficient	Std.Error	Standardized Coefficient	t
Constant	116.990	4.353		26.876***
Academic Level	.893	.949	.039	.942
Gender	-.697	1.764	-.018	-.395
Race	-2.445	2.603	-.047	-.939
Townsize	-.602	1.913	-.015	-.314
Major	.000	1.698	.000	.000
Democrat	-.208	2.209	-.005	-.094
Republican	-8.813	2.291	-.212	-3.847***
Close relationship	4.168	1.776	.103	2.347*
Casual relationship	3.602	1.757	.087	2.050*
Victimization	1.088	1.685	.027	.646
Religion	-8.904	2.488	-.167	-3.579***
Forgiveness	.515	.114	.215	4.510***

Note: $R^2 = .147$ and $F = 7.437$ $p < .001$ * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$; (2-tailed)

The linear combination of the variables, political affiliation, relationship with prisoners (both close and casual), religion, and forgiveness were significantly related to the participant's attitudes towards inmates, $F(13, 516) = 7.437$, $p < .001$. The sample

variance was .383 and the coefficient of determination (r^2) was .147. The value of R^2 indicates that for this sample, about 14.7% of a respondent's attitude toward prisoners could be explained by the independent variables used in the model.

Results of this model indicated that for this sample, attitudes towards prisoners were positively affected by both close prisoner relations ($p < .05$) and casual prisoner relationship ($p < .05$) and by forgiveness ($p < .001$). More specifically, individuals who identified as either having a close or casual relationship with a prisoner were significantly more likely to be supportive of prisoners. Similarly, as forgiveness scores increased, so did support for prisoners. Religion and political affiliation also had a significant, but inverse relationship ($p < .001$) with attitudes towards prisoners. As a participant's political affiliation moved from other to Republican, while controlling for Democrat, the participant's attitude towards prisoners decreased significantly. Similarly, as a participant's religious beliefs moved from other to Christian, the participant's attitude toward prisoners decreased significantly. The standardized beta coefficients suggest that forgiveness had the largest impact on attitudes toward prisoners, followed by political affiliation, religion, close prisoner relationship, and casual prisoner relationship.

Multiple Regression of ATPR

For another dependent variable, the attitudes toward prisoner reentry, a multiple regression model with 12 independent variables was constructed. Table 5 presents the impact of 12 independent variables on college students' attitudes toward prisoner reentry.

Table 5

Multiple Regression for Attitudes Toward Prisoner Reentry

Independent Variables	Unstandardized Coefficient	Std.Error	Standardized Coefficient	t
Constant	56.559	2.332		24.256 ***
Academic Level	1.280	.508	.105	2.519 *
Gender	.860	.945	.041	.910
Race	-.118	1.395	-.004	-.084
Townsize	.930	1.025	.043	.907
Major	.993	.910	.047	1.092
Democrat	-.267	1.183	-.013	-.225
Republican	-4.138	1.227	-.188	-3.372 **
Close relationship	2.512	.951	.118	2.640 **
Casual relationship	.119	.941	.005	.126
Victimization	1.139	.902	.054	1.262
Religion	-4.936	1.333	-.175	-3.703 ***
Forgiveness	.244	.061	.192	3.979 ***

Note: $R^2 = .128$ and $F = 5.893$ $p < .001$ * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$; (2-tailed)

As shown in Table 5, the linear combination of the 12 independent variables in this model is significant with the 5.893 of F value and .000 significance ($F(13, 516) = 5.893, p < .001$). The sample variance was .360 and the coefficient of determination (r^2) was .128. The R^2 value of .128 indicates that about 12.8 % of the variance in the attitudes toward prisoner reentry could be explained by twelve independent variables.

Results of this model indicate that for this sample, five independent variables were significant predictors in college students' attitudes toward prisoner reentry. While academic level, close relationship with prisoners, and forgiveness positively affected attitudes toward prisoner reentry, political party and religion had a negative impact on attitudes toward prisoner reentry. That is, an individual with a higher academic rank, a close relationship with prisoners, and a higher level of the value of forgiveness was significantly more likely to support prisoner reentry.

On the other hand, a participant who identified him/herself as a Republican or a Christian was significantly less likely to demonstrate a supportive attitude toward prisoner reentry. The standardized beta coefficients suggested that forgiveness had the largest impact on attitudes toward prisoners, followed by political affiliation, religion, close prisoner relationship, and academic level.

Summary

In this chapter, the results of analyzing data from 529 surveys were presented. In the first section, the characteristics of this sample group were described. The bivariate correlation using Pearson's r indicated that there are several significant relationships among independent variables. However, these correlations were not strong enough to cause multicollinearity. With regard to the correlations between independent variables and dependent variables, many factors were found to be significant. However, since multiple regression controls the impact of other independent variables on the dependent variable, the multiple regression model produced different results. Table 6 lists the ten hypotheses and the results of the data analysis using bivariate and multiple regression analysis.

Table 6

Each Hypothesis Supported in Multiple Regression Model

Variables	Hypothesis	ATP	ATPR
Gender	Ha (1) A female student is more likely to demonstrate a supportive attitude toward prisoners and prisoner reentry than a male student.	Not Supported	Not Supported
Race	Ha (2) A non-white student is more likely to demonstrate a supportive attitude toward prisoners and prisoner reentry than a white student.	Not Supported	Not Supported
Academic level	Ha (3) A student who is more advanced academically is more likely to have a supportive attitude toward prisoners and prisoner reentry.	Not Supported	Supported
Townsize	Ha (4) A student who grew up in a large town is more likely to have a supportive attitude toward prisoners and prisoner reentry.	Not Supported	Not Supported
Major	Ha (5) A criminology student is more likely to demonstrate a supportive attitude toward prisoners and prisoner reentry than a non-criminology student.	Not Supported	Not Supported
Political Party	Ha (6) A student who identifies himself or herself as a Republican is less likely to demonstrate a supportive attitude toward prisoners and prisoner reentry than a student who identifies himself or herself as a Democrat.	Supported	Supported
Religion	Ha (7) A student who identified himself or herself as a Christian is less likely to demonstrate a supportive attitude toward prisoners and prisoner reentry than a non-Christian.	Supported	Supported
Forgiveness	Ha (8) A student with a higher value of forgiveness is more likely to support prisoners and prisoner reentry.	Supported	Supported
Victimization experience	Ha (9) A student with a victimization experience is more likely to demonstrate a negative attitude toward prisoners and prisoner reentry.	Not Supported	Not Supported
Acquaintance with prisoners	Ha (10) A student who is acquainted with prisoners is more likely to demonstrate a supportive attitude toward prisoners and prisoner reentry.	Supported	Supported

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

In the previous chapter, the data obtained from the 529 surveys were analyzed and the findings were reported. In this chapter, a discussion of the research findings, the strengths and the limitations of this research, the policy implications, and conclusion are presented. Moreover, the limitations of this research can help to guide future research.

Research Findings

Attitudes Toward Prisoners (ATP)

The current study investigated college students' attitudes toward prisoners using the Melvin et al. ATP scale. When developing the 36-item ATP (Attitude Toward Prisoners) scale, Melvin et al. (1985) stressed the importance of the positive attitudes of the public, criminal justice personnel, and policy makers toward prisoners. As discussed in the literature review, Melvin and his colleagues also examined college students' attitudes toward prisoners using their own scale (1985). Furthermore, their research was replicated in Spain by Ortet-Fabregat et al. (1993) and in Norway by Kjelsberg et al. (2007). All three studies included student sample groups in their research and produced similar mean ATP scores in student sample groups. Melvin et al. found a mean ATP score of 90.5 for students; the Ortet-Fabregat et al. student sample averaged 92.1 on the ATP; and the Kjelsberg et al. student sample mean ATP was 91. The current study found a mean ATP score of 82.2.

Furthermore, the three previous studies employed various sample groups in order to compare opinions among different sample groups. These studies found that college students were more likely to have negative attitudes toward prisoners than other sample

groups. However, as the current study did not include various sample groups such as correctional officers and law enforcement personnel, college students' attitudes toward prisoners could not be compared with other groups in society.

Attitudes Toward Prisoner Reentry (ATPR)

As prisoner reentry is an emerging issue in corrections, it is valuable to examine how much support was found for each reentry item. Thus, Appendix I provides the level of agreement with each reentry item. Appendix I demonstrates that a sizable portion of respondents supported prison based job training (83.9%), post-release job training (70.6%), and post-release drug treatment (81.9%). Among 18 prisoner reentry items, the item with the most support was that the prisoner should work in prison to gain a job skill (87.9%). Although 50.3% of the respondents supported the Second Chance Act which enables each state to use more funds for prisoner reentry programs, only 19.5% of the respondents agreed to pay more taxes for reentry programs.

In terms of returning prisoners, the respondents demonstrated positive attitudes. More respondents (48.6%) answered that they were not fearful about the huge number of returning prisoners while 32.3% of the respondents reported that they did have some fear about this situation. Furthermore, respondents were unlikely to perceive returning prisoners as dangerous. While 28.6% of the respondents thought released prisoners would be a risk to public safety, 46.3% of the respondents did not. Regarding the integration of the ex-prisoners back into society, respondents demonstrated more supportive attitudes in situations when indirect involvement is needed than when direct involvement is required. While more respondents accepted returning prisoners as their colleagues in the work place (59.1% vs 16.9%), only 38.9% of the respondents agreed to hire ex-prisoners if

they were employers. The same pattern was identified with regard to the housing issue. More respondents were willing to accept ex-prisoners as their neighbors (41.8% vs 19.3%). On the other hand, only 35.9% of the respondents demonstrated that they were willing to rent their property to ex-prisoners.

Five items examined a respondent's opinion about ex-prisoners' legal barriers. Over half of the respondents agreed to restore ex-prisoners' voting rights (61.2%) and drivers' licenses (62.2%). However, with regard to the three other legal restrictions on ex-prisoners, respondents demonstrated different attitudes for each item. While more respondents (48.9% vs 14.6%) supported the public housing restriction for parole and probation violators, fewer respondents (24.6% vs 50.1%) agreed to the ban on receiving grants, loans, and work assistance for drug offenders. On the other hand, regarding the legal restriction of food stamps and cash benefits to drug offenders, respondents demonstrated similar support. Slightly more respondents (38.5%) disagreed with the legal restriction of food stamps and cash benefits to drug offenders, while 30.4% of the respondents agreed to this legal restriction.

In summary, the research findings on the attitudes toward prisoner reentry indicate that, for the most part, college students in the current study supported prisoner reentry programs and efforts.

Independent Variables

Due to the lack of research on prisoners and prisoner reentry, 12 independent variables were developed based on previous research on college students' opinions concerning punishment and rehabilitation. However, the research findings of the current study suggest that attitudes toward punishment and prisoner/prisoner reentry can be

demonstrated differently. This possibility of different attitudes has also been noted by several researchers (Applegate et al, 1997; Cullen et al., 1988; McCorkle, 1993). For example, Cullen and his colleagues (1988) argued that the public's attitude is not monolithic.

Therefore, although punishment and the prisoner reentry issue are strongly related, college students as well as the public may demonstrate their attitudes toward punishment, rehabilitation, prisoners, and prisoner reentry in various ways. The research findings of this study propose the possibility that predictors of punitiveness can be different from predictors of attitudes toward prisoners or prisoner reentry. For example, the low R^2 values of the ATP and ATPR suggest that there are many more predictors of attitudes toward prisoners and prisoner reentry that differ from predictors of punishment and rehabilitation. This will be further discussed in the following section. In addition to the low R^2 , the different results from previous research indicate that the factors associated with attitudes toward prisoners and prisoner reentry may be different from the factors related to the punitiveness and support for rehabilitation. The major variable and race variable are good examples in the current study.

Major is one of the primary variables in the research on college students' perceptions. The opinions of criminal justice students and non-criminal justice students were compared in several studies (e.g., Falco, 2008; Hensley et al., 2003; Lambert, 2004; Mackey & Courtright, 2000; Mackey et al., 2006). Through these studies, criminal justice students' more punitive attitudes have been identified (Lambert, 2004; Mackey & Courtright, 2000). However, the recent research of Falco (2008) utilized criminology students instead of criminal justice students as a sample group. Falco found that

criminology students were less likely to be punitive than non-criminology students. In interpreting this finding, she suggested the possibility that the differences in the curriculum in criminology and criminal justice programs can be one possible reason for these different results.

However, the current study produced different results. Contrary to the hypothesis, it was found that there is no difference between criminology students' and non-criminology students' attitudes toward prisoners.

Regarding attitudes toward prisoner reentry, although it is not statistically significant, criminology students demonstrated more supportive attitudes toward prisoner reentry than non-criminology students. This result was anticipated because criminology students are likely to be more aware of the importance of prisoner reentry efforts than students in other majors.

Race also is a commonly examined variable in research on college students' opinions about punishment and rehabilitation (e.g., Hensley et al., 2003; Lambert et al., 2005). However, in this study, race is not a significant predictor in the multiple regression model, although there was a significant association between race and attitudes toward prisoners and prisoner reentry in the bivariate model. Due to the lack of racial diversity in this sample group, it was difficult to achieve an accurate comparison across races. This lack of diversity will be discussed in the section on the study's limitations.

Theoretical Foundations

The research findings of this study support reintegrative shaming, peacemaking criminology, and restorative justice which were provided as the theoretical basis for the current study. Specifically, the religious value of forgiveness variable reflects the core

concepts of these three theories and the acquaintance with prisoner variable is related to restorative justice.

With the assumption that the concept of forgiveness is associated with the prisoner reentry issue, the forgiveness variable was examined in the current study. As shown in the previous chapter, the forgiveness variable was found to be a significant predictor in both attitudes toward prisoners and attitudes toward prisoner reentry. Furthermore, the comparison of standardized coefficients (beta weight) among twelve independent variables indicates that forgiveness is the most powerful predictor in both attitudes toward prisoners and prisoner reentry.

In fact, the importance of value of the forgiveness variable in attitudes toward prisoners and prisoner reentry was anticipated, due to the fact that forgiveness is one of the common concepts of reintegrative shaming, peacemaking criminology, and restorative justice which were provided as theoretical foundations for this study. Braithwaite (1989) argued that the public's words or gestures of forgiveness elicit reintegrative shaming and lower recidivism. According to peacemaking criminologists, mediation, conflict resolution, reconciliation, and reintegration of the offender into the community are crucial ways to solve problems (Pepinsky & Quinney, 1991). Thus, the value of forgiveness was expected to play an important role in mediation, conflict resolution, reconciliation, and reintegration of the offenders into the community.

In addition, the function of forgiveness is essential to restorative justice. In the restorative justice model, one of the major concerns is to restore broken relationships among people. Forgiveness can be considered a powerful tool in repairing interpersonal relationships, specifically in a victim-offender mediation program. Thus, the concept of

forgiveness is a common theme in the theories of reintegrative shaming, peacemaking criminology, and restorative justice.

Regarding the acquaintance with prisoner variable, a close relationship with prisoners was found to be a significant predictor both for attitudes toward prisoners and attitudes toward prisoner reentry. A casual relationship with prisoners was not significant in students' attitudes toward prisoner reentry, but it was significant in their attitudes toward prisoners. As mentioned in the literature review chapter, the evaluation research on victim-offender mediation revealed that participants in victim offender mediation experienced a reduced fear of crime and an increased understanding of criminals through personal contacts with offenders (Roberts, 1995; Umbreit, 1989, 1994, 1996; Umbreit et al., 1998; Van Ness & Strong, 1997; Wright & Galaway, 1989). Therefore, these research findings support the argument made in the literature review that personal contact with criminals may indirectly affect one's level of punitiveness and level of support for rehabilitation and reentry by reducing the fear of crime and criminals. Victim-offender mediation is a program which was developed based on reintegrative shaming and restorative justice.

Limitations

Using a large scale survey method, the current study provides a better understanding of college students' perceptions toward prisoners and prisoner reentry issues at one university. However, several limitations were identified in this research. Thus, a discussion of the limitations of this study can also inform future research directions.

ATPR Scale

The most salient limitation of this study is the Attitude Toward Prisoner Reentry (ATPR) scale which was developed by the researcher. Due to the lack of a standard scale for prisoner reentry, the researcher selected 18 reentry-related items from several public opinion surveys. These items were selected based on previous research on prisoner reentry. Although the ATPR scale's reliability was assessed through a factor analysis test and a scale reliability test, the validity issue still remained. Through further research on prisoner reentry, the reliability and the validity of the ATPR scale needs to be evaluated and revised. In addition to the 18 items, more relevant items should be included for the ATPR scale after more reentry studies have been conducted.

More Predictors

The low value of R^2 is another major limitation of this study. This limitation derived from the fact that prisoners and prisoner reentry have been less frequently researched when compared to other areas of corrections. Furthermore, there is no published study regarding which factors influence the public's attitudes toward prisoners and prisoner reentry. Accordingly, for the current study, 12 predictors were developed primarily based on punishment studies although prisoner reentry studies also were reviewed. In the multiple regression analysis of this study, the R^2 of attitudes toward prisoners was .147 and the R^2 of attitudes toward prisoner reentry was .128. These analyses indicate that approximately 14.7 % of the variance in the attitudes toward prisoners and 12.8 % of the variance in the attitudes toward prisoner reentry is explained by twelve independent variables. In other words, over 85% of the variance in the attitudes

toward prisoners and prisoner reentry, respectively, is still unexplained. Therefore, more predictors should be identified based on reentry research rather than punishment research.

Type of Offenses

In measuring attitudes toward prisoners and prisoner reentry, the offender's offense was not considered. However, a number of researchers have found that the public is likely to demonstrate a different attitude toward various types of offenders (Applegate et al., 2002; Mears, 2001; Bouley & Wells, 2001). For example, Gideon's latest public opinion survey revealed that in support for the Second Chance Act, respondents demonstrated the strongest support for drug offender treatment and the least support for sex offender treatment (2008).

In fact, five participants in the current study expressed their opinions on the survey instrument, commenting "it depends on the type of offense". Thus, in future investigations of the public's and students' attitudes toward prisoners and prisoner reentry, it would be helpful to list various types of offenses. However, the amount of time to complete the survey is considered to be an issue that might affect the inclusion of these items.

Limitations of the Sample Group

Another limitation of this study is the sample group. First of all, through frequencies and descriptive statistics, there was little diversity within this sample group. The majority of the respondents were white (82.2%) and Christians (83.4%). Over 62% of the respondents were raised in rural areas. This lack of diversity can be a potential barrier to an accurate analysis on the impact of race, religion, and size of town on the

dependent variables. Accordingly, more replication research at other universities with a more diverse population needs to be conducted.

Furthermore, in order to generalize the findings to the general public, replication research with a sample of the general public also is needed. Since this study utilized college students as a sample group, the generalization of findings is limited to one public university. In addition, if the sample is selected from the general public, more factors such as SES, education level, and marital status can be explored as potential predictors of attitudes toward prisoners and prisoner reentry.

Involvement in Prisoner Reentry Efforts

For the current study, in examining attitudes toward prisoners and prisoner reentry, whether a respondent is willing to participate in rehabilitation and reentry programs was not explored. That is, instead of involvement (actual behavior), the respondents' perceptions were examined. An examination of willingness of involvement in prisoner reentry efforts is important because some researchers (e.g., Golembeski & Fullilove, 2005; Petersilia, 2003; Travis, 2005) have emphasized that active community involvement and support are key elements for successful prisoner reentry.

However, according to the reentry research, the public is unlikely to be involved in prisoner reentry efforts. For example, the Clear et al. (2001) interviews with Florida residents revealed that participants supported prisoner reentry programs, but they did not want to be involved in prisoner reentry efforts. Furthermore, the findings of attitudes toward prisoner reentry in this study suggest that these respondents may have ambivalent attitudes toward prisoners and prisoner reentry. As shown in Appendix G, over 80% of the respondents supported pre-release and post-release reentry programs such as job

training and drug treatment programs. Regarding the concern about ex-prisoners living in their neighborhood, 41.8% of the respondents demonstrated positive attitudes. In addition, 59.1% of respondents also reported positive attitudes toward ex-prisoners as potential colleagues.

However, when the housing and employment issues require the respondents' active involvement, the respondents demonstrated different attitudes. Regarding whether they were willing to rent their property to ex-prisoners, 35.9% of the respondents agreed to rent their property. On the item about the respondent's willingness to hire ex-prisoners, 38% of the respondents agreed that they were willing to hire ex-prisoners. These data suggest that the respondents in the current study demonstrated more positive attitudes when they were not directly involved. As the prisoner reentry researchers recommended, in order to elicit the public's active involvement in rehabilitation and reentry efforts, these areas require investigation.

Strengths

In spite of several limitations, there are three major strengths of this study. First of all, based on the published research, the current study is the first study to investigate college students' attitudes toward prisoner reentry. Due to the large number of returning prisoners and their high recidivism rates, prisoner reentry has become a critical issue in American corrections. Recently, a substantial body of research on prisoner reentry has been produced, but the majority of the research has focused on identifying barriers to the prisoner's successful reintegration into society. Furthermore, college students' attitudes toward prisoner reentry were not studied previously. Accordingly, the current study can increase researchers' understanding of college students' attitudes toward prisoner reentry.

The second strength of this study was that it employed a large scale quantitative research method. In addition to the lack of research on this topic, the research methods used to study prisoner reentry also have been limited. Overall, a qualitative interview method has been used primarily, and it sometimes has included focus group interviews. In fact, large scale quantitative studies rarely have been conducted. Accordingly, the current survey of 529 college students can provide a better understanding of college students' attitudes toward prisoners and prisoner reentry.

Third, based on the published study, this study is the first research to explore which factors influence college students' attitudes toward prisoners. As discussed above, due to the lack of research, independent variables were constructed based on studies of punishment and rehabilitation. Although the low values of R^2 indicate that there are a number of unknown predictors of attitudes toward prisoners and prisoner reentry, several factors were identified as potential predictors in attitudes toward prisoners and prisoner reentry. These predictors can be used to address the public's negative attitudes toward prisoners, and they will be discussed in the following policy implications section.

Policy Implications

Prisoner reentry research revealed that along with employment, housing, and family relationships, the public's negative attitude toward prisoners is one of the major barriers to prisoners' successful reintegration into society (Brooks et al.; Clear et al.; Immerwahr & Johnson, 2002; Petersilia, 2003). Thus, many researchers (e.g., Brooks et al., 2006; Clear et al., 2001; Golembeski & Fullilove, 2005; Petersilia, 2003; Travis, 2005) suggested that the public's negative attitudes should be addressed to gain its support and involvement in prisoner reentry efforts. Regarding negative attitudes toward

prisoners, Zimring and Johnson (2006) contend that the negative attitude toward criminals is a natural response. Accordingly, in terms of prisoner reentry, the problem is how to deal with this response. Education can be a powerful tool to deal with negative attitudes toward criminals and prisoners. As Mackey et al. (2006) argued, individual attitudes toward prisoners are changeable and the public's negative attitude toward prisoners can be altered through education.

Therefore, the ultimate goal of this study is to develop an educational program aimed at improving the public's negative attitudes toward prisoners based on the predictors identified in the current study. Among the ten independent variables, four factors were found to be significantly related to the attitudes toward prisoners and prisoner reentry. These four predictors are: political party (Republican), religion, the religious value of forgiveness, and acquaintance with prisoners. Among these significant predictors, two factors - forgiveness and acquaintance with prisoners – can be used for the public educational program.

As this research revealed, the religious value of forgiveness is the most powerful predictor in both attitudes toward prisoners and prisoner reentry. The concept of forgiveness can be a useful educational resource for improving negative attitudes toward prisoners. Specifically, victim-offender mediation programs can be included in the public educational program because forgiveness plays an important role in the reconciliation among offenders, victims, and mediators in the victim-offender mediation session. By watching victim-offender mediation sessions, an individual can realize the importance of forgiveness in reconciliation and in repairing the harms.

In addition to focusing on the function of forgiveness in a public educational program, the value of forgiveness needs be emphasized in the entire educational system. The fact that Americans are more likely to demonstrate punitive attitudes than other Western countries (Neapolitan, 2001; Nelken, 2006; Mayhew & Kesteren, 2002; Savelsberg, 2008) may indicate the lack of emphasis on the value of forgiveness. Schools are ideal settings for implementing the value of forgiveness. From pre-school to college, the value of forgiveness can be emphasized as a way of resolving conflicts, rebuilding broken relationships, and assisting in reconciliation. Consequently, the emphasis on the value of forgiveness will be helpful in establishing a more welcome environment for returning prisoners.

Second, the personal acquaintance with a prisoner variable also can be used for a public education program. This research finding supports the argument of Doob and Roberts (1984) that people's knowledge of an offender and an offender's situation could reduce punitive attitudes. Thus, a documentary film showing prisoners' struggles to adjust to society or a public forum involving ex-prisoners who share their experiences can be incorporated into a public education program. These kinds of programs would be appropriate for college students.

In addition, the victim-offender mediation program can be used to reflect the effect of the acquaintance with prisoner variable. As previously discussed in the literature review, the evaluation research on victim offender mediation programs revealed that participants in victim offender mediation experienced a reduced fear of crime and an increased understanding of criminals through personal contact with offenders (Roberts, 1995; Umbreit, 1989, 1994, 1996; Umbreit et al., 1998; Van Ness & Strong, 1997;

Wright & Galaway, 1989). As the victim-offender mediation session includes both the concepts of forgiveness and acquaintance with prisoners, watching the victim-offender mediation process as well as participating in a victim-offender mediation session might help to improve the public's negative attitudes toward prisoners.

In summary, based on the research findings of this study, it is anticipated that a public educational program can be developed to improve the public's antipathy toward prisoners. Two powerful predictors, the value of forgiveness and the acquaintance with prisoners, can be emphasized in the public educational program.

Conclusion

One of the leading scholars of the prisoner reentry, Jeremy Travis (2005) noted the public's antipathy toward ex-prisoners in his book *But They All Come Back*. Coining the term "invisible punishment", he argued that we create unwelcoming atmospheres for returning prisoners,

From an external perspective, mainstream society does not welcome prisoners home. We deny ex-felons access to jobs, housing, health care, welfare benefits, voting rights, and other privileges and rights of citizenship through a vast network of invisible punishments. On a more fundamental level, we create a symbolic distance between mainstream society and ex-felons by attaching a powerful, seemingly indelible stigma to those who have violated society's laws. Society shuns ex-felons, while simultaneously expecting them to work, support their children, respect the law and observe their release conditions (p. 250).

As Travis pointed out, the public's antipathy toward ex-prisoners exists in society. As previously mentioned, prisoner reentry researchers have found that the public's

negative attitude toward offenders is one of the major barriers to prisoners' successful reintegration into society. Thus, reentry researchers (Petersilia, 2003; Travis, 2005; Golembeski & Fullilove, 2005) recommend the public's support and involvement in prisoner reentry efforts as one of the key factors for successful prisoner reentry.

It is important to address this recommendation because of the current rate of recidivism. As discussed in the introduction section, at midyear of 2008, 2.4 million people were in prison or jail in the United States, and 1,700 inmates were being released every day. Released prisoners' recidivism rates exceed 70% one year after they are released. Researchers, policy makers, and correctional administrators have recently acknowledged the prisoner reentry issue. Consequently, there are efforts to develop pre-release and post-release reentry programs. Moreover, researchers are beginning to focus on how these programs can be effective and successful with limited resources and personnel. Therefore, the public's support and active involvement are considered key factors for successful and effective prisoner reentry efforts (Brooks, Visher, & Naser, 2006; Clear, Rose, & Ryder, 2001; Listwan, Cullen, & Lattassa, 2006; Petersilia, 2003; Travis, 2005; Travis & Visher, 2005).

The current study investigated college students' attitudes toward prisoners and prisoner reentry in one public university. Regarding public attitudes toward prisoners, Melvin et al. (1985), Ortet-Fabregat et al., (1993), and Kjelsberg et al. (2007) compared the mean ATP score between student sample groups and other sample groups. They found that college students were more likely to have negative attitudes toward prisoners. However, as the current study did not include other sample groups (e.g., community

members, law enforcement personnel, and correctional officers), a comparison of different attitudes was not possible

Regarding attitudes toward prisoner reentry, the current study found that on the whole, college students in the sample supported prisoner reentry programs and efforts. When compared to other public opinion surveys, college students demonstrated a similar level of support for prisoner reentry efforts and programs. However, consistent with the previous prisoner reentry studies (e.g., Brooks et al., 2006; Clear et al., 2001; Helfgott, 1997; Visher, 2007), the participants of the current study also demonstrated ambivalent attitudes; they supported prisoner reentry efforts, but still were likely to shun returning prisoners and unlikely to be directly involved in prisoner reentry efforts.

In addition to attitudes toward prisoners and prisoner reentry, the current study investigated which factors are associated with attitudes toward prisoners and prisoner reentry. Ten independent variables were constructed based on the previous research on punishment and support for rehabilitation. The most frequently investigated predictor of college students' attitudes is major; but it was not found to be significant. Demographic factors - academic year, race, gender, and size of the town where a respondent was raised – were not significantly associated with attitudes toward prisoners and prisoner reentry.

Conversely, political party, religion, the value of forgiveness, and acquaintance with prisoners were found to be significant predictors of attitudes toward prisoners and prisoner reentry. The most powerful predictor in both attitudes toward prisoners and prisoner reentry was the religious value of forgiveness. In fact, this result was anticipated. Because the value of the forgiveness is the basis of the three theoretical foundations of

the current study- reintegrative shaming, restorative justice, and peacemaking criminology, its role is important.

Acquaintance with prisoners also reflects the core concept of restorative justice through victim-offender mediation programs. As discussed in the policy implication section, two factors, the value of forgiveness and acquaintance with prisoners, can be useful sources for public education programs aimed at improving the public's negative attitudes toward prisoners. In addition, the value of forgiveness needs to be emphasized in the entire school system- from pre-school to college to help make a supportive atmosphere for returning prisoners.

However, the low value of R^2 of the multiple regression model indicates that a substantial portion of variation in attitudes toward prisoners and prisoner reentry is not explained by the ten independent variables. To enhance the prediction power, more predictors need to be identified through research on attitudes toward prisoners and prisoner reentry instead of research on punishment and rehabilitation. In addition, using the general public as a sample group will enable the researcher to include more predictors such as marital status, SES, and education level, which may increase the value of R^2 .

In spite of several limitations, the current study is helpful to understand college students' attitudes toward prisoners and prisoner reentry. Prisoner reentry is important because released prisoners' successful reintegration into society is not a temporary issue. Regardless of the number of released prisoners per day, as long as the prison system exists, prisoner reentry will continue to be a crucial issue not only for public safety but also for the released prisoners themselves. As discussed in the policy implication section, the ultimate goal of this research is to develop public education programs aimed at

improving the public's negative attitude toward prisoners. Thus, this dissertation provides preliminary information about plausible strategies to gain the public's support and to encourage the public's active involvement in prisoners' successful reintegration into society.

References

- Ahmed, E., & Braithwaite, J. (2005). Forgiveness, shaming, shame and bullying. *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Criminology*, 38, 298–323.
- Akers, R., & Sellers, C. S. (2004). *Criminological theories: Introduction, evaluation, and application*. Los Angeles, CA: Roxbury Publishing.
- Applegate, B. K., Cullen, F. T., Turner, M. G., & Sundt, J. L. (1996). Assessing public support for three-strikes-and-you're-out laws: global versus specific attitudes. *Crime and Delinquency*, 42, 517-534.
- Applegate, B. K., Cullen, F.T., & Fisher, B.S. (1997). Public support for correctional treatment: the continuing appeal of the retributive ideal. *The Prison Journal*, 77, 237-258.
- Applegate, B. K., Cullen, F. T., Fisher, B. S., & Ven, V. T. (2000). Forgiveness and fundamentalism: Reconsidering the relationship between correctional attitudes and religion. *Criminology*, 38(3), 719-753.
- Applegate, B., Cullen, F., & Fisher, B. (2002). Public views toward crime and correctional policies: Is there a gender gap? *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 30, 89-100.
- Astin, A.W. (1977). *What matters most in college: Four critical years*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Babbie, E. (2001). *The practice of social research* (9th Ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth /Thomson Learning.
- Bachman, R., & Paternoster, R. (2004). *Statistical methods for criminology and criminal justice*. New York, NY: The McGraw-Hill Companies, Inc.
- Bachman, R., & Schutt, R.K. (2007). *The practice of research in criminology and criminal justice*. Boston, MA: Pine Forge Press.
- Barak, G. (1994). *Media, process, and the social construction of crime*. New York, NY: Garland Press.
- Barkan, S. E., & Cohn, S. F. (1994). Racial prejudice and support for the death penalty by whites. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 31(2), 202-209.
- Barnett, R. (1977). Restitution: A new paradigm of criminal justice. *Ethics*, 87, 279-301.
- Baron, S. W., & Hartnagel, T. F. (1996). Lock them up: Attitudes toward punishing juvenile offenders. *Canadian Journal of Criminology*, 38, 191-212.

- Baumer, E. P., Rosenfeld, R., & Messner, S.F. (2000). *The effect of homicide rates on support for capital punishment*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Society of Criminology. San Francisco, California.
- Bazemore, G., & Schiff, M. (2001). *Restorative Justice and the Offender: The challenge of reintegration*. Cincinnati, OH: Anderson Publishing Co.
- Bearden, W. O., Hardesty, D., & R.L. Rose. (2001). Consumer self-confidence: Refinements in conceptualization and measurement. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 28, 121-134.
- Berry, P. E., & Eigenberg, H. M. (2003). Role strain and incarcerated mothers: Understanding the process of mothering. *Women and Criminal Justice*, 15(1), 101-119.
- Blumstein, A., & Cohen, J. (1980). Sentencing of convicted offenders: An analysis of the public's views. *Law and Society Review*, 14, 223-62.
- Bohm, R. M., Clark, L. J., & Aveni, A. F. (1991). Knowledge and death penalty opinion: A test of the Marshall Hypothesis. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 28(3), 360-387.
- Bohm, R. M., & Vogel R.E. (1994). A comparison of factors associated with uninformed and informed death penalty opinions. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 22, 125-143.
- Bonta, J., Rooney, J., & Mcanoy, K. (2002). An outcome evaluation of a restorative justice alternative to incarceration. *Contemporary Justice Review*, 5, 319-338.
- Borg, M. J. (1997). The southern subculture of punitiveness? Regional variation in support for capital punishment. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 34, 25-45.
- Bouley, E. E., Jr., & Wells, T. L. (2001). Attitudes of citizens in a southern rural county toward juvenile crime and justice issues. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice*, 17, 60-70.
- Braithwaite, J. (1989). *Crime, shame and reintegration*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press.
- Braithwaite, J., & Mugfold, S. (1994). Conditions of successful reintegration ceremonies. *British Journal of Criminology*, 34, 139-171.
- Britt, C. L. (1998). Race, religion, and support for the death penalty: A research note. *Justice Quarterly*, 15(1), 175-191.

- Brooks, L. E., Visher, C. A., & Naser, R. L. (2006). *Community resident's perceptions of prisoner reentry in selected Cleveland neighborhoods*. Washington, D.C.: Urban Institute.
- Brown, M. P., & Elrod, P. (1995). Electronic house arrests: An examination of citizen attitudes. *Crime and Delinquency*, *41*, 332-346.
- Brown, S. (1999). Public attitude toward the treatment of sex offenders. *Legal and Criminological Psychology*, *4*, 239-252.
- Bryman, A., & Cramer, D. (2001). *Quantitative data analysis with SPSS release 10 for Windows: A guide for social scientists*. London: Routledge.
- Chiricos, T., Welch, K., & Gertz, M. (2004). Racial typification of crime and support for punitive measures. *Criminology*, *42*(2), 359-389.
- Clark, L. A., & Watson, D. (1995). Constructing validity: Basic issues in objective scale development. *Psychological Assessment*, *7*(3), 309-319.
- Clear, T.R., & Karp, D.R. (1999). *The community justice ideal: Preventing crime and achieving justice*. Boulder, CO: Westview.
- Clear, T.R., Rose, D.R., & Ryder, J.A. (2001). Incarceration and the community: The problem of removing and returning offenders. *Crime and Delinquency*, *47*(3), 335-351.
- Cohen, J., Cohen, P., West, S. G., & Aiken, L. S. (2003). *Applied multiple regression/correlation analysis for the behavioral sciences* (3rd Ed.). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Cohn, S. F., Barkan, S. E., & Halteman, W. A. (1991). Punitive attitudes toward criminals: Racial consensus or racial conflict. *Social Problems*, *38*(2), 287-296.
- Comb, M. W., & Comer, J. C. (1982). Race and capital punishment: A longitudinal analysis. *Journal of Behavioral Economics*, *6*, 87-105.
- Committee on the Judiciary. (2006). *2006 Second Chance act of 2005*. Hearing before the subcommittee on crime, terrorism, and homeland security of the committee on the judiciary house of representatives at one hundred ninth Congress. Retrieved from http://commdocs.house.gov/committees/judiciary/hju24371.000/hju24371_of.htm
- Corden, J., Kuipers, J., & Wilson, K. (1978). *After prison: A study of the post-release experiences of discharged prisoners*. London: Department of Social Administration and Social Work, University of York.

- Cormier, R. B. (2002). *Restorative justice: Directions and principles, developments in Canada*. Ottawa: Solicitor General.
- Costelloe, M. T., Chiricos, T., Burianek, J., Gertz, M., & Maier-Katkin, D. (2002). The social correlates of punitiveness toward criminals: A comparison of the Czech Republic and Florida. *The Justice System Journal, 23*(2), 191-213.
- Courtright, K. E., & Mackey, D.A. (2004). Job desirability among criminal justice majors: Exploring relationship between personal characteristics and occupational attractiveness. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education, 15*(2), 311-326.
- Courtright, K. E., Mackey, D. A., & Packard, S. H. (2005). Empathy among college students and criminal justice majors: identifying predisposition traits and the role of education. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education, 16*(1), 125-144.
- Cowan, D. S., & Fionda, J. (1994). The response of local authorities' housing departments to the housing of ex-offenders. *British Journal of Criminology, 34*, 444-458.
- Cullen, F. T. (2006). It is time to reaffirm rehabilitation. *Journal of Criminal Justice, 5*, 665-672.
- Cullen, F. T., & Gendreau, P. (2001). From nothing works to what works: Changing professional ideology in the 21st century. *Prison Journal, 81*, 313-338.
- Cullen, F. T., Clark, G. A., Cullen, J. B., & Mathers, R. A. (1985). Attribution, salience, and attitudes toward criminal sanctioning. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 12*(3), 305-331
- Cullen, F. T., Fisher, B. S., & Applegate, B. K. (2000). Public opinion about punishment and corrections. *Crime and Justice: A Review of Research, 27*, 1-79.
- DeVellis, R. (2003). *Scale development: Theory and applications* (2nd Ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Dignan, J. (1992). Repairing the damage. *British Journal of Criminology, 32*(4), 453-473.
- Dillman, D. (2007). *Mail and Internet surveys: The tailored-design method 2007 update with Internet, visual, and mixed-mode guide*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Doob, A., & Roberts, J. (1984). Social psychology, social attitudes and attitude towards sentencing, *Canadian Journal of Behavioral Science, 16*, 269-280.
- Dull, R. T., & Wint, A.V.N. (1997). Criminal victimization and its effect on fear of crime and justice attitudes. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 12*(5), 748-758.

- Durham, A. M., Elrod, P., & Kinkade, P.T. (1996). Public support for the death penalty: Beyond Gallup. *Justice Quarterly*, *13*, 705-736.
- Eglash, A. (1977). Beyond restitution: Creative restitution. In J. Hudson & B. Galaway (Eds.), *Restitution in criminal justice* (pp. 91-129). Lexington, MA: D.C. Heath.
- Ellison, C. G. (1991). An eye for an eye? A note on the Southern subculture of thesis. *Social Forces*, *69*(4), 1223-1239.
- Ellison, C. G., & Sherkat, D. E. (1993). Conservative Protestantism and support for corporal punishment. *American Sociological Review* *58*, 131-144.
- Evans, T. D., & Adams, M. (2003). Salvation or damnation? Religion and correctional ideology. *American Journal of Criminal Justice*, *28*(1), 15-35.
- Fabianic, D. (1979). Social work and criminal justice student support of civil liberties. *Journal of Sociology and Social Welfare*, *6*, 221-230.
- Fahey, J., Roberts, C., & Engel, L. (2006). *Employment of Ex-offenders: Employer Perspectives*. Retrieved from http://http://www.crjustice.org/cji/ex_offenders_employers_12-15-06.pdf
- Falco, D. L. (2008). *Assessing Students' Views toward punishment: A comparison of Punitiveness among criminology and non-criminology students* (Doctoral dissertation, Indiana University of Pennsylvania, 2008). Retrieved from <http://dspace.lib.iup.edu:8080/dspace/bitstream/2069/120/1/Diana+Falco.pdf>
- Farnworth, M., Longmire, D. R., & West, V. M. (1998). College students' views on criminal justice. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education*, *9*(1), 39-57.
- Flanagan, T. J., & Longmire, D. R. (1996). *American view crime and justice: A national public opinion survey*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Frankfort-Nachmias, C., & Nachmias, D. (2000). *Research methods in the social sciences* (6th Ed.). New York, NY: Wadsworth.
- Gabbidon, S. L., Penn, E. B., & Richards, W.A. (2003). Career choice and characteristics of African-American undergraduates majoring in criminal justice at historically Black colleges and universities. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education*, *14*, 229-244.
- Giacopassi, D., & Vandiver, M. (1999). University students' perception of tobacco, cocaine, and homicide fatalities. *The American Journal of Drug and Alcohol Abuse*, *25*(1), 163-172.

- Gideon, L. (2008). *Public attitude toward prisoners rehabilitation, reintegration and reentry*. Presented at the ACJS Annual Meeting in 2008.
- Gillian, C. (1982). *In a different voice. Psychological theory and women's development*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Glaser, D. (1969). *The effectiveness of a prison and parole system*. Indianapolis, IN: Bobbs-Merrill.
- Golembeski, C., & Fullilove, R. (2005). Criminal (in)justice in the city and its associated health consequences. *American Journal of Public Health, 95(10)*, 1701-1714.
- Grasmick, H. G., Davenport, E., Chamlin, M. B., & Bursik, R. J. (1992). Protestant fundamentalism and the retributive doctrine of punishment. *Criminology, 30*, 21-45.
- Grasmick, H. G., & McGill, A. L. (1994). Religion, attribution style, and punitiveness toward juvenile offenders. *Criminology, 32(1)*, 23-46.
- Grasmick, H. G., Robert, J., Bursik, Jr., & Blackwell, B. S. (1993). Religious beliefs and public support for the death penalty for juveniles and adults. *Journal of Crime and Justice, 16*, 59-86.
- Haghighi, B., & Lopez, A. (1998). Gender and perception of prisons and prisoners. *Journal of Criminal Justice, 26*, 453-464.
- Halim, S., & Stiles, B. L. (2001). Differential support for police use of force, the death penalty, and the perceived harshness of courts. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 28*, 3-23.
- Hamm, M. S. (1989). Legislator ideology and capital punishment: The special case for Indiana juveniles. *Justice Quarterly, 6*, 219-232.
- Hans, V. P. (1986). An analysis of public attitudes toward the insanity defense. *Criminology, 24*, 393-414.
- Hardy, M., & Bryman, A. (2004). *Handbook of data analysis*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage
- Harris, P.W. (1986). Over-simplification and error in public opinion surveys on capital punishment. *Justice Quarterly, 3*, 429-455.
- Hart Research Associates, Inc. (2002). *Chaining public attitudes toward the criminal justice system*. Washington, D.C.: Peter D. Hart Research Associates.

- Hartlaub, M. G. (1998). Attitudes toward punishment: Personality correlates of perceived importance and preferred type of punishment. *Dissertation Abstracts International, Section B: The Sciences and Engineering*, 59, 3-18.
- Hay, C. (2001). An Exploratory Test of Braithwaite's Reintegrative Shaming Theory. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 38(1), 132-153.
- Hayes, H. (2005). Assessing re-offending in restorative justice conferences. *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Criminology*, 38(1), 77-101
- Hayes, H., & Daly, K. (2004). Conferencing and re-offending in Queensland. *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Criminology*, 37(2), 167-191.
- Helfgott, J. (1997). Ex-offender needs versus community opportunity in Seattle, Washington. *Federal Probation*, 61(2), 12-13.
- Hensley, C., Koscheski, M., & Tewksbury, R. (2003). College students' attitudes toward inmate programs, services, and amenities. *Criminal Justice Studies*, 16(4), 295-304.
- Herman, S., & Wasserman, C. (2001). A role for victims in offender reentry. *Crime and Delinquency*, 47(3), 428-435.
- Hogan, M. J., Chiricos, T., Gertz, M. (2005). Economic insecurity, blame, and punitive attitudes. *Justice Quarterly*, 22(3), 392-412.
- Holzer, H. J., Raphael, S., & Stoll, M. A. (2002). Will employers hire ex-offenders? Employer preferences, background checks, and their determinants. *Institute Research on Poverty Discussion Paper*, 1243-02.
- Hough, M., Lewis, H., & Walker, N. (1988). *Factors associated with punitiveness in England and Wales*. Brookfield, VT: Avebury Publishing Co.
- Howells, G. N., Flanagan, K. A., & Hagan, V. (1995). Does viewing a televised execution affect attitudes toward capital punishment? *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 22(4), 411-424.
- Hurwitz, J. & Smithey, S. (1998). Gender differences on crime and punishment. *Political Research Quarterly*, 51(1), 89-115.
- Immerwahr, J., & Johnson, J. (2002). *The revolving door: Exploring public attitude toward prisoner reentry*. Retrieved from http://www.urban.org/UploadedPDF/410804_RevolvingDoor.pdf

- Institutional Research Planning and Assessment (2008). *Student headcount by level and campus: IUP Trendbook*. Retrieved from: <http://old.www.iup.edu/planning-analysis/ir/trendbook/Table%20A%20-%203.pdf>
- Jocobi, J. H. (1975). *Reducing Police stress: A psychiatrist's point of view*. Washington, D. C.: Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.
- Johnson, D. (2001). Punitive attitudes on crime: Economic insecurity, racial prejudice, or both? *Sociological Focus*, 34(1), 33-54.
- Johnson, K. (2000, February 10). Unready, unrehabilitated, and up for release. *USA Today*, p.13A
- Keil, T. J., & Vito, G. F. (1992). The effects of the *Furman* and *Gregg* decisions on Black-White execution ratios in the south. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 20, 217-226.
- Kelly, J., & Braithwaite, J. (1990). Public opinion and the death penalty in Australia. *Justice Quarterly*, 7, 529-563.
- Kennedy, R. (1997). *Race, crime and the law*. New York, NY: Vintage Books.
- Kjelsberg, E., Skoglund, T. H., & Rustad, A. B. (2007). Attitude towards prisoners, as reported by prison inmates, prison employees and college students. *BioMed Central Public Health*, 7, 1-9.
- Krisberg, B., & Marchionna, S. (2006). Attitudes of US voters toward prisoner rehabilitation and reentry policies. *National Council on Crime and Delinquency page*. Retrieved from http://www.nccd-crc.org/nccd/pubs/2006april_focus_zogby.pdf
- Lambert, E. G. (2004). Assessing the crime and punishment views of criminal justice majors: How different are they from other majors? *Criminal Justice Studies*, 17(3), 245-257.
- Lambert, E. G. (2005). Worlds Apart: The views on crime and punishment among white and minority college students. *Criminal Justice Studies*, 18(1), 99-121.
- Lambert, E. G., Pasupuleti, S., & Allen, R. (2005). Punishment and rehabilitation views of social work majors and non-social work students: an exploratory study. *Journal of the South Carolina Academy of Science*, 3(1), 31-42.
- Lane, J. S. (1997). Can you make a horse drink? The effects of a corrections course on attitudes toward capital punishment. *Crime and Delinquency*, 43, 186-202.

- Langan, P. A., & Levin, D. J. (2002). Recidivism of Prisoners released in 1994. *Special Report U.S Department of Justice*. Retrieved from <http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/bjs/abstract/rpr94.htm>
- Langworthy, R. H., & Whitehead, J. T. (1986). Liberalism and fear as explanations of punitiveness. *Criminology*, 24, 575-591.
- Latimer, J., Dowden, C., & Muise, D. (2005). The Effectiveness of Restorative Justice Practices: A Meta-Analysis. *The Prison Journal*, 85(2), 127-144.
- La Vigne, N. G., Visher, C., & Castro, J. (2004). *Chicago prisoners' experiences returning home*. Washington, D.C: The Urban Institute
- La Vigne, N. G., & Thomson, G. (2003). *A portrait of prisoner reentry in Ohio*. Washington, D.C: The Urban Institute
- Leiber, M. J., & Woodrick, A. C. (1997). Religious beliefs, attributional styles, and adherence to correctional orientations. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 24, 495-511.
- Levenson, J. S., Brannon, Y., Fortney, T., & Baker, J. (2007). Public perceptions about sex offenders and community protection policies. *Analyses of Social Issues and Public Policy*, 7(1), 1-25.
- Lipsey, M. W. (1995). *What do we learn from 400 research studies on the effectiveness of treatment with juvenile delinquents?* New York, NY: John Wiley.
- Listwan, S. J., Cullen, F. T., & Lattassa, E., J. (2006). How to prevent reentry from failing. *Federal Probation*, 20(3). Retrieved from http://www.uscourts.gov/fedprob/December_2006/prevent.html
- Luke, G., & Lind, B. (2002). Reducing juvenile crime: Conferencing versus court', *Crime and Justice Bulletin*, 69. Retrieved from [http://www.professionalstandardscouncil.gov.au/lawlink/bocsar/ll_bocsar.nsf/vwFiles/CJB69.pdf/\\$file/CJB69.pdf](http://www.professionalstandardscouncil.gov.au/lawlink/bocsar/ll_bocsar.nsf/vwFiles/CJB69.pdf/$file/CJB69.pdf)
- MacDonald, S., & Erickson, P. (1999). Factors associated with attitudes toward harm reduction among judges in Ontario, Canada. *International Journal of Drug Policy*, 10, 17-24.
- Mackey, D. A., & Courtright, K. E. (2000). Assessing punitiveness among college students: A comparison of criminal justice majors with other majors. *The Justice Professional*, 12, 423-441.
- Mackey, D. A., Courtright, K. E., & Packard, S. H. (2006). Testing the rehabilitative ideal among college students. *Criminal Justice Studies*, 19(2), 153-170.

- Makkai, T., & Braithwaite, J. (1994). Reintegrative shaming and compliance with regulatory standards. *Criminology*, 32, 361–85.
- Maruna, S., & King, A. (2004). *Public opinion and community sanctions: Alternatives to Prison*. Cullompton, Devon: Willam Publishing.
- Mauer, M. (1999). *Race to Incarcerate: The Sentencing Project*. New York, NY: The New Press.
- Maxfield, M., & Babbie, E. (2005). *Research Methods for Criminal Justice and Criminology* (4th Ed.) Scarborough, Canada: Thomson/Wadsworth Publishing.
- Maxwell, J. A. (1996). *Qualitative research design. An interactive approach*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage
- Maxwell, G., & Morris, A. (2001). *Family group conferences and re-offending. Restorative justice for juveniles: Conferencing, mediation and circles*. Oxford, UK: Hart.
- Mayhew, P. & Kesteren, J. V. (2002). *Changing attitudes toward punishment: Cross-National Attitudes to Punishment*. Devon, U.K: Wilan Publishing.
- McCarthy, B. R., & McCarthy, B. J. (1981). Criminal justice student views of the criminal justice system: The impact of education and self-selection and their implications for the human services. *Journal of sociology and Social Welfare*, 8, 610-622.
- McCorkle, R. C. (1993). Punish and rehabilitate? Public attitudes toward six common crimes. *Crime and Delinquency*, 39(2), 240-252.
- McGarrel, E., Olivares, K., Crawford, K., & Kroovand, N. (2000). *Returning Justice to the Community: The Indianapolis Juvenile Restorative Justice Experiment*. Indianapolis, IN: Hudson Institute.
- Mears, D. P. (2001). Getting tough with juvenile offenders. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 28(2), 206-226.
- Melvin, K.B., Gramling, L.K., & Gardner, W.M. (1985). A scale to measure attitudes toward prisoners. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 12(2), 241-253.
- Mehrabian, A. (1996). *Manual for the balanced emotional empathy scale* (available from Albert Mehrabian, 1130 Alta Mesa Road, Monterey, CA 92940).
- Mertler, C. A., & Vannatta, R. A. (2006). *Advanced and multivariate statistical approach: Practical application and interpretation* (3rd Ed) Glendale, CA: Pyrczak Publishing.

- Meyers, L., Gamst, G., & Guarino, A. (2006). *Applied multivariate research: Design an interpretation*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Miller, A. (2001). Student perceptions of hate crimes. *American Journal of Criminal Justice, 25*(2), 293-307.
- Miller, J. L., Rossi, P. H., & Simpson, J. E. (1986). Perceptions of justice: Race and gender differences in judgments of appropriate prison sentence. *Law and Society, 20*, 313-334.
- Miller, A. J., Tewksbury, R., & Hensley, C. (2004). College students' perceptions of crime, prison and prisoners. *The Justice Professional, 17*, 311-328.
- Murphy, K., & Harris, N. (2007). Shaming, shame, and recidivism: A test of reintegrative shaming theory in the white-collar crime context. *British Journal of Criminology, 78*-90.
- Myers, M. A. (1988). Social background and the sentencing behavior of judges. *Criminology, 26*, 649-675.
- Neapolitan, J. L. (2001). An examination of cross-national variation in punitiveness. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology, 45*(6), 691- 710.
- Nelken, D. (2006). Patterns of punitiveness. *Modern Law Review, 69*, 262-277.
- Netemeyer, R., Boles, J., & McMurrian, R. (1996). Development and validation of work-family conflict and family-work conflict scales. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 81*, 400-410.
- Niederdoffer, A. (1969). *Behind the shield: The police in urban society*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.
- Obermiller, C., & Spangenberg, E. R. (1998). Development of a scale to measure skepticism toward advertising. *Journal of Consumer Psychology, 7*(2), 159-86.
- Office of the press secretary. President Bush signs H.R. 1593, the Second Chance Act of 2007. *The White House*. Retrieved from <http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2008/04/20080409-2.html>.
- Ortet-Fabregat, G., Perez, J., & Lewis, R. (1993). Measuring attitudes toward prisoners. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 20*(2), 190-198.
- Ouimet, M., & Coyle, E. J. (1991). Fear of crime and sentencing punitiveness: Comparing the general public and court practitioners. *Canadian Journal of Criminology, 149*-162.

- Page, B. I., & Shapiro, R. Y. (1992). *The rational public*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Payne, B. K., & Coogle, V. (1998). Examining attitudes about the death penalty. *Corrections Compendium*, 23, 24-26.
- Payne, B. K., & Riedel, R. (2002). Gun control attitudes and the criminal justice student: Do differences exist? *College Student Journal*, 36(2), 314-322.
- Pearson, F. S., & Lipton, D. S. (1999). A meta-analytic review of the effectiveness of corrections-based treatment for drug abuse. *The Prison Journal*, 79(4), 384-410.
- Pepinsky, H. E., & Quinney, R. (1991). *Criminology as peacemaking*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
- Petersilia, J. (2003). *When prisoners come home*. New York, NY: Oxford press.
- Roberts, T. (1995). *Evaluation of the victim offender mediation program in Langley, B.C.* Victoria, BC: Focus Consultants.
- Roberts, C. A., Doble, J., Clawson, E., Selton, C., & Briker, A. (2005). *Rethinking Justice in Massachusetts: Public attitudes toward crime and punishment*. Boston, MA: The Boston Foundation.
- Rogers, D. L. (2004). *Structural analysis of treatment and punishment attitudes toward offenders*. Retrieved from <http://www.ohiolink.edu/etd/send-pdf.cgi?osu1121749945>
- Rossi, P. H., & Berk, R. A. (1997). *Just punishments: Federal guidelines and public views compared*. New York, NY: Aldine De Gruyter.
- Rossi, P. H., Simpson, J. E., & Miller, J. L. (1985). Beyond crime seriousness: Fitting the punishment to the crime. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, 1, 59-90.
- Sabol, W. J., Coutour, H., & Harrison, P. M. (2008). *Prisoners in 2007*. Bureau of Justice Statistics. Retrieved from <http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/bjs/pub/pdf/p06.pdf>
- Samuel, W., & Elizabeth, M. (1986). The effect of crime severity on perceptions of fair punishment: A California case study. *The Journal of Criminal Law & Criminology*, 77, 931-948.
- Sandys, M., & McGarrell, E. F. (1995). Attitudes toward capital punishment: Preference for the penalty or mere acceptance? *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 32(2), 191-213.

- Savelsberg, J. J. (2008). *Punitiveness in cross-national comparison: Toward a historically and institutionally grounded multi-factorial approach (From International perspectives on punitivity)*. Bochum, Germany: Universitätsverlag Brockmeyer.
- Scheingold, S. A. (1984). *The Politics of law and order: Street crime and public policy*. New York, NY: Longman.
- Schwartz, I. M., Guo, S., & Kerbs, J. J. (1993). The impact of demographic variables on public opinion regarding juvenile justice: Implications for public policy. *Crime & Delinquency*, 39(1), 5-28.
- Selke, W. L. (1980). The impact of higher education on crime orientations. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 8, 175-184.
- Sims, B. (2003). The impact of causal attribution on correctional ideology: A national study. *Criminal Justice Review*, 28(1), 1-25.
- Solomon, A., Johnson, K., Travis, J., & McBride, E. (2004). *From Prison to Work: The employment dimensions of prisoner reentry: A report of the reentry roundtable*. Washington, DC: Urban Institute, Justice Policy Center.
- Spitzberg, B. H., & Cadiz, M. (2002). The media construction of stalking stereotypes. *Journal of Criminal Justice and Popular Culture*, 9(3), 128-149.
- Sprott, J. B. (1999). Are members of the public tough on crime? The dimensions of public punitiveness. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 27(5), 467-474.
- Sprott, J. B., & Doob, A. N. (1997). Fear, victimization, and attitudes to sentencing, the courts, and the police. *Canadian Journal of Criminology*, 275-291.
- Stephen, R., James, A., & Richard, J. (2004). Thinking about prison release and budget crisis in the blue grass state. *Critical Criminology*, 12(3), 243-263.
- Stinchcombe, A. L., Adams, R., Heimer, C. A., Scheppele, K. L., Smith, T.W., & Taylor, D. G. (1980). *Crime and punishment: Changing attitudes in America*. Washington D. C.: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Stolsenberg, R. M. (1990). Ethnicity, geography and occupational achievement of Hispanic men in the United States. *American Sociological Review*, 55, 34-45.
- Stotland, E. (1969). *Advances in experimental social psychology: Exploratory investigation of empathy*. New York, NY: Academic Press.

- Stuart, B. (1996). Circle Sentencing in Yukon Territory, Canada: A Partnership of the Community and the Criminal Justice System. *International Journal of Comparative and Applied Criminal Justice*, 20 (1), 291-309.
- Sundt, J. L., Cullen, F. T., & Applegate, B. K. (1998). The tenacity of the rehabilitative ideal revisited. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 25, 426-443.
- Surrette, R. (1998). Measures of sexual behavior in an Ohio prison. *Sociology and Social Research*, 74(1), 34-39.
- Taxman, F. S. (2004). *The offender and Reentry: supporting Active Participation in Reintegration*. Retrieved from <http://www.caction.org/rrt/articles/TAXMAN-OFFENDERS'%20VIEWS%20OF%20REENTRY.pdf>
- Taylor, R. B. (1999). *Crime, grime, fear and decline: A longitudinal look. Research in brief*. New York, NY: National Institute of Justice.
- Taylor, C., & Kleinke, C. L (1992). Effects of severity of accident, history of drunk driving, intent, and remorse on judgments of a drunk driver, *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 22, 1641–1655.
- Taylor, D. G., Scheppele, K. L., & Stinchombe, A. L. (1979). Salience of crime and support for harsher criminal sanctions. *Social Problems*, 26(4), 413-424.
- Tittle, C. R., Bratton, J., & Gertz, M.G. (2003). A test of a micro-level application of shaming theory. *Social Problems*, 50, 592–617.
- Tonry, M. (1995). *Malign Neglect*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Travis, J. (2005). *But they all come back*. Washington, D.C.: The Urban Institute Press.
- Travis, J., & Visher, C. (2005). *Prisoner reentry and crime in America*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Tsoudis, O. (2000). Does majoring in criminal justice affect perceptions of criminal justice? *Journal of Criminal Justice Education*, 11(2), 225-236.
- Tyler, T. R., & Weber, R. (1982). Support for the death penalty: Instrumental response to crime or symbolic attitude? *Law and Society Review*, 17, 21-45.
- Tyler, T. R., & Boeckmann, R. J. (1997). Three strikes and you are out, but why? The psychology of public support for punishing rule breakers. *Law & Society Review*, 31(2), 237-265.
- Umbreit, M. S. (1985). *Crime and reconciliation: Creative options for victims and offenders*. Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press.

- Umbreit, M. S. (1989). Victims seeking fairness, not revenge: Toward restorative justice. *Federal Probation*, 53(3), 52-57.
- Umbreit, M. S. (1994). *Victim meets offender: The impact of restorative justice & mediation*. Monsey, NY: Criminal Justice Press.
- Umbreit, M. S. (1996). Restorative justice through mediation: The impact of offenders facing their victims in Oakland. *Journal of Law and Social Work*, 5, 1-13.
- Umbreit, M. S., & Coates, R. B. (1992). The impact of mediating victim offender conflict: An analysis of programs in three States. *Juvenile and Family Court Journal*, 43(1), 21-28.
- Umbreit, M. S., Coates, R. B., & Roberts, A. (1998). Impact of victim-offender mediation in Canada, England, and the United States. *Crime Victim Report*, 1(6), 90-92.
- Unnever, J. D., & Cullen, F. T. (2007). The racial divide in support for the death penalty. *Social Forces*, 85(3), 1281-1301.
- Unnever, J. D., Cullen, F. T., & Applegate, B. K. (2005). Turning the other cheek: Reassessing the impact of religion on punitive ideology. *Justice Quarterly*, 22(3), 304-339.
- Vandiver, M., & Giacopassi, D. (1997). One million and counting: Students' estimates of the annual number of homicides. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education*, 8(2), 135-143.
- Van Ness, D.W., & Strong, K. H. (1997) *Restoring justice*. Cincinnati, OH: Anderson Publishing Company.
- Visher, C., La Vigne, N., & Travis, J. (2004). *Returning home: Understanding the challenges of prisoner reentry*. Washington, D.C.: Urban Institute.
- Visher, C., Palmer, T., Roman, C.G. (2007). *Returning home: Understanding the challenges of prisoner reentry: Cleveland stakeholders' perceptions of prisoner reentry*. Washington, D.C.: Urban Institute.
- Walker, S., Spohn, C., & DeLone, M. (2000). Three strikes and you are out, but why? The psychology of public support for punishing rule breakers. *Law and Society*, 31, 37-265.
- Warner, S. (1992). *Making amends: Justice for victims and offenders*. Brookfield, VT: Avebury.

- Warr, M. (1995). Public opinion on crime and punishment. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 59, 296-310.
- Weiner, T. S. & Eckland, B.K. (1979) Education and political party: the effects of college or social class. *American Journal of Sociology*, 84 (1). 911-928.
- Warr, M., & Stafford, M. (1984). Public goals of punishment and support for the death penalty. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 21, 95-111.
- Welch, K. A. (2004). *Punitive attitudes and the racial typification of crime*. Retrieved from <http://etd.lib.fsu.edu/theses/available/etd-05252004-005153/>.
- Welsh, W. N., & Harris, P.W. (2004). *Criminal justice policy & planning*. Albany, NY: LexisNexis.
- Whitehead, J. (1998). Good ol' boys' and the chair: Death penalty attitudes of policy Makers in Tennessee. *Crime and Delinquency*, 44(2), 245-56.
- Wilk, R. J., & McCarthy, C. R. (1986). Intervention in child sexual abuse: A survey of attitudes. *Social Casework*, 67, 20-26.
- Williams, F. P., & McShane, M. P. (2004). *Criminological theory*. Upper Saddle River, NY: Pearson Prentice Hall.
- Wilson, G., & Dunham, R. (2001). Race, class and attitudes toward crime control: The views of the African American middle class. *Criminal Justice & Behavior*, 28, 259-278.
- Wilson, D., Gallagher, C. A., & MacKenzie, D. L. (2000). A meta-analysis of corrections-based education, vocation, and work programs for adult offenders. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 37(4), 347-368.
- Wright, M. (1991). *Justice for victims and offenders*. Philadelphia, PA: Open University.
- Wright, M., & Galaway, B. (1989). *Mediation and criminal justice*. London, England: Sage Publications.
- Young, R. L., & Thompson, C. Y. (1995). Religious fundamentalism, punitiveness, and firearms ownership. *Journal of Crime and Justice*, 18(2), 81-98.
- Zehr, H. (1990). *Changing lenses*. Scottsdale, PA: Herald Press.
- Zhang, L., & Zhang, S. (2004). Reintegrative shaming and predatory delinquency. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 41, 433-53.

Zimbardo, P., & Haney, C. (1998). The past and future of U.S. prison policy: Twenty five years after the Stanford Prison Experiment. *The American Psychologist*, *53*, 709-727.

Zimbardo, P. G., Ebbesen, E. B., & Maslach, C. (1977). *Influencing attitudes and changing behavior*. Reading, MA: Addison Wesley.

Zimring, F. E., & Johnson, D. T. (2006). Public opinion and the governance of punishment in democratic political systems. *American Academy of Political & Social Science*, *605*, 266-280.

Appendix A
Public's Attitudes toward Reentry

Year	Author	Sample	Method	Dependent Variables	Result
2001	Hart Research Associates	N=1,056 Randomly selected adults	Telephone survey	The public's attitudes toward the criminal justice system	-Over 90% of respondents supported prison-based job training and educational programs. -88% of respondents supported job training programs for released prisoners. -68% of respondents favored restoring voting rights and drivers' licenses to felony convicts.
2002	Immerwahr & Johnson	Philadelphia Residents	Qualitative Group interview	Prisoner reentry	-80% of the respondents approved allocating more funds for reentry programs. -The majority of the participants supported prisoner reentry.
2005	Roberts, Dole, Clawson, Selton, & Briker	N= 748 Randomly selected Massachusetts adults (N=411) & Boston adults (N=337)	Telephone survey	Prisoner reentry	-Boston residents demonstrated more supportive attitudes toward returning prisoners than Massachusetts residents, but the difference was slight. -90% of the respondents agreed to provide job training and housing assistance for the released prisoners.

2006	Brooks, Visher, & Naser	N= 69 Residents from three Cleveland neighborhoods (Central, Hough, & Mt.Pleasant)	30- minute focus group discussion	Prisoner reentry	-Residents supported prisoner reentry but did not want to be involved in these programs.
2006	Krisberg & Marchionna	N=1,039 Randomly selected American voters	Telephone Survey	Prisoner reentry	-79% of the respondents expressed concern about the large number of returning inmates. -93% of the respondents supported reentry programs. -78% of the respondents supported the Second Chance Act, which enables each state to use more money for reentry programs.
2007	Gideon	N=879 Quota sampling combined with snow ball sampling, Residents in New York city and the Tri-State area.	99-item self-administered survey by mail	The public's attitudes toward rehabilitation and reentry	-84.8% respondents expressed concern about the large numbers of returning inmates. -83.1% of the respondents supported the Second Chance Act. -Respondents demonstrated the most support for the drug offenders and the least support for the sex offenders.

Appendix B
College Students' Attitudes toward Prisoners, Rehabilitation, and Punishment

Year	Author	Sample	Method	Dependent Variables	Predictors	Result
1985	Melvin, Gramling, & Gardner	N= 409 Prison reform/ rehabilitation group (N=19), Prisoners' group (N=157), Students' group (N=90), Community members' group (N=64), & Law enforcement officers' group (N=23)	Quantitative survey -ATP(Attitudes Toward Prisoners) scale - Comparison of ATP scores among six groups	Attitudes toward prisoners	Six different groups in the population	-Students demonstrated negative attitudes toward prisoners. -Prisoners' group demonstrated the most positive attitudes toward prisoners. - Law enforcement officers' group showed the most negative attitudes toward prisoners. - Students' group mean score (90.5) was higher than the community members' mean score (87.4).
1993	Ortet-Fabregat, Perez, & Lewis	N= 396 Students' group (N=191), Prison rehabilitation team (N=47), Law enforcement officers' group (N=65), Defense attorneys' group (N=31), & Correctional officers' group (N=62)	-Quantitative survey - ATP scale - Comparison of ATP scores among five groups	Attitudes Toward prisoners	-Five different groups in the population - Gender	- Students and law enforcement officers demonstrated negative attitudes toward prisoners. -Prison rehabilitation team demonstrated the most positive attitudes toward prisoner, while correctional officers' group showed the most negative attitudes toward prisoners. - Women were less likely to show negative attitudes toward prisoners.

1997	Lane	N= 141 Purposive sampling from one Southeastern university	-Experimental design -Experiment group & comparison group -Pretest & Posttest	Students' attitudes toward punishment	Education (Correction class & White-collar crime class)	-Experimental group and comparison group showed reduced punitive attitudes in posttest. -Experimental group (Correction class students) showed less punitive attitudes than comparison group.
1997	Dull & Wint	N= 271 Convenient sampling from one California university	-Longitudinal study - post test 4 year after pretest - Victim group & non-victim group	Fear of crime & attitudes toward capital punishment	Victimization experience	-Victim group showed increased fear of crime. - No different attitudes toward the death penalty between victim group and non-victim group were found.
1998	Farnworth, Longmire, & West	N=683 Convenient sampling from four universities in Texas	Quantitative survey	college students' attitudes toward the death penalty and criminal sanctions, and the war on drugs	Major & academic year	-Criminal justice students demonstrated more punitive attitudes. - Juniors and seniors in criminal justice majors demonstrated more punitive attitudes, while juniors and seniors in non-criminal justice majors were less likely to be punitive.

2000	Tsdious	N= 200 Students from one Midwestern university, Non-criminal justice students (n=101) & criminal justice students (n=99)	Quantitative Self-administered survey	College students' attitudes toward crime, criminals, & punishment	Race, gender, age, education level, & major	-Criminal justice students were less likely to support harsh punishment. - Female and older students were more likely to support harsh punishment. - Education level and race was not significant.
2000	Mackey & Courtright	N=633 From five Notheastern universities Convenient sampling	Quantitative 30-item survey	Support for rehabilitation and punishment	Major, gender, age, race, grade level, political ideology, & the size of the town where a respondent grew up	-Major, grade level, political ideology, and size of the town were significant predictors, while gender and age were not. -Criminal justice students were more likely to be punitive and less supportive of rehabilitation. -Higher class level students, politically liberal students, students from larger towns were less likely to be punitive and more likely to support rehabilitation.
2003	Hensley, Koscheski, & Tewksbury	N= 553 Convenient sampling Sociology and criminology students from a Southern university.	Quantitative Survey	Support for in-prison programs, services, & amenities	Age, gender, race, major, class standing, & political ideology	-Gender, race, age, and political ideology were significant. - Female students, non-white students, older students, and politically liberal students were more likely to support in-prison programs, services, and amenities.

2004	Lambert	N=590 Convenient sampling from two Midwestern universities	Quantitative Self-administered survey 15-item survey	Opinions on crime, punishment, & the death penalty	Major, race, political ideology, age, gender, & academic level	-Major was not a significant predictor. - Race and political ideology were significant in all items. - Non-whites and politically liberal students were less likely to be punitive, less favorable of the death penalty, and more supportive of rehabilitation. - Age, gender, and academic level were significant in several items.
2005	Lambert	N=302 Convenient sampling, Undergraduate students from two Midwestern public universities	Quantitative Self-administered survey 65- item survey	Attitudes toward crime, punishment, & the death penalty	Race, gender, age, academic level, & conservative/ liberal ideology	-Race and political conservative view were statistically significant, while gender, age, academic level were not. -Non-white students and politically liberal students were more likely to support rehabilitation, less likely to be punitive, and more likely to support death penalty.
2005	Lambert, Oasypuleti, & Allen	N=406 Convenient sampling, Social work majors (N=172) & Non-social work majors (234)	Quantitative survey	Support for punishment & rehabilitation	Major, gender, race, college level, political party, importance of religion, & fear of victimization	-Social work major students were more likely to support rehabilitation than non-social work major students. - Female students were more likely to support rehabilitation. - Republican students were more likely to support rehabilitation.

2006	Mackey, Courtright, & Packard	N=633 Convenient sampling from three state universities and two small Catholic colleges	Quantitative Self-administered 30- itm survey	Support for rehabilitation	Gender, major, empathy, occupational attractiveness of correctional counselor, political ideology, the size of town, & academic year	-Gender, empathy level, political ideology, size of town, and occupational attractiveness of the correctional counselor were significant predictors. - Female students, students with higher empathy levels, politically liberal students, students from larger towns, students who want to be correctional counselors were more likely to support rehabilitation. - Major, academic year were not significant.
2007	Kjelsberg, Skoglund, & Rustad	N= 869 Prisoners' group (N=298), Students' group (N=184), Prison employees' group (N=387)	Quantitative survey, ATP scale, Comparison of ATP scores among four groups	Attitudes toward prisoners	- Four different groups in the population - Major in college students & gender	-Students' group demonstrated more positive attitudes toward prisoners than prison employees' group. -Business/economics major students showed the most negative attitudes while nursing and history major students demonstrated the most positive attitudes toward prisoners. -Prisoners' group demonstrated the most positive attitudes toward prisoners. - Prison officers' group had the most negative attitudes toward prisoners.

2008	Falco	N=519 Probability sampling, Undergraduate students from one Northeastern public university	Quantitative Self- administered survey	Attitudes toward punishment	Major, academic level, gender, size of the town, political ideology, religiosity, prior criminal victimization, fear of crime/ victimization, & causal attribution toward criminal behavior	-Criminology students were less likely to be punitive. -Politically conservative students were more likely to be punitive. - A student who supports labeling, structural positivism theory was less likely to be punitive and a student who supports classical theory was more likely to be punitive. -Gender, size of the town, religiosity, and victimization experience were not significant.
------	-------	---	---	-----------------------------------	--	--

Appendix C
Survey
Students' Attitude Survey

Part I.

Please answer all the following questions and select or write only one response. If you have any questions, please ask.

1. How old are you? _____ years

2. What is your current class level status at the start of this 2009 spring semester?
(Please select only **one** response)

- _____ Freshman
- _____ Sophomore
- _____ Junior
- _____ Senior

3. What is your gender?

- _____ Male
- _____ Female

4. What race do you consider yourself? (Please select only **one** response)

- _____ White
- _____ African-American
- _____ Asian
- _____ Other

5. How would you describe the size of town where you grew up?

- _____ Rural (Population with less than 25,000)
- _____ Urban (Population with more than 25,000)

6. What is your current major? (Please write **one** primary major)

7. With which political party do you identify ? (Please select only one response)

- Republican
- Democrat
- Independent
- Other

8. Do you have any **family members, friends or relatives** who are/were in prison?

- Yes
- No

9. Do you personally know of **anyone in prison excluding** family members, friends and/or relatives?

- Yes
- No

10. Have you ever been a victim of any of the following seven crimes?

If you had any victimization experience among these seven crimes, please answer “yes”.
If not, please answer “no”.

- (1) Someone broke into your house/apartment/dorm
- (2) Had property stolen from your house/apartment/dorm
- (3) Someone broke into your car
- (4) Had your wallet pick-pocketed or purse stolen
- (5) Someone threatened to beat you up on the street and/or robbed you
- (6) Someone beat you up in a fight
- (7) Any other violent crimes that happened to you

- Yes
- No

11. How would you identify your religious background?

(Please select only **one** response).

- Christian (Catholic & Protestant)
- Jewish
- Muslim
- Buddhist
- None
- Other

12. In the last twelve months, how often did you attend religious services?
(Please select only **one** response).

- About every week
- Once a month
- Twice a year
- Once a year
- Never

13. In the last twelve months, how often did you attend social events at church?
(Please select only **one** response).

- About every week
- Once a month
- Twice a year
- Once a year
- Never

14. In the last twelve months, how often did you read religious materials?
(Please select only **one** response).

- About every week
- Once a month
- Twice a year
- Once a year
- Never

15. In the last twelve months, how often did you listen to religious programs on radio or television? (Please select only **one** response).

- About every week
- Once a month
- Twice a year
- Once a year
- Never

Place a slash on the scale indicating your level of agreement with the following items. For example, “The IUP library is a good place to study.” What is your level of agreement with that statement?

Strongly Disagree _____ Strongly Agree

16. Religion is a very important part of my life.

Strongly Disagree ----- Strongly Agree

17. Following God's commandments is important to me.

Strongly ----- Strongly
Disagree Agree

18. In times of personal trouble, I turn to religion for guidance.

Strongly ----- Strongly
Disagree Agree

19. In order to receive God's forgiveness, it is important that we forgive those who sin against us.

Strongly ----- Strongly
Disagree Agree

20. God teaches that even if someone has lived a life of crime, s/he should be forgiven for his/her offenses if s/he is truly sorry.

Strongly ----- Strongly
Disagree Agree

21. It is important to hate the sin, but to love the sinner.

Strongly ----- Strongly
Disagree Agree

Part II.

The statements listed below describe different attitudes toward prisoners in jails and prisons in the United States. There is no right or wrong answer, only opinions. You are asked to express your feelings about each statement by indicating whether you (1) Strongly Disagree, (2) Disagree, (3) Undecided, (4) Agree, or (5) Strongly Agree. Indicate your opinion by writing the number that best describes your personal attitude in the left-hand margin. Please answer every item and select only one answer.

_____ 22. Prisoners are different from most people.

(1) Strongly Disagree, (2) Disagree, (3) Undecided, (4) Agree, (5) Strongly Agree.

_____ 23. Only a few prisoners are really dangerous.

(1) Strongly Disagree, (2) Disagree, (3) Undecided, (4) Agree, (5) Strongly Agree

_____ 24. Prisoners never change.

(1) Strongly Disagree, (2) Disagree, (3) Undecided, (4) Agree, (5) Strongly Agree

_____ 25. Most prisoners are victims of circumstance and deserve to be helped.

(1) Strongly Disagree, (2) Disagree, (3) Undecided, (4) Agree, (5) Strongly Agree

_____ 26. Prisoners have feelings like the rest of us.

(1) Strongly Disagree, (2) Disagree, (3) Undecided, (4) Agree, (5) Strongly Agree

_____ 27. It is not wise to trust a prisoner too far.

(1) Strongly Disagree, (2) Disagree, (3) Undecided, (4) Agree, (5) Strongly Agree

_____ 28. I think I would like a lot of prisoners.

(1) Strongly Disagree, (2) Disagree, (3) Undecided, (4) Agree, (5) Strongly Agree

_____ 29. Bad prison conditions just make a prisoner more bitter.

(1) Strongly Disagree, (2) Disagree, (3) Undecided, (4) Agree, (5) Strongly Agree

_____ 30. Give a prisoner an inch and he'll take a mile.

(1) Strongly Disagree, (2) Disagree, (3) Undecided, (4) Agree, (5) Strongly Agree

_____ 31. Most prisoners are stupid.

(1) Strongly Disagree, (2) Disagree, (3) Undecided, (4) Agree, (5) Strongly Agree

_____ 32. Prisoners need affection and praise just like anybody else.

(1) Strongly Disagree, (2) Disagree, (3) Undecided, (4) Agree, (5) Strongly Agree

_____ 33. You should not expect too much from a prisoner.

(1) Strongly Disagree, (2) Disagree, (3) Undecided, (4) Agree, (5) Strongly Agree

_____ 34. Trying to rehabilitate prisoners is a waste of time and money.

(1) Strongly Disagree, (2) Disagree, (3) Undecided, (4) Agree, (5) Strongly Agree

_____ 35. You never know when a prisoner is telling the truth.

(1) Strongly Disagree, (2) Disagree, (3) Undecided, (4) Agree, (5) Strongly Agree

_____ 36. Prisoners are no better or worse than other people.

(1) Strongly Disagree, (2) Disagree, (3) Undecided, (4) Agree, (5) Strongly Agree

_____ 37. You have to be constantly on your guard with prisoners.

(1) Strongly Disagree, (2) Disagree, (3) Undecided, (4) Agree, (5) Strongly Agree

_____ 38. In general, prisoners think and act alike.

(1) Strongly Disagree, (2) Disagree, (3) Undecided, (4) Agree, (5) Strongly Agree

_____ 39. If you give a prisoner your respect, s/he will give you the same.

(1) Strongly Disagree, (2) Disagree, (3) Undecided, (4) Agree, (5) Strongly Agree

_____ 40. Prisoners only think about themselves.

(1) Strongly Disagree, (2) Disagree, (3) Undecided, (4) Agree, (5) Strongly Agree

_____ 41. There are some prisoners I would trust with my life.

(1) Strongly Disagree, (2) Disagree, (3) Undecided, (4) Agree, (5) Strongly Agree

_____ 42. Prisoners will listen to reason.

(1) Strongly Disagree, (2) Disagree, (3) Undecided, (4) Agree, (5) Strongly Agree

_____ 43. Most prisoners are too lazy to earn an honest living.

(1) Strongly Disagree, (2) Disagree, (3) Undecided, (4) Agree, (5) Strongly Agree

_____ 44. I wouldn't mind living next door to an ex-prisoner.

(1) Strongly Disagree, (2) Disagree, (3) Undecided, (4) Agree, (5) Strongly Agree

_____ 45. Prisoners are just plain mean at heart.

(1) Strongly Disagree, (2) Disagree, (3) Undecided, (4) Agree, (5) Strongly Agree

_____ 46. Prisoners always are trying to get something out of somebody.

(1) Strongly Disagree, (2) Disagree, (3) Undecided, (4) Agree, (5) Strongly Agree

_____ 47. The values of most prisoners are about the same as the rest of us.

(1) Strongly Disagree, (2) Disagree, (3) Undecided, (4) Agree, (5) Strongly Agree

_____ 48. I would never want one of my children dating an ex-prisoner.

(1) Strongly Disagree, (2) Disagree, (3) Undecided, (4) Agree, (5) Strongly Agree

_____ 49. Most prisoners have the capacity for love.

(1) Strongly Disagree, (2) Disagree, (3) Undecided, (4) Agree, (5) Strongly Agree

_____ 50. Prisoners are just plain immoral.

(1) Strongly Disagree, (2) Disagree, (3) Undecided, (4) Agree, (5) Strongly Agree

_____ 51. Prisoners should be under strict, harsh discipline.

(1) Strongly Disagree, (2) Disagree, (3) Undecided, (4) Agree, (5) Strongly Agree

_____ 52. In general, prisoners are basically bad people.

(1) Strongly Disagree, (2) Disagree, (3) Undecided, (4) Agree, (5) Strongly Agree

_____ 53. Most prisoners can be rehabilitated.

(1) Strongly Disagree, (2) Disagree, (3) Undecided, (4) Agree, (5) Strongly Agree

_____ 54. Some prisoners are pretty nice people.

(1) Strongly Disagree, (2) Disagree, (3) Undecided, (4) Agree, (5) Strongly Agree

_____ 55. I would like associating with some prisoners.

(1) Strongly Disagree, (2) Disagree, (3) Undecided, (4) Agree, (5) Strongly Agree

_____ 56. Prisoners respect only brute force.

(1) Strongly Disagree, (2) Disagree, (3) Undecided, (4) Agree, (5) Strongly Agree

_____ 57. If a person does well in prison, s/he should be let out on parole.

(1) Strongly Disagree, (2) Disagree, (3) Undecided, (4) Agree, (5) Strongly Agree

Part III.

The statements listed below describe different attitudes toward prisoner reentry. Prisoner reentry is defined as “all activities and programming conducted to prepare ex-convicts to return safely to the community and to live as law-abiding citizens”(Petersilia, 2003, p. 3).

There is no right or wrong answer, only opinions. You are asked to express your opinion about each statement by indicating whether you (1) Strongly Disagree, (2) Disagree, (3) Undecided, (4) Agree, or (5) Strongly Agree. Indicate your opinion by writing the number that best describes your personal attitude in the left-hand margin. Please answer every item and select only one answer.

_____ 58. In 2009, approximately 700,000 prisoners in all categories will be released from prison to their home communities.

I am fearful about this situation.

(1) Strongly Disagree, (2) Disagree, (3) Undecided, (4) Agree, (5) Strongly Agree

_____ 59. Most released prisoners will be a risk to public safety.

(1) Strongly Disagree, (2) Disagree, (3) Undecided, (4) Agree, (5) Strongly Agree

_____ 60. Prisoners should work in prison so that they have job skills when they are released from prison.

(1) Strongly Disagree, (2) Disagree, (3) Undecided, (4) Agree, (5) Strongly Agree

_____ 61. Prisoners should receive job training in prison so that they have employment opportunities when they are released from prison.

(1) Strongly Disagree, (2) Disagree, (3) Undecided, (4) Agree, (5) Strongly Agree

_____ 62. Prisoners can obtain early release after they participate in prison-based rehabilitation programs.

(1) Strongly Disagree, (2) Disagree, (3) Undecided, (4) Agree, (5) Strongly Agree

_____ 63. Job training should be provided to released prisoners.

(1) Strongly Disagree, (2) Disagree, (3) Undecided, (4) Agree, (5) Strongly Agree

_____ 64. Drug treatment services should be provided to released prisoners who were convicted of drug offenses.

(1) Strongly Disagree, (2) Disagree, (3) Undecided, (4) Agree, (5) Strongly Agree

_____ 65. I am willing to pay more taxes for prisoner reentry programs.

(1) Strongly Disagree, (2) Disagree, (3) Undecided, (4) Agree, (5) Strongly Agree

_____ 66. The Second Chance Act funds programs and services for prisoners reentering the community.

Please indicate your level of support for this **Act** by selecting **one** answer.

(1) Strongly Disagree, (2) Disagree, (3) Undecided, (4) Agree, (5) Strongly Agree

_____ 67. Suppose you have become aware that an ex-offender, who was recently released from a period of incarceration, has just moved into your neighborhood. Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statement by selecting **one** answer.

This situation bothers me and I definitely would take action.

(1) Strongly Disagree, (2) Disagree, (3) Undecided, (4) Agree, (5) Strongly Agree

_____ 68. If I own rental property, I am willing to rent my property to an ex-prisoner.

(1) Strongly Disagree, (2) Disagree, (3) Undecided, (4) Agree, (5) Strongly Agree

_____ 69. If I am an employer, I am willing to hire an ex-prisoner.

(1) Strongly Disagree, (2) Disagree, (3) Undecided, (4) Agree, (5) Strongly Agree

_____ 70. If my colleague at work is an ex-prisoner, it does not bother me.

(1) Strongly Disagree, (2) Disagree, (3) Undecided, (4) Agree, (5) Strongly Agree

_____ 71. The right to vote should be restored for people with felony convictions after they have served their time and are released from prison.

(1) Strongly Disagree, (2) Disagree, (3) Undecided, (4) Agree, (5) Strongly Agree

_____ 72. A driver's license should be restored for people with felony convictions after they have served their time and are released from prison.

(1) Strongly Disagree, (2) Disagree, (3) Undecided, (4) Agree, (5) Strongly Agree

_____ 73. The Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996 **prohibits** states from providing public housing to anyone in violation of their parole or probation.

Please indicate your level of support for this **Act** by selecting one answer.

(1) Strongly Disagree, (2) Disagree, (3) Undecided, (4) Agree, (5) Strongly Agree

_____ 74. The Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996 includes a lifetime **ban** on eligibility for food stamps and cash benefits under the Temporary Assistance for Needy Family (TANF) program for anyone convicted of a drug- related felony.

Please indicate your level of support for this **Act** by selecting one answer.

(1) Strongly Disagree, (2) Disagree, (3) Undecided, (4) Agree, (5) Strongly Agree

_____ 75. The Higher Education Act of 1998 **prohibits** students convicted of drug-related offenses from receiving any grant, loan, or work assistance.

Please indicate your level of support for this **Act** by selecting one answer.

(1) Strongly Disagree, (2) Disagree, (3) Undecided, (4) Agree, (5) Strongly Agree

THANK YOU FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION.

Appendix D

Letter of Access

Dear Professor

My name is Sunyoung Park, and I am a doctoral candidate in the Department of Criminology. Currently, I am gathering my dissertation data for analysis. My dissertation is entitled, "College Students' Attitudes toward Prisoners and Prisoner Reentry".

To enhance the representativeness of the sample, classes were randomly selected from all the undergraduate courses offered at IUP this spring. Your class has been randomly selected. I am requesting permission to administer the survey to your class.

This process will include distributing the survey to the students, asking them to read informed consent form, and then asking them to complete the survey. It will take approximately 20 minutes. Student participation in this survey is completely voluntary. This research project was approved by the Indiana University of Pennsylvania Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects (Phone: 724-357-7730).

If you will allow me to administer the survey in your class, please let me know when it is convenient. Thank you in advance for your time and assistance.

Sincerely,

Sunyoung Park
s.park5@iup.edu

Appendix E

Letter Requesting Permission to Use Survey Items

Dear Dr. Melvin,

I am a doctoral student of Criminology at Indiana University of Pennsylvania. Currently, I am working on my dissertation under the supervision of Dr. Alida Merlo. My dissertation topic is “College Students’ Attitudes toward Prisoners and Prisoner Reentry”. I plan to administer an anonymous survey to undergraduate students to assess their attitudes. The attitude of college students toward prisoners is included in my dissertation as one of the dependent variables.

After reviewing several studies on the public’s attitude toward prisoners, I found your research. In 1985, you, Dr. Gramling, and Dr. Gardner published “A scale to measure attitudes toward prisoners” in the journal *Criminal Justice Behavior*. I think that the ATP scale which you developed and was used in above research is an excellent instrument to measure one’s attitude toward prisoners.

If you permit me to do so, I would like to use this scale to examine college students’ attitudes toward prisoners. If you allow me to use this scale, will you please communicate your permission via letter or e-mail? My e-mail address is s.park5@iup.edu. I am happy to furnish you with the results of my survey data after I collect and evaluate the data.

Sincerely,

Sunyoung Park

ATP Scale

Dear Sunyoung,

As I published the scale in the public domain, I don't think you need my permission to use it. However, I would be happy to have you use the ATP, and you have my permission. Good luck on your research.

Best regards,
Ken Melvin Ph.D. Professor Emeritus

Victimization Scale

Dear Sunyoung,

Thank you for writing about using my items. You have permission to these items and materials from any other publications I might have.

Sincerely,
Frank Cullen

Personal Religiosity Scale

Hello Sunyoung,

Yes, you are certainly welcome to use the scale, with proper credit. Good luck with your research and please keep me informed of your findings.

Thank you,
Prof. T. D. Evans

Forgiveness Scale

Dear Sunyoung,

I am happy to hear that my measure of people's positions on religion may be useful for your project. My co-authors and I intentionally provided all of the items in the appendix so that they would be available to people. Please feel free to replicate the items. Best of luck with your dissertation.

Best regards,
Brandon Applegate

Prisoner Reentry Scale

Dear Sunyoung,

I received your letter regarding the 1997 article “Ex-Offender Needs v. Community Opportunity in Seattle” published in Federal Probation. You are welcome to use the survey questions. Please let me know if you need any of the other surveys.

Jackie Helfgott

Prisoner Reentry Scale

Dear Sunyoung,

Thank you very much for contacting Hart Research about the survey for your dissertation. Because we were commissioned to do that research, the research materials themselves, including the survey instrument, are really the property of our client, an organization called the Open Society Institute. Please feel free to contact the Institute directly about using the survey questions. Best of luck with your work.

Regards,
David Drembus

Appendix F

Informed Consent Form

You are invited to participate in this research study. The following information is provided in order to help you to make an informed decision whether or not to participate. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to ask. You are eligible to participate because you are a student at Indiana University of Pennsylvania. Your class was randomly selected to participate in this study. However, you must be at least 18 years old to participate in this study. **If you are under 18, you cannot participate in this study.** Do not take the survey, please write “withdraw” on the front of your survey, sit quietly, and submit the survey when other students have completed it.

The purpose of this study is to examine college students’ attitudes toward prisoners and prisoner reentry. The information gained from this study will help the researcher better understand college students’ opinions about prisoners and prisoners’ re-enter into society. You are asked to complete this survey. The participation in this study will require approximately 20 minutes of your time. This study involves no risk to you and all answers will be kept completely anonymous.

If you already have completed this survey in another course this semester, do not participate again. Please write “withdraw” on the front of your survey, sit quietly, and submit the survey when other students have completed it.

Your participation in this study is voluntary. You are free to decide not to participate in this study or to withdraw at any time without adversely affecting your relationship with the investigators or IUP. Your decision will not result in any loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. If you choose to participate, you may withdraw at anytime by writing the word “withdraw” on the front of your survey and submitting it when other students have completed the survey. Upon your request to withdraw, all your survey responses will be destroyed. If you choose to participate, all information will be anonymous. Your responses will be considered only in combination with those from other participants. The information obtained in the study may be published in scientific journals or presented at scientific meetings.

If you choose to participate in this study, please tear this Informed Consent Form off the attached survey and keep it for your own files. Thank you for your time and anticipated participation in this study. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me or my dissertation advisor, Dr. Alida Merlo.

Sunyoung Park, Doctoral Candidate
Indiana University of Pennsylvania
Department of Criminology
Wilson Hall, Room 200
Indiana, PA 15705
Phone: 724-357-2720
Email: s.park5@iup.edu

Alida V. Merlo, Ph.D.
Indiana University of Pennsylvania
Department of Criminology
Wilson Hall, Room 112
Indiana, PA 15705
Phone: 724-357-5610
Email: amerlo@iup.edu

Appendix G

Factor Analysis for ATPR Items

Factors	Items	Factor Loading
Factor 1	In 2009, approximately 700,000 prisoners in all categories will be released from prison to their communities. “I am fearful about this situation”.	.756
	If I am an employer, I am willing to hire an ex-prisoner.	.754
	Most released prisoners will be a risk to public safety.	.744
	An ex-offender has just moved into your neighborhood. This situation bothers me and I definitely would take action.	.646
	If I own rental property, I am willing to rent my property to an ex-prisoner	.645
	Prisoners can obtain early release after they participate in prison-based rehabilitation program.	.567
	I am willing to pay more taxes for prisoner reentry programs.	.534
	If my colleague at work is an ex-prisoner, it does not bother me.	.512
	Factor 2	Drug treatment services should be provided to released prisoners who were convicted of drug offenses
Prisoners should receive job training in prison so that they have employment opportunities when they are released from prison		.727
Job training should be provided to released prisoners		.714
Prisoners should work in prison so that they have job skills when they are released from prison.		.632
The Second Chance Act funds programs and services for prisoners reentering community.		.551
Factor 3	The right to vote should be restored for people with felony convictions after they served their time and are released from prison.	.694
	A driver’s license should be restored for people with felony convictions after they served their time and are released from prison.	.638
Factor4	The Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996 includes a lifetime ban on eligibility for food stamps and cash benefits under the Temporary Assistance for Needy Family(TANF) program for anyone convicted of a drug-related felony.	.783

The Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996 prohibits states from providing public housing to anyone in violation of their parole or probation.	.733
The Higher Education Act of 1998 prohibits students convicted of drug-related offenses from receiving any grant, loan, or work assistance. Indicate your level of support for this act.	.647

Appendix H

1. Item-Total Correlations and Cronbach's Alpha for Forgiveness Scale

Item	Item-Total Correlation
In order to receive God's forgiveness, it is important that we forgive those who sin against us.	.798
God teaches that even if someone has lived a life of crime, s/he should be forgiven for his/her offenses if s/he is truly sorry.	.810
It is important to hate the sin, but to love the sinner.	.758
*Cronbach's Alpha= .892	

2. Item-Total Correlations and Cronbach's Alpha for ATP Scale

Item	Item-Total Correlation
Prisoners are different from most people.	.485
Only a few prisoners are really dangerous.	.373
Prisoners never change.	.532
Most prisoners are victims of circumstance and deserve to be helped.	.468
Prisoners have feelings like the rest of us.	.447
It is not wise to trust a prisoner too far.	.513
I think I would like a lot of prisoners.	.618
Bad prison conditions just make a prisoner more bitter.	.315
Give a prisoner an inch and he'll take a mile.	.583
Most prisoners are stupid.	.453
Prisoners need affection and praise just like anybody else.	.582
You should not expect too much from a prisoner.	.614
Trying to rehabilitate prisoners is a waste of time and money.	.647
You never know when a prisoner is telling the truth.	.576
Prisoners are no better or worse than other people. .	.509
You have to be constantly on your guard with prisoners.	.466
In general, prisoners think and act alike.	.430
If you give a prisoner your respect, s/he will give you the same.	.508
Prisoners only think about themselves.	.593
There are some prisoners I would trust with my life.	.516
Prisoners will listen to reason.	.547
Most prisoners are too lazy to earn an honest living.	.540
I wouldn't mind living next door to an ex-prisoner.	.618
Prisoners are just plain mean at heart.	.636
Prisoners always are trying to get something out of somebody.	.637
The values of most prisoners are about the same as the rest of us.	.592
I would never want one of my children dating an ex-prisoner.	.566
Most prisoners have the capacity for love.	.527
Prisoners are just plain immoral.	.624
Prisoners should be under strict, harsh discipline.	.569
In general, prisoners are basically bad people.	.700

Most prisoners can be rehabilitated.	.546
Some prisoners are pretty nice people.	.533
I would like associating with some prisoners.	.625
Prisoners respect only brute force.	.495
If a person does well in prison, s/he should be let out on parole.	.459
*Cronbach's Alpha = .940	

3. Item-Total Correlations and Cronbach's Alpha for ATPR Scale

Item	Item-Total Correlation
In 2009, approximately 700,000 prisoners in all categories will be released from prison to their home communities. I am fearful about this situation.	.542 .597
Most released prisoners will be a risk to public safety.	
Prisoners should work in prison so that they have job skills when they are released from prison.	.308
Prisoners should receive job training in prison so that they have employment opportunities when they are released from prison.	.500
Prisoners can obtain early release after they participate in prison-based rehabilitation programs.	.557
Job training should be provided to released prisoners.	.505
Drug treatment services should be provided to released prisoners who were convicted of drug offenses.	.371
I am willing to pay more taxes for prisoner reentry programs.	.523
The Second Chance Act funds programs and services for prisoners reentering the community. Please indicate your level of support for this Act.	.642
Suppose you have become aware that an ex-offender, who was recently released from a period of incarceration, has just moved into your neighborhood. This situation bothers me and I definitely would take action.	.571
If I own rental property, I am willing to rent my property to an ex-prisoner.	.563
If I am an employer, I am willing to hire an ex-prisoner.	.676
If my colleague at work is an ex-prisoner, it does not bother me.	.379
The right to vote should be restored for people with felony convictions after they have served their time and are released from prison.	.468
A driver's license should be restored for people with felony convictions after they have served their time and are released from prison.	.545
The Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996 prohibits states from providing public housing to anyone in violation of their parole or probation.	.247
The Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996 includes a lifetime ban on eligibility for food stamps and cash benefits under the Temporary Assistance for Needy Family (TANF) program for anyone convicted of a drug- related felony.	.497
The Higher Education Act of 1998 prohibits students convicted of drug-related offenses from receiving any grant, loan, or work assistance.	.490
*Cronbach's Alpha = .875	

Appendix I
Percentages for Each Item of ATPR

Attitude Toward Prisoner Reentry Items	Valid %		
	Disagree	Undecided	Agree
In 2009, approximately 700,000 prisoners in all categories will be released from prison to their home communities. I am fearful about this situation.	48.6%	19.1%	32.3%
Most released prisoners will be a risk to public safety.	46.3%	25.1%	28.6%
Prisoners should work in prison so that they have job skills when they are released from prison.	4.7%	7.4%	87.9%
Prisoners should receive job training in prison so that they have employment opportunities when they are released from prison.	7.0%	16.1%	83.9%
Prisoners can obtain early release after they participate in prison-based rehabilitation programs.	21.6%	29.3%	.49.1%
Job training should be provided to released prisoners.	13.0%	16.4%	70.6%
Drug treatment services should be provided to released prisoners who were convicted of drug offenses.	7.9%	10.2%	81.9%
I am willing to pay more taxes for prisoner reentry programs.	49.3%	31.2%	19.5%
The Second Chance Act funds programs and services for prisoners reentering the community.	16.1%	33.6%	50.3%
Suppose you have become aware that an ex-offender, who was recently released from a period of incarceration, has just moved into your neighborhood. This situation bothers me and I definitely would take action.	41.8%	38.9%	19.3%

If I own rental property, I am willing to rent my property to an ex-prisoner.	32.2%	31.9%	35.9%
If I am an employer, I am willing to hire an ex-prisoner.	21.2%	40.8%	38.0%
If my colleague at work is an ex-prisoner, it does not bother me.	16.9%	24%	59.1%
The right to vote should be restored for people with felony convictions after they have served their time and are released from prison.	19.3%	19.5%	61.2%
A driver's license should be restored for people with felony convictions after they have served their time and are released from prison.	12.1%	25.7%	62.2%
The Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996 prohibits states from providing public housing to anyone in violation of their parole or probation.	14.6%	36.5%	48.9%
The Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996 includes a lifetime ban on eligibility for food stamps and cash benefits under the Temporary Assistance for Needy Family (TANF) program for anyone convicted of a drug- related felony.	38.6%	31.0%	30.4%
The Higher Education Act of 1998 prohibits students convicted of drug-related offenses from receiving any grant, loan, or work assistance.	50.1%	25.3%	24.6%
