



Walden University
ScholarWorks

Walden Dissertations and Doctoral Studies

Walden Dissertations and Doctoral Studies
Collection

2015

Varying Levels of Morality Awareness in Corrections Officers

William L. Hanna
Walden University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.waldenu.edu/dissertations>

 Part of the [Clinical Psychology Commons](#)

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Walden Dissertations and Doctoral Studies Collection at ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Walden Dissertations and Doctoral Studies by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact ScholarWorks@waldenu.edu.

Walden University

College of Social and Behavioral Sciences

This is to certify that the doctoral dissertation by

William Hanna

has been found to be complete and satisfactory in all respects,
and that any and all revisions required by
the review committee have been made.

Review Committee

Dr. Mitchell Hicks, Committee Chairperson, Psychology Faculty

Dr. Susan Kaz, Committee Member, Psychology Faculty

Dr. Abby Harris, University Reviewer, Psychology Faculty

Chief Academic Officer
Eric Riedel, Ph.D.

Walden University
2015

Abstract

Varying Levels of Morality Awareness in Corrections Officers

by

William L. Hanna

MS, Tiffin University, 2005

BA, Ohio State University, 2003

Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree of

Doctorate of Philosophy

Psychology

Walden University

August 2015

Abstract

Morality has been a focus in criminal justice with recent events involving officers. This quantitative study offered research in the criminal justice field regarding the moral awareness of corrections officers. The main research question investigated the relationship between the security level of the prison unit in which a corrections officer works and his or her level of morality awareness. The study surveyed corrections officers of prison units in the Ohio Department of Rehabilitations and Corrections and focused on morality awareness of corrections officers. The independent variable was the security level of the prison unit worked in. The dependent variables were the correlational scores of the Defining Issues Test-2nd edition and the Corrections Officer Perception Survey. The security level of the prison unit was analyzed with a multiple regression analysis and concluded the significant difference of the security level. A paired sample *t* test and general linear multivariate analysis was conducted to determine the relation of variables. The results showed there was a correlation of general morality and morality in the workplace, but there was no significant difference between these two areas nor was there any significant difference in morality between the security levels of the prison units worked in. The lack of understanding and knowledge surrounding morality awareness of corrections officers involving sexual misconduct and other unethical acts has left the criminal justice field in a vulnerable position. This study contributes to social change by incorporating morality awareness of corrections officers that could be checked in preemployment screening in the future. These findings could also assist in reducing future lawsuits inviting all criminal justice employees to participate in future studies of morality awareness to assist in the same preventions.

Varying Levels of Morality Awareness in Corrections Officers

by

William L. Hanna

MS, Tiffin University, 2005

BA, Ohio State University, 2003

Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree of

Doctorate of Philosophy

Psychology

Walden University

August 2015

Dedication

To my wife Cindy, who had to deal with me during this journey. Thank you for being by my side and supporting me. I know I did not make it easy for you, but I am happy you were here. To my mom, dad and all my family, thank you for your love and support. I know I was on this path for a long time, but I finally finished. To all my friends, loved ones and students, thank you for all the support and best wishes.

To all the criminal justice employees who work in the field, know your hard work and long hours are greatly appreciated and I will work hard to assist you when possible.

Finally, to two special friends who stood by my side during this process to make sure I succeeded-Dr. Greg Smith and D. E. Smith. I appreciate your insight, assistance and kind words and support throughout this process and helping me to see the light at the end of the tunnel.

Table of Contents

List of Tables	v
Chapter 1: Introduction to the Study.....	1
Background of the Study	3
Problem Statement	4
Purpose of the Study	6
Research Questions and Hypotheses	6
Theoretical and Conceptual Frameworks	8
Nature of the Study	8
Definition of Key Terms.....	10
Assumptions.....	13
Scope, Delimitations, and Limitations.....	13
Significance of the Study	16
Summary.....	17
Chapter 2: Literature Review.....	19
Literature Search Strategy.....	21
Theoretical Foundations.....	21
Climates and Perceptions of Ethics.....	21
Conceptual Framework.....	30
Officer Deviance.....	30
Opinions of Officers With Misconduct.....	32
Views on Excessive Abuse of Authority	35

Literature Review Related to Key Variables and/or Concepts	37
Attitudes of Corrections Officers.....	37
Sexual Misconduct.....	44
Summary.....	51
Chapter 3: Research Method.....	54
Research Design.....	55
Overview of the Design	55
Variables	55
Methodology.....	56
Procedure	57
Population and Sample	59
Sampling.....	59
Sample Size Analysis.....	60
Procedures for Recruitment, Participation and Data Collection.....	61
Data Collection	61
Instrumentation and Operationalization of Constructs	61
Corrections Officers Perceptions Survey.....	63
Defining Issues Test-2 nd Edition.....	65
Demographic Data Collection.....	66
Data Collection and Analysis.....	66
Data Collection	66
Data Analysis	67

Threats to Validity	68
Ethical Protection of Participants.....	71
Summary	71
Chapter 4: Results	73
Data Collection	73
Recruitment.....	73
Sample Size.....	74
Results.....	75
Description of the Participant Response	75
Analysis of Data.....	77
General Analysis.....	77
Hypothesis Testing.....	80
Summary	88
Chapter 5: Discussion, Conclusions, and Recommendations	90
Interpretation of the Findings.....	91
Limitations of the Study.....	94
External Validity.....	94
Internal Validity	95
Statistical Validity.....	96
Recommendations.....	96
Implications for Positive Social Change.....	99
Conclusion	102

References.....	105
Appendix A: Original Mesloh et al. Survey	111
Appendix B: Corrections Officers Perceptions Survey	122
Appendix C: Mesloh, et al. Permission	135
Appendix D: DIT-2.....	136
Appendix E: IRB-Approved Consent Form	151
Appendix F: Survey Announcements	154

List of Tables

Table 1. Reasons for Survey Exclusion	75
Table 2. Sample Demographics	77
Table 3. Overall Means and Means by Security Level.....	79
Table 4. Multiple Regression Analysis Between Security Levels of Morality.....	82
Table 5. Multiple Regression Analysis Between Security Levels of Norms and Discipline.....	88

Chapter 1: Introduction to the Study

When an individual enters training in any criminal justice agency, the first rule he or she is told in the academy is that he or she is a representative of the agency 24 hours a day and 7 days a week. According to Pollock (2012), on or off the job, officers in the criminal justice system must behave in a way that is ethical at all times. Officers should maintain a level of moral awareness. Reynolds (2006) states moral awareness is defined as a person's determination that a situation contains moral content and legitimately can be considered from a moral point of view. On the job, officers must obey the rules and policies of the agency, which include not abusing those in custody by physical, verbal, or sexual assault. Off the job, officers must not behave immorally or illegally, nor should they wear their uniforms in situations that might embarrass their agencies, such as when buying alcohol. It is important for all new recruits to remember they will be watched by the public and the media. According to Hunter (1999), the media will not spare any opportunity to portray a person in a law enforcement agency in a negative situation for ratings, whether the individual is in a police agency or a correctional agency. Because the media has limited time to present their information, the entire story is not revealed to the public. As a result, the public will draw their own conclusions about incidents whether they are completely true, partially true, or completely false, therefore causing possible irreparable harm to the individual and agency in question (Lersch & Mieczkowski, 2000). Due to incidents publicized in the media, researchers have conducted studies to examine morality and ethics in law enforcement agencies and the efforts to understand how

morality and ethics should be practiced in all criminal justice agencies (Mesloh, Wolf, & Henych, 2003).

People may ask why unethical and immoral behavior occurs within criminal justice agencies. If these individuals are trained to obey laws and protect the public from harm, the assumption is that they should not be subject to conducting unethical and immoral behavior. Layman, McCampbell, and Moss (2000) state similar to parental discipline with children, if any incident is not remedied, controlled, or prevented, the problematic behavior can become much worse. Criminal justice agencies create policies and procedures to assist in controlling negative behavior by their employees. In a correctional agency, officers need to be aware of policies regarding officer conduct and inmate behavior. These policies include expectations for officers' behaviors and interactions with inmates. Guidelines are maintained to separate the officers from inmates, and it is important for all officers working in a correctional institution to be aware of these guidelines at all times. These agencies create sanctions for any individual who violates the policy of ethical and moral behavior. The sanctions can result in warnings, written reprimand, suspension, or termination. According to Layman et al., employees in any criminal justice agency should be completely aware of the policies of committing an unethical act in their agency and the sanctions resulting from the violation of such policy.

What makes a corrections environment different from other criminal justice agencies is the culture that defines the environment. Mesloh et al. (2003) discuss the staff and the inmates compose the culture within a corrections institution. An element, such as

language, is different inside a prison than the language used on the streets and is developed by officers and inmates. Corcoran (2005) defined prison culture as the beliefs and values correctional employees hold in common. The prison culture can dictate the way a prison unit will operate daily. Corcoran also stated that the most important factor in this operation is the prison administrators and their style of leadership.

There is a gap in the literature with respect to morality awareness for corrections officers. It is important for all criminal justice employees to have access to current literature and research discussing concerns in their field. The current literature and research can contribute to advancing standards of training. Advancing training can assist in the operations of prisons and their success, including the hiring and maintaining of professional corrections officers. While previous research conducted with police officers is reviewed in the present study, research focused specifically on corrections officers is needed.

Background of the Study

To study morality awareness in the workplace, it is important to research forms of workplace deviance. Deviance can include sexual misconduct, sleeping on duty, inappropriate use of force, abuse of one's authority, accepting gifts, drinking on or before duty, and stealing work items from the site. Workplace deviance is discussed in the literature review section (Barker, 2006; Weisburd, Greenspan, Hamilton, Williams, & Bryant, 2000). Previous research studies on ethics and morality have focused on corrections officers and police officers (Barker, 2006; Farkas, 2001; Hemmens & Stohr, 2001a; Henry, 1998; Maahs & Pratt, 2001; Metcalf & Dick, 2000; Palmiotto, 2001;

Tellier et al., 2001) and areas of employee sexual misconduct (Dumond, 2000; “Forty Percent,” 2005; Lambert et al., 2002; Layman et al., 2000; “Sexual Assault in Prisons,” 2005; Struckman-Johnson & Struckman-Johnson, 2002). The majority of the previous research on ethics and morality focused on police officers (Lersch & Mieczkowski, 2000; Metcalfe & Dick, 2000).

To assist in the expansion of understanding moral awareness, the literature review section highlights additional research studies in the area of ethics and morality in the workplace (Ingstrup, 2000; Kleinig & Smith, 2002; Milks, 2007; Swope, 2001). In this study, I will attempt to determine whether corrections officers who behave unethically in the course of their duties, as evidenced by responses on the Corrections Officer Perception Survey, tend to be less ethical in other areas. Previous researchers have found that corrections officers who behave immorally have a higher probability of grievances being filed against them (Ingstrup, 2000; Kleinig & Smith, 2005; Milks, 2007; Swope, 2001).

As previously noted, prior research conducted in ethics and morality has focused primarily on police officers, with little research focused on corrections officers. In this study, I will attempt to add to the literature by supplying results acquired from prison units in the state of Ohio. The prison units will be of different institutional security levels to assist in providing additional information to the corrections industry.

Problem Statement

Among the criminal justice employees, corrections officers have the least amount of ethics training compared to other criminal justice agencies such as police departments

(Pollock, 2012). A morality awareness program may assist in improving ethics and moral awareness of corrections officers (Hemmens & Stohr, 2001). The problem addressed in the Hemmens and Stohr (2001) study is that the unethical and immoral behavior of some corrections officers creates incidents in which officers engage in further unethical and immoral behavior. Macvean and Cox (2012) believe morality awareness training in a corrections division reduces civil and criminal liability by prompting officers to act appropriately in many situations, but the correlational relationship, or the causal relationship, has not been shown. Macvean and Cox (2012) state morality awareness training may affect one gender over another, and morality awareness training may have different effects on the officers who work in one particular security level over another.

Researchers have hypothesized that corrections officers engaging in unethical and immoral behavior can be observed by other corrections officers, and their behavior or response may be misinterpreted as ethical and moral. Observation of inappropriate behavior can change other corrections officers' perceptions of moral behavior and magnify the problem. This factor is important because the ethics and morality of corrections officers may decline. If an incident is unnoticed or handled inappropriately, there is the possibility it will continue unchanged and cause additional concerns in the future, resulting in retaliation from inmates physically or legally. Another problem with improper resolution to concerns of improper behavior is that other officers can be influenced by the response, thinking it is appropriate, and may respond in a similar manner in a future incident. Immoral behavior resulting from observing immorally behaving correctional officers could produce a negative reaction in inmates, reducing the

possibility of their successful reintegration into society and adding to rates of recidivism. Community concerns can rise if inmates released into society are reengaging in criminal activity and are rearrested for similar behaviors.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this quantitative study is to correlate whether or not morality awareness is connected to immoral attitudes by corrections officers. Potential relationships between the security level of the institution and appropriateness of officer response were examined. Corrections officers could state if they were aware of other officers conducting acts involving immoral behavior. The independent variable is the relationship of morality awareness and ethical decision making. The security level of the prison unit is another relationship I explored. The dependent variables were the relationship between Defining Issues Test-2nd Edition (DIT-2) and the Corrections Officer Perception Survey (COPS). The study's objective was to provide additional research on morality awareness of corrections officers and its relationship to ethical decision making.

Research Questions and Hypotheses

The research questions presented are as follows:

- What is the correlational relationship between morality awareness in general and workplace morality by corrections officers in the Ohio Department of Rehabilitations and Corrections?
- Is there a correlation between workplace-related morality and morality in general?

H1₀: There is no significant difference between the workplace-related morality (as measured by the COPS) and morality in general (as measured by the DIT-2) of corrections officers between security levels of prison units.

H1_A: There is a significant difference between the workplace-related morality (as measured by the COPS) and morality in general (as measured by the DIT-2) of corrections officers between security levels of prison units.

- Is there a correlation between morality awareness in general and the security level of the institution the officer works in?
- Is there a correlation between workplace morality and the security level of the institution the officer works in?

H2₀: There is no significant difference between the workplace-related morality (as measured by the COPS) and morality in general (as measured by the DIT-2) of corrections officers in minimum security prison units.

H2_A: There is a significant difference between the workplace-related morality (as measured by the COPS) and morality in general (as measured by the DIT-2) of corrections officers in minimum security prison units.

H3₀: There is no significant difference between the workplace-related morality (as measured by the COPS) and morality in general (as measured by the DIT-2) of corrections officers in medium security prison units.

H3_A: There is a significant difference between the workplace-related morality (as measured by the COPS) and morality in general (as measured by the DIT-2) of corrections officers in medium security prison units.

H4₀: There is no significant difference between the workplace-related morality (as measured by the COPS) and morality in general (as measured by the DIT-2) of corrections officers in maximum security prison units.

H4_A: There is a significant difference between the workplace-related morality (as measured by the COPS) and morality in general (as measured by the DIT-2) of corrections officers in maximum security prison units.

Theoretical and Conceptual Frameworks

The theoretical framework for this study is ethical climate theory. According to Rothwell and Baldwin (2007), ethical climate theory is defined as the organization member's feelings about activities that have ethical content or aspects of a work environment that affect ethical behavior. The authors stated that ethical climate theory within a correctional environment is based on a code of silence officers maintain when involved in responding to incidents or what is agreed upon, as accepted by corrections officers, in the correctional institution (Rothwell & Baldwin, 2007). Ethical climate affects decisions about whether individuals behave the way they ought to behave. Ethical climate theory was used in this study to explain the basis for examining whether corrections officers engaged in appropriate responses in regards to an incident, especially if the incident involved another corrections officer.

Nature of the Study

The selection of this research is to provide additional understanding of moral awareness of corrections officers on and off the job. The significance of the selection is to

assist corrections officers in understanding the awareness of their morality on and off the job.

The independent variable in this study was the security level of the prison the corrections officer works in. According to Worrall and Morris (2011), an argument to their analysis of research in prisons is the custody level. The researchers stated that this is an important level of analysis ignored in research studies of prisons (Worrall & Morris, 2011). The researchers felt this was important because their theory asked if security levels of prisons made a difference in the behavior of inmates (Worrall & Morris, 2011). Although the authors conducted a study with custody levels and inmate prison violations, the same independent variable can be used to connect levels of morality with corrections officers and the level of security the corrections officer works in. The security level of the prison may affect the officer's morality because of the inmates locked up in those facilities. A maximum security level prison holds individuals whom have been found guilty of severe crimes. The dependent variables in this study were the correlation levels of the DIT-2 and the COPS.

I employed methods similar to those used by Mesloh et al. (2003). In addition, I used the DIT-2 as a second independent variable to gain information from corrections officers on their feelings about moral issues from different perspectives. I conducted the study at public places near prison units throughout the state of Ohio for 6 weeks. The data collected were changed into a quantitative format and entered into an SPSS program to produce results to indicate any correlation between the DIT-2 and the COPS.

Definition of Key Terms

In this study, definitions of correctional terminology were identified and expressed in simplest terms based on the research used in the literature review. The terms are as follows:

Correctional ethics: An ethical system integrated with management systems and a business plan customized for the correctional agency (Ingstrup, 2000).

Corruption: Acts of corruption are “characterized in three ways: forbidden by some norm, regulation, or law; involve the misuse of the employee’s position; and involve a material gain no matter how significant” (Palmiotto, 2001, p. 37).

Ethical climate: Considered the ethical attitude, atmosphere, or condition of the correctional agency (Ingstrup, 2000).

Moral agents: Those persons responsible for enforcing consequences for violating society’s laws. In the correctional environment, it is the employees who instill the prosocial, law-abiding behavior in offenders and the custodians of two public values: public safety and human freedom (Ingstrup, 2000).

Moral awareness: A person’s determination that a situation contains moral content and legitimately can be considered from a moral point of view (Reynolds, 2006).

Mutual exchange relationship: A corrections officer and an inmate who base their sexual relationship on an explicit agreement involving the exchange of goods for some sexual act performed. The exchange of other favors is also included (Dumond, 2000).

Occupational deviance: For this study, this is considered as deviant behavior (criminal and noncriminal) committed during the course of normal work activities. It

“encompasses violations of any or all of the following normative systems: criminal acts which are directly related to employment, violations of occupationally prescribed ethical standards, and violations of work rules and regulations” (Barker, 2006, p. 356).

Off-duty: Corrections officers not clocked in to the unit or in the performance of their duties at the unit to which they are assigned. The personal time or time away from the unit not involved in the course of duties.

On-duty: A corrections officer clocked in to their unit, or in the performance of duties at the unit to which the officer is assigned. This is the work time or time away from the unit involved in the course of duties (e.g., training, special duty at another unit, overtime).

Organizational commitment: Includes job performance, absenteeism, turnover, and job satisfaction (Haarr, 1997). It can also be identified as the relative strength of an individual’s identification with, and involvement in, an organization (Metcalf & Dick, 2000).

Organizational culture: A set of assumptions, values, and beliefs shared by members of an organization, which, as a result, create language, behavioral processes, norms, and goals within the organization (Stojkovic et al., 2002).

Principled thinking: Used when deciding to tell the truth, to respect another’s rights, or to obey a set of moral guidelines because to do so is the right thing, even though it may not be in a person’s immediate best interest. Principled thinking can be deliberate or it can be spontaneous (Ingstrup, 2000).

Prison culture: A particular society at a particular time and place in the prison.

Like traditional culture, prisons have their own defined culture within (Corcoran, 2005).

(See also *organizational culture*.)

Rape: Forced oral, anal, or vaginal intercourse (Struckman-Johnson & Struckman-Johnson, 2002).

Sexual predatory relationships: A corrections officer uses force, coercion, or threats to have sexual contact with an inmate (Dumond, 2000).

Social distance: Can be interpreted as the preference by the corrections officer for the amount and quality of social interactions the officer desires to have with inmates (Tellier et al., 2001).

Staff: This term refers to all employees at the prison, including secretaries, corrections officers, food staff, education staff, managers, supervisors, medical staff, case workers, contractors, vendors, volunteers, and support staff (Mesloh et al., 2003).

Staff misconduct: In general, misconduct can be defined as a wrongdoing committed by a corrections officer. The wrongdoing can be a criminal act or a violation of department policies and procedure. Misconduct can be “unethical or amoral and yet not be considered criminal” (Palmiotto, 2001, p. 32).

Staff sexual misconduct: Layman et al. (2000) defined staff sexual misconduct as any behavior or act of any sexual nature, directed toward an inmate or detainee, by an employee, vendor, contractor, volunteer, visitor, or any other agency representative. It includes, but is not limited to, acts or attempts to commit acts such as sexual assault, sexual abuse, sexual harassment, sexual contact, obscenity, unreasonable and unnecessary invasion of privacy, behavior of sexual nature or implication, and

conversations or correspondence suggesting a romantic or sexual relationship. For the sake of this study, staff sexual misconduct will apply to male and/or female corrections officers and male inmates. The literature review on this topic applies to all types of staff sexual misconduct.

Use of force: The amount of force used by a correctional officer in accordance with the use of force continuum applied to an inmate in order to maintain or gain control (Palmiotto, 2001).

Assumptions

Assumptions included in this paper are that participants would be honest when they answered the questions in each scenario, participants would participate in the study when asked, participants would answer on their own judgment to the questions provided and not share with others, participants would be the individuals answering questions and not having a family member as a substitute to answer questions for them, and participants would independently interpret definitions based on diversity in perceptions and work experience. A final assumption is that the measurement devices were appropriate for the sample used in the study.

Scope, Delimitations, and Limitations

The scope of this study addresses the correlation of morality awareness in general and workplace morality with corrections officers. Delimitations of a study are characteristics that can limit the range of the problem. The delimitations of this study include only corrections officers at the prison, not any other staff member employed at the prison unit. A second delimitation is that the study applies only to correctional

officers who work in prisons housing male inmates (there is only one women's unit located in the state of Ohio).

Limitations are defined as factors that can prevent individuals from participating in the study and weaknesses of the study. The limitations of this study were that participants may be reluctant to answer honestly due to fear of identification, retaliation, or termination. This limitation may prevent the officers from wanting to participate in the study. Corrections officers were advised that their responses would remain anonymous to help reduce their fears and promote participation in the study. Another limitation was the self-selection of participants. It is possible that the corrections officers who are the least ethical are the least likely to participate, and more ethical corrections officers felt compelled to help. This may affect the generalizability of the results, showing more awareness of morality with officers and minimizing any negative results of morality awareness with officers. According to Babbie (2004), any research using surveys can have its strengths and weaknesses. Babbie stated the strengths of using a survey include describing the characteristics of a large population, making large samples feasible, having flexibility when necessary, having strong measurement, and having reliability. Babbie reported the following are weaknesses of using a survey: Standardization can result in seeming superficial and somewhat artificial. In terms of this study, standardization of the surveys can make the responses appear to be general and take out any individuality of responses. The context of social life is sometimes missing, inflexible at times, and cannot measure social action and validity.

Due to the length and complexity of the COPS, participants found the surveys to be too tedious and some did not complete the entire process. The DIT-2 has a limitation of being written for college students and presented vocabulary and situations that a standard Midwestern high school graduate may not be familiar with. The DIT-2 survey was also very long and increased the incomplete rate. Participants may have different definitions for certain terms. This could have affected the results based on the possible variety of the interpretations used in definitions and scenarios on the DIT-2. I was not able to validate the corrections officers' responses to survey questions referring to being involved in prior complaints because personnel files cannot be accessed. Another limitation is the officers felt the surveys are too long, separate and together, and refused to complete them both. I attempted to offset this limitation with a well-written consent form that addresses the importance of the corrections officer completing both surveys.

The corrections officers saw two surveys and could become complacent with answering the questions after a certain length of time. Some officers might not have revealed information currently existing within their unit for fear of revealing information about their colleagues. There is an internal code officers abide by about not informing supervisors on one another if a rule is broken (Pollock, 2012). As a result, there was a possibility that some information was not revealed in the surveys. This could have impacted the study by generalizing officers who have higher levels of morality awareness in the results than in reality. Corrections officers appeared to answer all the questions, but it is not known if this took place although the officers stated they were honest in answering all questions. Another limitation might have been problems with

generalizations and sample selection. Due to the small sample size within the prison unit, if officers did not participate in the study, information and results were limited, thus making it necessary to rely on other prison units for additional samples.

One advantage of this design is the officers only needed to take the surveys one time and then they were finished. It was more likely to get compliance with the whole process and the dropout rate was expected to be minor. There were some disadvantages to this design. Some officers might not have had immediate access to the Internet at home and may have had to travel to a public location to take the survey. If there were problems with the Internet servers, it might have stopped corrections officers from taking the surveys. Depending on weather conditions and power outages, officers might have been without power or the Internet for an extended period of time that would have caused delays in the administration of surveys and gathering of responses from corrections officers.

Significance of the Study

The significance of the research is that it provided additional knowledge of correctional officers' moral awareness and understanding of the reasons for immoral behavior when responding to an incident in the course of their duties. As most research in this area has focused primarily on police officers, the current literature on this topic was lacking in respect to corrections officers. This research allowed for comparison with various levels of prison security as applied to the correctional facility visited. The research could have improved the appropriate response level of corrections officers in

responding to incidents through proper actions in incident responses and resolving incidents in proper de-escalation.

This research may be applied to future research studies in other Ohio correctional facilities, adult or juvenile, and prisons in other states. Correctional administrators should be aware of the responses their officers should provide to various situations and know if their corrections officers are applying the appropriate response and moral behavior to any incident. For the purpose of this study, correctional administrators did not have any insight to the responses from correctional officers on the surveys. Addressing this problem could affect positive social change by reducing the need to discipline corrections officers and saving taxpayer money on lawsuits. Another positive social change is that recidivism rates for inmates may be reduced because inmates may observe officers' behaviors and replicate those behaviors when released in resolving situations to prevent them from returning to prison, which would cost additional taxpayer dollars. The literature reviewed for the present study presents behaviors involving police officers, corrections officers, and other criminal justice staff, but the focus of this study was on corrections officers.

Summary

There is a need to continue to fill in a gap in literature with morality awareness and moral behavior in regards to corrections officers. The majority of research has focused on police officers and ethical behavior conducted by police officers. Studies have been conducted on corrections officers, but those studies are only beginning to fill in the gap in literature. State prisons have a culture different from other criminal justice

agencies, and this difference makes it important to understand how corrections officers interpret ethical concerns. It is necessary to study corrections officers because they are the backbone of maintaining security within prisons and provide the most direct contact with inmates and can have a major impact on their rehabilitation process.

Corrections officers work with the inmate population and need to be aware of all operations within the prison and the activities of the inmates. Corrections officers could provide information to their supervisors if they are aware of current situations involving immoral behavior of other corrections officers. This study will add to the extant literature and provide insight into the moral awareness of corrections officers. In the study, I reflected how corrections officers view ethics, integrity, and the appropriate behavior in response to an incident. This study contributed to positive social change by helping to improve moral awareness of correctional officers. The results of the study have the potential to influence policy changes for prisons, improve training for corrections officers, and improve the quality of service provided to inmates, potentially leading to lower recidivism rates.

In Chapter 2 of this study, I focus on the literature review. Topics included are ethics, staff sexual misconduct, employee attitudes and perceptions, occupational deviance, and views on abuse of authority. In the review, I highlight research efforts concerning a variety of correctional facilities. The literature offers significant information to the correctional environment and can offer innovative ideas for prevention of inappropriate responses from corrections officers.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

In Chapter 2, I present information concerning ethics, morality, attitudes of employees, their perceptions of ethics, and the climate of ethical behavior in organizations. In Chapter 2, I also present organizations and the desire to improve the ethical and moral behavior of their employees as well as the conduct displayed by corrections officers both on-duty and off-duty. Myths regarding correctional organizations and employment are summarized in Chapter 2.

If an unethical act is committed, particular agencies can suffer from the backlash of these acts due to the nature of the profession. According to Henry (1998), unethical and immoral behavior can be committed in any business, organization, or agency. Physicians, nurses, attorneys, judges, and criminal justice professionals are examples of individuals who, if they committed an unethical or immoral act, would suffer harsher consequences than a general business employee. One reason for the stricter punishment is because physicians, nurses, attorneys, and criminal justice professionals are held to a higher standard of ethical and moral behavior because of the issues of responsibility within their profession.

Efforts are made to assist professionals with ethical decisions and morality. Pollock (2012) stated studies of ethical and moral behavior have been conducted in several law enforcement agencies, focusing primarily on theories of the individual decision making process. The ethics research has had an effect on criminal justice organizations, including correctional institutions. Additional research is being conducted in correctional institutions to address the prison and inmate culture. According to Morial

(2006), when the United States was enforcing the “get tough on crime” philosophy in the 1980s, there was a sense of less compassion for an individual. During this period, the United States was focused on incarcerating individuals for long sentences without the possibility of parole and new sentencing guidelines took away possibilities for inmates to have an early release (Morial, 2006). Morial stated that the application of morality and respect in prisons are keys to reducing violent behavior and retaliation from inmates upon corrections officers. The researcher also emphasized the idea of remembering to respect each person as an individual, not a group stereotype. This idea is important in today’s corrections culture because the get tough on crime era is over and the focus is now on rehabilitation and treatment of offenders.

Unethical and immoral behavior can have negative results in any work setting. In correctional institutions, unethical and immoral behavior committed by a correctional officer can impact the safety and security of the institution in which the officer works (Morial, 2006). Henry (1998) discussed examples of unethical and immoral behavior can include the following: an officer introducing contraband to a correctional unit, excessive use of force, inappropriate relationships with inmates, and not acting appropriately in a situation to prevent harm to another person. Henry defined inappropriate relationships with inmates as receiving gifts from an inmate, sexual misconduct of any type, or the giving of favors to an inmate or a member of the inmate’s family. Morial asserted the inmates with whom the corrections officer works can be observant and have ample time in their day to observe the officer’s habits and behaviors. The inmates know which institution rules the corrections officer will be lenient in enforcing and which institution

rules will be strictly enforced. The inmate will know if the corrections officer can be compromised in terms of his or her ethics. Because the inmates are watching, it is important for corrections officers to be very cognizant in their approach of situations.

Literature Search Strategy

All information for Chapter 2 was acquired from peer-reviewed journals through the Walden University EBSCO database, the National Institute of Corrections website, and ProQuest. The keywords that were used to find the research information included *ethics, professional ethics, morality, misconduct, unethical behavior, officer-inmate relations, employee recruiting, occupational deviance, employee sexual misconduct, and perceptions of misconduct*. The reason for the use of the research beyond 5 years is because of the literature gap in research with ethics training, morality, and corrections institutions. Most of the research conducted in ethics training and criminal justice focuses on police agencies.

Theoretical Foundations

Climates and Perceptions of Ethics

Perceptions of ethics and ethical climates are included in research of criminal justice organizations. The majority of ethics research in criminal justice agencies involves police officers and their organizations (Stohr et al., 2000). There is a similarity between police and correctional organizations in respect to ethical behavior, and while describing police officers' perceptions of ethical climate is important to the research, it limits the application to the police department. Stohr et al. (2000) highlighted the work of a corrections officer is significantly different than the work of a police officer. A

corrections officer works within a confined facility with a set population, while a police officer works in an open setting within society where a variety of interactions can occur and the clientele are unpredictable. A police officer could perform one traffic stop with no concerns while another could involve domestic violence and intoxication with a risk of harm to the officer making the stop. The two professions are similar in some areas, but are different due to the additional variables involved in police work on the streets. With these additional variables, there are more opportunities for a police officer to commit unethical and immoral behavior on the streets (Stohr et al., 2000). Kleinig (1990) stated that the reasons for these differences included the following: the authority the police possess, the moral nature of the work police perform, the crisis situations they confront, the legal and moral imperatives that they involve themselves in during such situations, the temptations they face, and the subcultural pressures that they confront to conform to group norms. In this context of research, researchers see the link of ethics research and the police agencies, but the shift is now leaning towards corrections agencies.

In ethics research, the current focus is on the perceptions of corrections officers and their behavior. Researchers have attempted to include as many of the corrections staff as possible in their research. Maahs and Pratt (2001) conducted different studies to attempt to determine how corrections officers are influenced in their perception of ethical behavior. They revealed that the success of management and the institution itself and how satisfied the corrections officer was to be employed with an organization were the predictors of a corrections officer's behavior. Furthermore, the authors stated the happier a corrections officer is with his or her organization and management's operational

methods, the greater the officer's level of satisfaction and the less likely he or she was to commit an unethical act. In line with these findings, it would appear corrections officers who are satisfied with their position worked harder to please the management and carried a sense of pride.

Leaders and managers of correctional organizations are constantly reminded of the concerns of officer ethics and moral behavior due to incidents occurring all over the United States in their prisons and jails. According to Kleinig and Smith (2005), there is a need to create, modify, and maintain enforcement of professional ethics and moral behavior for all prison employees. They questioned if ethical and moral behavior can be taught to prison staff, and if the prison staff can maintain that morality. In their research, Kleinig and Smith discussed the six areas involving the use of professional ethics. These areas are professionalizing incarceration; the possibility of a correctional ethic; staff-prisoner relations; ethical analysis of health care in a correctional setting; staff-offender relationships in corrections; and issues of leadership, ethics, and values. With the large number of individuals in incarceration, there can be an argument for finding ways to maintain awareness of morality inside the correctional environment.

Individuals follow leaders and model their behavior on that instituted by their leaders. Wright (1999) stated leadership needs to be established in a correctional institution for corrections officers to model the highest standard of professional ethical values and moral conduct. Wright stated that ethical codes need to be established and maintained for every possible situation. Mission statements within the organization are an important tool; developed by leaders, they can enhance the morality of their employees

and their perception of ethical behavior. The author also indicated that an important variable in maintaining ethical standards in the criminal justice system, and therefore the correctional environment, is to hold staff accountable. Thus, with these findings, leadership is an important key in establishing morality awareness and standards for a correctional organization.

The prison administrator, police chief, or chief executive officer (CEO) of a business needs to constantly train, remind, and retrain staff in areas of ethics and remain consistent on these standards of accountability. Wright (1999) further indicated the accountability of staff should be part of an organization's structure for operations. Administrators and directors initiate and implement ethics in a correctional institution. Because the administrator, CEO, or chief is the leader of the organization, the leader must talk and act in a fair and consistent manner.

The leader must not show favoritism to any specific employee and enforce all the rules in the same methods according to the policies and procedures of their particular agency. According to Ingstrup (2000), there are three steps an administrator can implement for an institution to be ethically and morally competent. The first step is to ensure the mission statement of the institution includes core values. The second step is to recruit future employees of high character. The third step is to develop a system of management that supports the employees in achieving the organization's mission statement. Ingstrup asserted that the mission statement is the core beliefs of the institution to build morality of all staff who are employed in the institution. The author also stated that recruiting employees of high character will assist in supporting the mission

statement, and those employees will perform their duties with high moral standards. Finally, proper management assists supervising officers with maintaining ethics and integrity in the institution to support the mission statement developed by administrators (Ingstrup, 2000). In this line of reference, leadership plays an important role in setting standards for morals and professional development.

A core, professional standard of morality can assist an officer in maintaining a sense of professionalism. In a place of employment where the clientele is unpredictable and dangerous, professionalism is key in officer safety and institutional security. Milks (2007) indicated officers escorting dangerous or unpredictable inmates need to maintain their professionalism. Milks stated that, depending on the inmate, the escorting duty could be a dangerous time, and if the corrections officer makes a mistake, the officer could jeopardize his or her life, his or her partner's life, or the lives of the public should the inmate escape. Milks further indicated teachers who train students in any criminal justice profession should emphasize that officers should be firm, fair, and consistent. This phrase, when applied, is the standard for establishing respect and professionalism. Therefore, maintaining values and standards as a corrections officer is crucial in the role of the job.

Values and integrity are important to any organization. Any person can hold a particular set of values, but values and ethics are tested when a difficult situation arises. Every person establishes a set of core values (Ingstrup, 2000). Some core values may include respect of other individuals; giving individuals a second chance when they make a mistake, such as an inmate who committed a crime and has paid his or her debt to

society; and relationships with family and others (Ingstrup, 2000). Ingstrup (2000) purported that when a job does not conform to the employee's personal set of core values, he or she will protect themselves first, and any issues of morality will be disregarded instead of being addressed and resolved. Many individuals possess a philosophy that places family before work, which causes a conflict in resolving questions of morality. Inmates in a correctional institution look for role models to imitate behavior, and if a corrections officer has a lack of morals, inmates may be influenced to continue the same behavior that resulted in their incarceration (Ingstrup, 2000). Inmates in a correctional institution remember corrections officers who display consistent morals (Ingstrup, 2000). Inmates' respect is higher for officers who maintain their morals (Ingstrup, 2000). In an environment where respect is an honored agreement, corrections officers need to be consistent in establishing and maintaining morals.

An established ethics code for an organization can provide a set of guidelines for corrections officers to follow in the course of their duties. A code of ethics should specifically address the behavior of individual employees. The American Correctional Association designed a code of ethics for correctional officers in 1975 and revised it in 1990. According to Pollock (2012), the code describes the expected and ideal behavior of all correctional officers and support staff. Examples of the code include respect and protection of all individuals, improvement in the quality of service provided, respecting all criminal justice disciplines and working to improve cooperation among them, members will not use their positions to secure personal privileges, members will not

discriminate, members will not accept gifts, services, or favors, and members will preserve the integrity of private information.

In professional organizations like correctional facilities, policies delineating correct and incorrect behavior are established in policy and communicated to corrections officers. Stohr, Hemmens, Kifer, and Schoeler (2000) used an instrument of ethics they created in three prisons, two jails, and one corrections academy class to determine workplace perceptions and attitudes regarding ethics. Stohr et al. discovered most of the staff agreed in perceptions of ethical and unethical behavior. As part of the research, they noted that there were differences in the staff titles and the security levels of institutions where the staff worked. Stohr et al. noted that the longer a staff member worked with the organization, the greater the likelihood of the individual having an ethical response. Along with length of employment, gender proved another difference in the study. Male staff were more likely to use force than their female counterpart, but the presence of women working in a correctional institution increased the likelihood of a higher ethical rating (Stohr et al., 2000). The authors stated that the older an individual, the increased likelihood of the staff member having a higher ethical rating in a correctional environment. Stohr et al. hypothesized some of the correctional institutions conducted business with a higher professional regard than other correctional institutions. Although the variable of age was an important factor in the study, the correctional institution can reach a different conclusion.

It can be more difficult to work as a corrections officer inside a jail than work as a prison corrections officer. The main difference for the corrections officer inside the jail is

that the population is constantly in transition, whereas a prison population is relatively consistent. Individuals entering a jail upon arrest may be on illegal substances, intoxicated from alcohol, mentally unstable due to either a lack of response to medications or not having taken their medications, suicidal, injured from having been involved in a domestic violence situation, or have an unknown infectious disease. Activity in a jail can vary and incidents can arise unexpectedly. In the busy environment of a jail, ethical dilemmas can occur. Corrections officers can be so consumed in their work they may miss the signs pointing towards a fellow corrections officer committing immoral behavior.

Corrections officers, like other officers, will defend each other and form a culture within the organization. Pollock (2012) identified a culture of correctional officers. This culture lists the norms a corrections officer is expected to follow. The list identified by Pollock included the following: always go to the aid of another officer, do not smuggle drugs, do not rat an officer to an inmate and never cooperate in an investigation against a fellow officer in regard to that officer's treatment of inmates, never make a fellow corrections officer look bad in front of inmates, always support a corrections officer in a dispute with an inmate, always support a corrections officer sanctions against inmates, do not be a white hat (i.e., do not be sympathetic toward inmates), maintain officer solidarity against all outside groups, and show positive concern for fellow corrections officers. In conclusion, officers will defend each other in many circumstances regardless of moral decisions. When an individual applies for a position as a corrections officer, the initial intent is not to act immorally; most individuals, upon hiring, do not think of bringing

harm to another individual, hope to earn a lot of money from an inmate, or want to become involved in a drug deal (Stohr et al., 2000). According to Swope (2001), the individual learns immorality from his or her coworkers at the facility. The new employee will work hard to be accepted as part of the group, so the new employee will imitate the behaviors of the employees working in the organization for many years. Swope stated that the immoral behavior does not originate from the individual, but from the subcultures existing within the organization. Although Pollock believed that the culture is already within the system, Swope suggested the employees become a part of the culture once employed because the new employee wants to impress the others and be accepted within the culture.

As research on morality continues, additional instruments to measure ethical behavior are developed to use in studies. One group of researchers designed a survey to measure ethics for various levels of correctional security institutions (Stohr, Hemmens, Marsh, Barrier, & Palhegyi, 2000). Stohr, Hemmens, Marsh, et al. (2000) observed difficulty in defining ethical standards because items on the survey were misleading, confusing, or useless. Individual items on the survey could be identified as significant. The significant items on the survey instrument were identified as subcultural influences, professional relations with inmates, appropriate use of force, general conduct and the good officer, democratic participation in the workplace, and professional coworker relations (Stohr, Hemmens, Marsh, et al., 2000). In this conclusion, subcultures are a variable with ethics research and could lead to the conclusions given in research, even if they disregard morality.

Pollock (2012) examined ethics in corrections and with corrections officers and observed that the corrections atmosphere is an area for disregarding ethics when working with inmates and Pollock discussed the common ethical concerns. Some of these ethical concerns involved bribery, choosing favorites, accepting gifts, and abusing power. Pollock stated that the most important aspect of these ethical dilemmas is to address ethics concerns and attempt to prevent the ethical dilemmas from occurring. This dilemma would suggest deviance is widely present in a corrections agency among officers and needs to be resolved.

Conceptual Framework

Officer Deviance

Job deviance is not present in just one particular organization. Barker (2011) stated job deviance can occur in any occupation. Job deviance can range from theft on the job to regularly showing up late. Barker conducted a survey and asked participants to report their views on employee misconduct. The survey included many topics of employee misconduct including areas of sexual misconduct, inappropriate use of force, and perjury in a courtroom. Barker stated employee misconduct could exist within any organization and created a *rotten apple* concept. The employee misconduct concept applies to any organization, especially a criminal justice agency, that possesses many individuals who work within policies and procedures, but it is the individuals who commit violations that compromise the integrity and ethics of the organization.

As stated previously a person's happiness can lead to the work levels performed in an agency. According to Haarr (2001) employees have different levels of commitment

to an agency. Haarr stated only 6% of employees give a high level of commitment to an employer. Twenty-seven percent of the participants stated their employer receives a low level of commitment and 66% stated they give their employer a medium level of commitment. In this research, most people do not give their best efforts at their place of employment.

For the purpose of this paper, the definition of organizational commitment established by Haarr (2001) will be used. Haarr defined organizational commitment as the level of commitment an employee gives to the employer in regards to the performance of their duties and level of achievement to complete the tasks assigned to the officer. Haarr stated areas to complete the definition of organizational commitment are: resignations, attendance, and level of job satisfaction. Haarr indicated other factors that could be included are how an employee relates their role to the organization and how the employee identifies their personal existence with the assigned role. In this conclusion, the research states it is not only the job that defines commitment, but other factors are included.

What determines the commitment? According to Metcalf and Dick (2000) police officers are employed in an environment that produces low levels of commitment. This low level of commitment is displayed in their attitude and their behavior on and off the job. Metcalf and Dick composed their study in England to offer the contrasting viewpoint of officers in another country. The authors surveyed many officers in the British police force for a total of 2,303 officers. All levels of officers in rank from recruit to commander were surveyed and received a return rate of 54%. Metcalf and Dick used demographics of

gender and received results on the level of commitment based on rank. The authors showed as a person moves progressively through the ranks of a department, the commitment level correlates in the same progression.

Opinions of Officers With Misconduct

Additional research is in progress with officers and their experiences and knowledge relating to misconduct. According to Klockars, Ivkovich, Harver, and Haberfield (2007) officers will maintain a code of silence when a report of unethical behavior should be made to supervisors. Klockars et al. used a survey device with a 5-point scale and asked questions to the officers on scenarios presented. The authors discovered a majority of officers would not report any misconduct of an officer to their supervisor. Officers abide a code of silence with each other because an officer may feel the world is against them. In some cases, “them” may be referred to the supervisors of the department. Wright (1999) stated the silence is the perception to be formed in law enforcement. Officers may feel they can violate ethical limitations to justify the actions. Wright stated the code of silence gives officers a reason to perform unethically and another reason to not report their colleagues. Wright agreed with Klockars et al. in the rationalization of officers using unethical or immoral behavior because the officers feel no one else will support them and they are a select few against the public and their supervisors. Officers felt that supervisors did not understand what was happening in the field and were out of touch with the reality on the streets or in a prison unit. The information is useful in this study because surveys may give an officer an opportunity to

explain something that has happened while maintaining anonymity. The feelings are also a consideration to make with the results of the study.

Hunter (1999) discussed the focus of studies of police misconduct should be on proactive strategies to prevent the misconduct from occurring. Hunter stated allegations of police misconduct have existed for years. If administrators could focus on strategies to prevent police misconduct, the strategies could be enacted in departments to reduce future events of police misconduct, saving important department hours and resources from answering allegations about officers. Wright (1999) stated the implementation of ethical practices in law enforcement agencies is a package deal. Strong leaders would set the stage of ethical practices and policies and the officers would follow with strong commitments, personal achievement, and a commitment to the organization. The team work between administration and officers can prevent unethical practices from occurring.

Officer misconduct and unethical behavior can also be addressed in management and the disciplinary process. According to Hickman, Piquero, and Greene (2000) the disciplinary process can be a difficult area for departments, but some departments have developed policies and procedures to create a system or separate division just for this concern. The authors reviewed disciplinary files from the Philadelphia police department dating from 1991 to 1998. The researchers stated the Philadelphia police department's internal affairs unit (the Police Board of Inquiry) reviewed all case files involving officer misconduct, conducted hearings, and made decisions on final disciplinary action. Hickman, Piquero, and Greene reported that from 1991 to 1998 the Police Board of Inquiry was involved with approximately 3,690 cases of officer misconduct. These case

hearings resulted in decisions from no hearing to termination of employment on the original investigation. One limitation to the Hickman, Piquero, and Greene study is they used files of only patrol officers; the study did not include supervisors, detectives, or administrators. According to the authors, the results of their study did not reveal any gender-based differences when it came to punishment for refusing a direct order from a supervisor or neglect of performance while on duty. They did discover a gender-based difference in the Police Board of Inquiry results for issues of insubordination and conduct unbecoming of an officer. Female officers were less likely to receive similar sanctions for discipline on the same charges than their male counterparts and would receive lighter sanctions. Lighter sanctions creates the potential for further unethical behavior if the punishment for one group is more lenient than the punishment for other groups for similar infractions as members of the preferentially treated group may feel less need to adhere to ethical standards of conduct.

Police officers are different than corrections officers, but it is important to understand misconduct from a police officer's viewpoint. According to Lersch and Mieczkowski (2000) due to the nature and diversity of positions in a police force, the work conducted, and individuals with whom police officers interact, the view of misconduct can vary between officers. Lersch and Mieczkowski conducted a study to investigate misconduct by a police officer. The authors examined a department in the southeastern United States for complaints, internal and external, against the agency. All complaints were filed with the department's internal affairs division. Lersch and Mieczkowski discovered officers with a complaint filed against them from a citizen were

likely to also have a complaint filed against them from a co-worker in the department. Minority officers who received a complaint from a citizen were found to be twice as likely to have received a complaint from a co-worker in the department. Lersch and Mieczkowski indicated that the majority of the complaints filed against an officer resulted from a decline in performance of the officer. Excessive presence and intervention, inadequate intervention, and failure to de-escalate an incident received the most complaints from citizens (Lersch & Mieczkowski, 2000). In this conclusion, it is important to recognize the rights and concerns of others.

Views on Excessive Abuse of Authority

A concern from citizens and inmates in the past is under use of force. Use of force is an important topic in the criminal justice system for focus and research. With the influence of corrections officers on inmates' behavior, researchers wanted to turn the focus on appropriate use of force in the corrections environment. According to Hemmens and Stohr (2001b), the level of institution security, officers' gender, officers' age, the length of employment, and any previous related experience in criminal justice or the military were factors in the ability to judge the appropriate level of force to be used in an incident within a prison. Hemmens and Stohr did not find levels of education to be a correlation in the appropriate level of force to be used, but age and gender held significance in their study. They found that the older an individual working in a corrections environment was, the less chance there was that the individual would use an inappropriate amount of force. Hemmens and Stohr also found that gender was an important variable because males leaned more towards violence and using force than

females. In this conclusion, older individuals and females would be better in the role of a corrections officer because they are less likely to abuse authority or power.

A major complaint from citizens regarding corrections officers is that the corrections officer abuses their power of authority in an incident. Allegations of abuse of authority can lead to complaints of an officer using excessive force. Weisburd et al. (2000) stated departments are working to train their officers on a regular basis on the appropriate use of force in various situations. The researchers interviewed police officers regarding their knowledge of and experience in the use of force and abuse of authority in the line of duty. The researchers found that there was a difference in response based on ethnicity whereas African American officers and Caucasian officers differed in their response on the use of force against minorities and how they were treated in an interaction of an officer. The authors also discovered a majority of officers were not in agreement about the excessive use of force and the acceptance of using it. The authors discovered that the definition of excessive use of force varies between officers in the same department. Officers can look at situations differently and not all situations are as clear as others. The researchers stated with possible variables that exist in many situations in law enforcement, appropriate use of force has great diversity of existence and can change as the situation changes. Weisburd et al. stated appropriate use of force holds better results in the security of the prison unit and the service of the officer. Weisburd et al. found that the longer an officer worked with a corrections agency, the less the officer was inclined to use force in a situation. Weisburd et al. stated these results indicated that there were degrees of separation in using force in connection to the officer's tenure of

service to the point where the officer may be less inclined to use force even if use of force was required to prevent injuries or harm. In this line of research, there are varying degrees of what is excessive use of force so the lines of what is excessive seem to be unclear and this is important when it concerns the rights of citizens and inmates.

An area in the field of corrections under review is the subject of prisoners' rights. Bedau (2004) indicated the topic of prisoners' rights is controversial and a constant political battle. Bedau indicated there are two sets of rights known as natural rights and prisoners' rights. The author discussed the use of imprisonment as a punishment and the justification of its use. Bedau indicated inmates' civil rights are not violated with the use of punishment, such as being sentenced to prison. Inmates lose several rights upon a prison sentence and they cannot choose which prison unit to reside in for their sentence, nor can they choose the officers they wish to work at their unit (Bedau, 2004). When an inmate witnesses unethical behavior it can impede the inmate's reintegration and rehabilitation process (Bedau, 2004). Unfortunately, the acts of the officer can lead to the inmate observing unethical and criminal behavior. This behavior may affect the inmate directly or indirectly.

Literature Review Related to Key Variables and/or Concepts

Attitudes of Corrections Officers

In a special environment like a prison, there are limits on the amount of influence to which an inmate can relate. According to Maahs and Pratt (2001), corrections officers have a major influence over the behavior of inmates in a state unit. When a corrections officer supervises an inmate, their first priority is to maintain a safe environment for the

public, then the officer, and finally the offender. Maahs and Pratt stated the inmate's behavior is influenced and developed by the professional demeanor and attitude of the corrections officer and without proper training, the officer's attitude may be detrimental to the development of the inmate's rehabilitation. The authors indicated female officers, minority officers, younger officers, or officers with a higher education level were more likely to possess a negative attitude towards their employer. Based on this research, there are a number of officers who could hold a negative attitude toward their employer.

After the Maahs and Pratt (2001) study, additional research was conducted to support or dispute these results. Another study focused on the demographics of officers, job position, job satisfaction, and conflicts with a position in correlation to the attitude of the corrections officer. Farkas (2001) stated these are difficult variables to research because none of these variables may influence the attitude of the officer. Farkas focused primarily on age, but also on training standards and recruitment of future officers. Farkas suggested that a person should be able to cope with the stressors of the job in a state prison and recruiting should encompass working with experienced officers to assist in creating the positive environment for staff and inmates. Although one study suggests a number of individuals based on demographics are negative toward their employer, another study suggests if any individual works with an older individual, the person working with the older individual will learn stress coping techniques and maintain a more positive attitude toward their employer.

Hemmens and Stohr (2001a) conducted an additional study to measure the attitudes of corrections officers. A study conducted by Hemmens and Stohr involved

attitudes of corrections officers and the factors changing attitudes of officers, appropriate levels of force by corrections officers, females working in a corrections environment, and the perceptions of inmates on corrections officers. According to the authors, the studies conducted and the results acquired are difficult in a corrections environment and further research becomes more difficult due to new and possibly confounding variables. Some of these variables include budgets, politics, and differences in training standards between departments. This suggests there are more variables leading to the attitude of the officer than just demographics of age, education level and gender.

Yet expanded studies continue within the correctional environment. Corrections officers' attitudes, ethics, perceptions of appropriate levels of force, and perceptions toward unethical behavior remain a focus of study. Tellier et al. (2001) conducted a study using a multilevel scale to assess the professional work habits of a corrections officer. The authors grouped the scales into three sections. The first section was grouped based on offender relations. The second scale was grouped based on the orientation to corrections work. The third scale was grouped on attitudes towards the corrections field. According to Tellier et al. (2001) the five items are as follows: a corrections officer works hard to earn trust from inmates, it is important for a corrections officer to possess compassion, to earn respect from inmates a corrections officer should take an interest in them, you get to like the inmates you work with, and sometimes a corrections officer should be an advocate for an inmate.

Additional studies were conducted to gauge attitudes of officers. Scales created by Toch and Klofas (1982) are used in several studies engaging the question of attitudes of

corrections officers and their perception of behaviors from other corrections officers. A similar scale developed by Klofas and Toch (1982) was used to measure an officer's preference in keeping a safe social distance from an inmate while on the job. The scale was measured on a 4-point Likert scale from *strongly agree* to *strongly disagree* and included five different items. In their survey, Toch and Klofas used four statements to gauge their point scales to measure how strongly a corrections officer would support an orientation to the treatment of inmates. The 4-point scale used from the researchers' previous study was used on this study, but with four different statements for assessment: if prisons were uncomfortable, there would be less crime; corrections officers' jobs become worse when prison conditions improve for inmates; the best way to operate a prison is with a paramilitary structure; and rehabilitation programs are a waste of resources (Toch and Klofas, 1982). This study would suggest the get tough on crime era was the right way to hold offenders and make it easier on the corrections officer in terms of their employment helping their attitude to remain positive.

The limited number of items to assess each dimension was a concern with the use of these scales. Klofas and Toch (1982) argued that the limited questions would still present enough information on officers' attitudes for their studies. The authors concluded there was no significance in the overall statements with the attitudes of corrections officers. They also concluded that there was minor significance in the correlation of corrections officers' agreement with the final statement that rehabilitation programs for inmates were a waste of resources. The reason it is stated as minor significance is the

results were not statistically significant by confidence level, but it was significant enough to consider in the discussion of their study.

Another scale developed and used by Tellier et al. (2001) discusses the topic of corrections officers and corruption. This scale developed by Tellier et al. (2001) and it consists of five different statements gauged on a 4-point scale similar to the previous scales. The purpose of this scale was to correlate corrections officers' attitude with the amount of contact they have with inmates. On this scale a higher score for the corrections officer correlated to a higher chance for the officer to be corrupted. The scale indicated with the officer being corrupted there was the possibility of the cause of the corruption initiated through manipulation from the inmate. According to Tellier et al. (2001), the statements on this scale are as follows: "you cannot completely trust an inmate, a good philosophy is not to get too close to an inmate, relationships with inmates result in a case of corruption, keep your conversations with inmates brief and professional, and officers who are lenient with inmates will be taken advantage of." Tellier et al. concluded the probability for corruption was low for the majority of the corrections officers surveyed. Tellier et al. also noted that the responses of some officers lead to the conclusion that some officers could be corrupted easier than others, but it was not a definite predictor of officer corruption. The researchers suggested the level of security the corrections officer works may determine the level of corruption the officer is likely to engage in as another factor.

The topic of level of security of the institution was reintroduced into studies. Farkas (1999) researched corrections officers and their job position within a county jail.

During the late 1990s there was a change in incarceration philosophies based on political motives. Farkas researched whether corrections officers and inmates changed attitudes based on the political agenda of incarceration and discovered age was the prime motivator of rehabilitation over punishment for corrections officers. Education and ethnicity were not a significant factor in the study. The longer an officer served in his or her job position, the more focused the officer was on the philosophy of rehabilitation (Farkas, 1999). Farkas discovered the gender of an officer had a significant effect on the job satisfaction philosophy of the officer. The author asked officers about which areas provided them with the most job happiness and found that pay, security, and benefits were their top three reasons for working in a corrections environment.

Across a number of studies conducted, the length of time an officer serves in their position has been a variable that has consistently identified job satisfaction and attitude towards working with inmates indicating length of time is related to these variables. Klofas (1986) agreed the length of time a corrections officer serves in his or her duties and the age of the officer are important factors in officer attitudes and ethical behavior. The researcher stated that the age of a corrections officer is important because the older the officer in the position is, the more they will adhere to standards of ethical behavior. Race was not a significant factor in Klofas' study.

Klofas suggested that corrections officers may have different reasons for starting a corrections job. The author hypothesized younger officers may not have as many commitments in their personal lives as older officers have. Due to the lack of commitments, younger officers may have a higher probability for committing unethical

practices to make more progress in their personal lives. Klofas hypothesized older officers may have family concerns that make jeopardizing their employment a more significant loss to them. This is an older study and the author did not update this study. The results are the only ones produced by the author. Although the author has performed other research with additional authors, Klofas and the additional authors did not return to the specific topic as addressed in the original study.

In the previous studies presented, one variable was not discussed in each study, the variable of the level of security of the prison unit. Worrall and Morris (2011) conducted a study on inmate rule violations and prison security levels. The researchers stated the literature review yielded insights into prison misconduct, but the level of analysis in custody level was left out of the studies they reviewed. The authors' study concluded there was a strong and positive association with the custody level of the prison unit and inmate misconduct, even after accounting for endogeneity of custody levels and once inmate and prison level measures were included. The question remains if the same association can be made with security levels of the prison unit and morality awareness of corrections officers?

Correctional officer behavior is observed by inmates and their perception of an officer's behavior is noted in studies. Cheeseman, Mullings, & Marquart (2001) studied inmates' perceptions of officers across various custody levels. The researchers noted inmates' perceptions of female corrections officers were lower in job performance in a minimum security unit than a medium security unit. Inmates in the medium security unit were likely to be more aggressive against a female corrections officer than a maximum

security unit. The authors concluded there were differences among custody levels in perceptions of and behavior towards female officers. The researchers also noted this may be indicative of housing and privilege limitations and frequency of contact with female officers. This study showed another level of inmate perceptions and behavior based on the security level of the prison unit. The question still exists if the same behavior of officers varies with prison unit security levels, especially in awareness of morality.

Sexual Misconduct

Businesses and professional organizations have worked with the concern of sexual misconduct in the last few decades. In a corrections environment, there is the potential for sexual misconduct between employees, between a supervisor and an employee, and the additional factor of misconduct between an officer and an inmate. The National Institute of Justice (2007) discussed the creation of the Prison Rape Elimination Act created in 2003. The National Institute of Justice stated the act was created to address the problems of sexual abuse in prisons, jails, police holdings, and other confinement facilities. One of the highlights of the act required development of standards for detection, prevention, reduction, and punishment of prison rape. The National Institute of Corrections (“Sexual Assaults in Prison,” 2005) attempted to decrease the incidence of officer sexual misconduct with inmates. The National Institute of Corrections (“Sexual Assaults in Prison,” 2005) stated that in 2004 there were 2,100 incidents of staff sexual misconduct noted in the state and federal corrections system. The data obtained originated from jails, prisons, and juvenile detention facilities. Over 2,700 adult and juvenile correctional institutions were used for data collection. An astonishing 90% of

nonconsenting acts and those who became victims from these acts were perpetrated by male staff, not just corrections officers. Female staff, including corrections officers, accounted for 67% of sexual misconduct (Sexual Assaults in Prison, 2005). Officers are alleged to be involved in 40% of the cases of sexual violence in jails and prisons (“Forty Percent,” 2005). This research suggests sexual misconduct is a continued problem in the corrections environment.

There are other forms of sexual misconduct occurring in prisons between officers and inmates. According to Struckman-Johnson and Struckman-Johnson (2002) sexual coercion is more prevalent in a male prison, and actual rapes are not as common from staff. Struckman-Johnson and Struckman-Johnson observed male facilities in a few Midwestern states. Out of the 1,788 inmates questioned, only 21 percent of them stated at least one incident of sexual coercion occurred in their state prison unit. Four percent of those questioned stated they were raped in the system.

The female prison units included variations in their statistics for a couple of reasons. Overall there are fewer prison units for women in comparison to units for men. Struckman-Johnson and Struckman-Johnson reported another factor is women inmates are more reluctant to report incidents based on fear of retaliation from their perpetrators. There are reports that prison units and administrators did not complete their investigation of allegations, therefore leaving incomplete data for questioning. Several incidents occurred in the state of Ohio from 1998 to 1999 (“Prisoners in 1999,” 2000). Those incidents are as follows:

1. East Cleveland City Jail: Officer Beck and a police officer were charged with sexual battery. Both were released on bond.
2. Northeast Pre-Release Center: Officer Bannerman was accused of having sexual relations with two inmates. Officer Morris was charged with aiding Officer Bannerman and intimidating witnesses. Officer Bannerman was found not guilty, but he was fired. Officer Heyward was fired for having a sexual affair with a prisoner.
3. Warren County Juvenile Center: Officer Hurd was fired for groping a female inmate. There was insufficient evidence to criminally charge Officer Hurd. Officer Million was convicted of sexual misconduct with female inmates and was sentenced to six months in prison for these charges. Officer Heiber was arrested for two counts of public indecency for exposing himself to two female inmates.
4. Butler County Jail: Officer Cox was sentenced to 6 months jail time and three years probation for having sexual relations with a female inmate.
5. Franklin Pre-Release Center: Officer Peterson was sentenced to 5 years in prison for having sex with female inmates. The original charges Officer Peterson was indicted for was two felony counts of sexual battery against female prisoners.
6. Cleveland State Women's Prison: A prison supervisor was fired and facing a criminal investigation for having sex with an inmate.

Incidents of this type occur in women's prisons too. In a report published on the women's unit in Ohio, known as the Ohio Reformatory for Women, located in Marysville, Ohio, in 2002, a total of 33 staff members were terminated from their positions for *inappropriate sexual activity* with prisoners. "Officer Anthony Peterson was suspended from his position as a corrections officer from the Franklin County Pre-Release Center when an investigation discovered a female inmate was pregnant with the officer's child. The punishment for the officer was a week's suspension without pay. At the Ohio reformatory for Women, a female inmate reported she was raped by a male corrections officer. Later, the female inmate was punished for reporting the incident (*Stop Prisoner Rape Report*, 2003)." The Ohio Revised Code defines relations between an officer and an inmate as a crime. The crime is defined as sexual battery and is punishable by one to five years in a state prison and a possible \$10,000 fine (*Stop Prisoner Rape Report*, 2003). Yet, even with this law in place, criminal prosecutions of those alleged of sexual battery have not been prosecuted by the state of Ohio (*Stop Prisoner Rape Report*, 2003).

Although the majority of the allegations involve male officers and female inmates, female officers are not left out of allegations. According to Dutton (2004) there was an incident of a female officer becoming sexually involved with a male juvenile inmate at the Circleville Juvenile Correctional Facility. Dutton stated a male juvenile inmate fell in love with a female corrections officer and the two were married 7 months after he was released from the facility. Dutton stated the male inmate confessed to having inappropriate sexual relations with the officer's older sister, who also worked at the

facility as a corrections officer. A third female corrections officer was fired from her position after another male inmate confessed to having a *special relationship* with the female officer. Dutton reported there were doubts on the inmate's allegations. Because of the doubts, a polygraph examination was conducted. The inmate passed the polygraph examination stating he had sexual relations with the officer in the bathrooms. Dutton stated the officer denied the relationship, but confessed to allowing the inmate to use her personal cell phone to make illegal phone calls.

Due to previous incidents involving sexual misconduct from corrections officers with inmates, 41 of the 50 states have passed legislation defining the sexual acts with inmates as a criminal violation prosecutable in a court of law (General Accounting Office [GAO], 2000). According to the GAO the incidents most commonly reported are incidents of consensual sex, verbal harassment, improper touching, and improper viewing. The GAO lists very few incidents as rape or sexual assault.

As studies continue, researchers are attempting to locate and identify behaviors in officers that would lead to sexual misconduct. Layman et al. (2000) identifies the factors that can assist in an investigation and take a proactive approach to preventing incidents of sexual misconduct. The authors discussed training methods, what every officer needs to do to assist in the prevention of sexual misconduct, how an investigation should proceed, and other prevention methods.

Current research involves the addition of mental health professionals to review staff training procedures and offer information to improve training. According to Dumond (2000) policies and procedures, training, and key prevention techniques are

developed from the research conducted by mental health professionals. Layman et al. (2000) identified several *red flags* leading to possible sexual misconduct from officers upon inmates. This is the list as discussed from Layman et al. as a block quote:

1. Over-identifying with the inmate and/or personal issues.
2. Inappropriate play behavior between staff and inmates.
3. Inmates knowing personal information about staff.
4. Staff isolation from other staff.
5. Inmates in an unauthorized area or repeatedly out of their assigned area.
6. Staff spending more time with an inmate.
7. Telephone calls to and from staff/inmates.
8. Inmate snitches, inmate/staff rumors.
9. Staff in the facility during off duty hours.
10. Pregnancy or STD diagnosis.
11. Staff overly concerned about an inmate.
12. Drastic behavior changes with an inmate or staff.
13. Staff having sole involvement with a particular inmate.
14. Indispensable inmate.
15. High/low number of grievances.
16. Inmate wanting to report to work early or volunteering to stay late.
17. Staff confronting staff regarding an inmate.
18. Staff intercepting inmate disciplinary infractions or editing infractions.
19. Staff tracking outside inmate calls.

20. Inmate improving their appearance.
21. Isolated posts/positions/work assignments.
22. Staff cannot account for time.
23. Staff's family being involved with inmate's family.
24. Increase in contraband in an area.
25. Staff working in a secluded area with inmate(s).
26. Staff taking inmates out of cell at unusual times.
27. Staff in personal crisis.
28. Staff who consistently work more overtime than peers and volunteers to work overtime.
29. Unusual balance or activity in an inmate's commissary account.
30. Staff having excessive knowledge about an inmate and his or her family.
31. Staff intervening or helping with the inmate's personal life or legal affairs.
32. Staff sharing food or snacks with inmates.
33. Staff testifying for an inmate or requesting special treatment for an inmate.
34. Staff delegating their duties to inmates.
35. Staff bringing in large amounts of food, soda, or snacks.
36. Overhead conversations between staff and inmates that are sexual in nature.
37. Staff having sexual activity with an inmate.

This list discusses many items involving the work environment of a corrections officer. According to Layman et al. a list such as this would be beneficial to all correctional agencies. It would be imperative for a correctional agency to implement this

list into their training standards for recognizing unethical behavior. Every year additional information surfaces regarding unethical behavior and sexual misconduct. It is important for correctional agencies to stay informed on current research, but additional research is needed to determine if this is just a concern on the job, or if this type of immorality exists with corrections officers at home, or away from the job as a corrections officer.

Summary

Morality awareness and ethics training are areas important in research in the criminal justice field. According to Stohr et al. (2000) most of the previous research is focused on the ethical climate of police officers and that it is only recently that ethical behaviors and ethical climate in corrections environments has been researched. Stohr et al. stated both fields exist within the area of criminal justice and therefore, are similar in nature of training and work. Conducting research in both of these areas is invaluable to the other for reciprocal training and education.

In this study a combination of the prior research addressed the question in this paper. Levels of morality were studied with corrections officers comparing morality on the job and morality away from the job. The security levels of the prison units the corrections officer works in were examined in this study, but the gender of the officer was noted in comparisons of awareness of morality. Although previous studies in corrections focused on the jail environment, the proposed study focused on corrections officers in a prison environment. The literature review for this study included past efforts and current questions and reviews on ethical behavior and appropriate responses of corrections officers in a state prison setting.

Based on the previous research, the proposed study is important for the future of correctional agencies. The review of all the literature defined patterns in the previous research. In earlier decades, particularly the 1970s and 1980s, researchers recognized the concerns of misconduct within several agencies of the criminal justice system. In the 1990s, sexual misconduct was becoming more prevalent in the eyes of administrators and changes were being pursued for training purposes into today's society. The result of the training and policy changes increased the efforts of recruiting a better employee and increasing testing to check for ethical behavior through psychological assessments. Each year additional research is being added to the field to improve the process.

The potential for positive social change from the proposed study was an opportunity to assist state correctional agencies to save money using a proactive approach to enhance moral awareness to corrections officers. In a time of economic concerns where state governments are attempting to reduce their budgets and reduce their deficit to plan for the future, using a proactive approach to enhance morality awareness can apply positive social change to help save money from civil lawsuits filed by inmates who are alleging inappropriate behavior from corrections officers. This type of research can be applied to all levels of correctional facilities, jail or prison. The focus of the study was composed in prisons.

Chapter 3 included a review of the methodology of research in the literature, alternative research, and surveys as a data collection strategy. Chapter 3 focused on the research methods for this study. Included in Chapter 3 are topics such as overview of the

design, the population and sample, the survey instrument, the hypotheses, the proposed data analysis, assumptions and limitations, and threats to validity.

Chapter 3: Research Method

According to the Ohio Department of Rehabilitations and Corrections (2011) training standards, corrections officers receive a 2-hour block of ethics training in the academy and receive a half hour of online ethics training every year. The annual training can be completed online at any point during the fiscal year starting in July and ending in June of the following year. Incidents occurring in the criminal justice profession have raised questions regarding the efficacy of education and awareness of ethics and morality. The purpose of the quantitative study was to correlate workplace morality and morality awareness in general by corrections officers working in the Ohio Department of Rehabilitations and Corrections. Potential relationships between the security level of the institution and workplace morality in addition to morality in general were examined. The focus of the study was on long term adult correctional facilities within the state of Ohio, excluding juvenile and short term detention facilities such as jails. In this study, I examined whether or not a significant difference exists between corrections officers' morality awareness within and outside of their work environment. The data were examined to better understand how morality awareness can assist in reducing inappropriate responses by corrections officer in the Ohio Department of Rehabilitations and Corrections.

In Chapter 3, I presented information concerning the design of the study. Chapter 3 also addresses variables, methodology, procedures, and sampling. Furthermore, threats to validity was summarized in Chapter 3.

Research Design

Overview of the Design

The study was conducted involving prison units of different security levels and involved corrections officers from all shifts. The study used a modified version of the COPS, created by Mesloh et al. (2003; see Appendix A for the original and Appendix B for the modified version). The original use of the COPS was for a jail setting, so it was modified for this study to use in a prison environment because there is a difference in a jail setting and a prison setting. The study was a correlational design: independent variables are security levels of the correctional facility, dependent variables are scores on the COPS and the DIT-2. Permission to revise and use the COPS was received and is included in Appendix C.

Previous researchers have focused solely on ethical concerns or within the work environment of the officers; this study added the element of general moral awareness to the ethical concerns and questions specific to prisons. In addition to the COPS, which focused on prison-specific moral issues, in this study, I used the DIT-2 measure general moral awareness in officers in areas of personal interest and maintaining norms. The DIT-2 addressed issues outside of a prison environment and was used to determine if there is a significant difference between morality awareness of corrections officers inside their working environment and morality in general.

Variables

I examined if general morality awareness is correlated with workplace related morality in corrections officers. Correlations between security level of the unit worked in

and the morality awareness of the corrections officer was examined. The dependent variables for this study were the responses to the Mesloh et al. (2003) survey and the DIT-2 survey. The independent variable was the security level of the prison unit. If the results produced a negative or no correlation of morality based on the security level of the prison unit, the results were interpreted in the discussion section explaining why officers produced these results. The positive correlation is discussed, but it did not need to be interpreted in depth.

Officers participating in this research volunteered to answer questions based on scenarios that could compromise morality of officers. These results were inputted for analysis using an SPSS statistics program. The responses were given a number to indicate a level of morality awareness, and the responses indicated if the morality awareness of officers is affected by the prison unit's level of security. The three scenarios and willingness to report were included.

Methodology

According to Maxfield and Babbie (2001) and Babbie (2004), it is important for researchers to know what they are studying and know the methods to research the hypothesis. The investigative methods of social and behavioral sciences assist in the empirical exploration in the field of criminal justice and psychology of officers. Maxfield and Babbie stated, we, as researchers, have to remember the Hippocratic Oath and do no harm, and we must do so voluntarily. The methodology for this research was to use the COPS, a survey designed by Mesloh et al. (2003), but the survey was modified for use in the Ohio state prison system, changing some of the words in the survey to reflect the state

prison and not a jail. The survey was also redesigned to capture any significant difference between morality awareness and the security levels of the prison units in which the corrections officers work. While the gender of the officer was considered, gender-based differences were not a main hypothesis of this study. A positive relationship in the survey used assisted in establishing any significant difference in this study. The independent variables in this study were the security levels of the prison units when comparing the two morality tests. The dependent variable design for this study was the scores from the DIT-2 and the COPS. The DIT-2 and COPS were used to correlate the general moral awareness of corrections officers with duty-related morality.

Procedure

This study added the DIT-2 as an extra measurement to present scenarios outside of a correctional environment to participants. Participants completed the DIT-2 and the COPS. The officers completed the DIT-2 first and received scenarios involving events unrelated to the corrections environment. Once the participants completed the DIT-2, they proceeded to the COPS and answered questions involving the prison unit in which they work. The responses were translated into a quantitative format of scores and analyzed with SPSS. The scores from the surveys were the dependent variables.

Corrections officers have the majority of interactions with inmates inside a prison, and it was important to gauge their understanding of morality within the correctional system. To understand how morality could differ between corrections officers, corrections officers on all three shifts in facilities of varying security levels had the opportunity to participate in this study. I traveled to prison units throughout the state of

Ohio but remained in public places off state property to recruit officers going into work or exiting work. I met with officers going to work and leaving work by standing on public property outside of state prison units throughout the state of Ohio to present the opportunity to participate in the study. I supplied instructions on accessing the surveys and consent form on SurveyMonkey.com to the corrections officers at each security level of the prison units.

The officers, on their own time, logged into the site on SurveyMonkey and completed questions on both surveys. Officers completed the surveys and the answers were submitted for me to retrieve. The surveys were available on SurveyMonkey.com for 1 week past the time when the minimum number of participants was reached for the purpose of the study to permit additional officers to participate in the study.

I collected all surveys from the SurveyMonkey website at the end of the study period. The time frame allowed all officers an opportunity to fill out surveys in case they were on vacation, had extra days off, or just returned off their regular days off. After each week, the surveys were collected and the data were entered into an SPSS program. If there was not enough participation from the corrections officers from prison units of a particular security level, I scheduled an additional visit to those units to attempt to recruit more volunteers. This action was necessary, as there are a limited number of prison units of any particular security level required for the study. I could have brought doughnuts or candy bars to the officers as a form of appreciation to the officers for their participation in the study up front, but not as a form of payment. This could have increased the number of participants for the study and reduced the need to return for an additional visit.

Because the study was designed for responses to be entered into a website, I am the only person with access to the responses of the officers. Officers were not asked to provide names, badge numbers, or any other identifying information, maintaining participant anonymity.

Literature was reviewed to support the use of surveys as an instrument for collecting data. Babbie (2004) indicated there is a 50% response rate needed from participants to insure proper analysis and reporting of data. Babbie stated that 60% is good with surveys and 70% is better. It was estimated that 10% of the corrections officers would respond to the surveys. Although the sample for the study was not randomly chosen, the sample was close to representation of the population.

Babbie (2004) asserted that the anonymous survey is the preferred method for collecting data because it was anticipated that participants would answer all questions. Completing all questions in the survey assisted in comparing the data submitted by each corrections officer. A survey was used to take any undue pressure from the participants through maintaining anonymity and confidentiality so they would not feel their responses had to meet the expectations of their supervisors.

Population and Sample

Sampling

The sample was drawn from the population of corrections officers from the three security levels of prisons in the state of Ohio (minimum, medium, and maximum security). There are a total of 28 correctional institutions divided into three regions in the

state of Ohio. According to the latest published report in 2011 for the Ohio Department of Rehabilitations and Corrections, the total number of officers working in all correctional units is 6,658. The ratio of male corrections officers to female corrections officers is 5 to 1. Corrections officers were divided into three groups: corrections officers who work in minimum security prison units, corrections officers who work in medium security prison units, and corrections officers who work in maximum security prison units.

I used a convenience sample recruited from state correctional officers. The advantage of convenience sampling, for this study, is the officers are there and readily available to participate in the study. I visited each of the 28 prison units for this study. Officers of all ranks and positions were provided an opportunity to participate. Only corrections officers currently working for the Ohio Department of Rehabilitations and Corrections were invited to participate; other staff (such as medical, janitorial, and food service.) were excluded. Consent forms included a statement for the volunteer to attest they are a current corrections officer.

Sample Size Analysis

The review of similar work setting or organizational interventions—which included a meta-analysis of 448 studies involving the treatment of behavioral and social skills of employees and supervisory personnel—resulted in a mean effect size of .58 (Lipsey & Wilson, 1993). To ensure that the correlation of the surveys on morality awareness could be properly identified, a slightly larger effect size of .60 was used for the study. With an alpha of .05 and a power of .80, at least 45 participants were needed in each group, for a total of 135 participants (Burkholder, 2007). Adding 10% to allow for

attrition, the total number in each group would preferably be 50 per security level, for a total of 150 participants. This sample size was ideal for the nature of the experiment, allowing for the recruitment of a reasonable number of corrections officers from the prison units and also minimizing the chances of statistical errors.

Procedures for Recruitment, Participation, and Data Collection

The prison units were selected due to the security level needed to complete the research. I distributed flyers to the corrections officers by traveling to prison units throughout the state of Ohio but remained on public property outside of the prison units and distributed flyers to corrections officers entering for work or leaving work for the day. The flyers had all instructions needed to access the SurveyMonkey website to read the consent form and complete the surveys.

Data Collection

SurveyMonkey was used for data collection. The officers were recruited via advertisement outside of their facility and accessed SurveyMonkey to find the consent form and surveys. The officers completed the survey on their own time using their own Internet access and devices, minimizing time taken from work or the use of overtime. Anonymity was maintained with random alphanumeric identifiers for each participant. The demographics attained from each survey still kept the confidentiality of the surveys for this research.

Instrumentation and Operationalization of Constructs

According to Creswell (1998), using a survey can provide an adequate amount of information and details to note if there is a concern with integrity, morality, and the ethics

of an individual. For the application of this study, a survey seemed to be most effective although there is not one preferred method to collect data.

Surveys are frequently used tools in the area of social and behavioral sciences. Babbie (2004) indicated survey research is the preferred method for asking questions from participants, measuring perceptions and attitudes, and formatting orientations of individuals. Babbie stated that survey research involves a few steps. The three steps involve constructing questionnaires, selecting a sample, and collecting data.

The decision was made to collect the data through a self-administered survey. Babbie (2004) stated surveys that can be self-administered generally save the researcher money and time in the data collection process. The self-administered survey is more effective when working with sensitive information and concerns of individuals. A potential problem with a self-administered survey is the limited control the experimenter has over the process. For example, the experimenter has no idea if the corrections officer completed the survey or the officer's 13-year-old nephew did it. Time and money were saved by using preexisting survey instruments (the DIT-2 and COPS). Changes in the surveys, such as language, some of the questions in the topics, and adding questions such as security levels do not replicate the study. The original survey used by Mesloh et al. (2003) is included in Appendix A. The survey used for this study is in Appendix B. The two versions allowed readers to distinguish the language between the two surveys for corrections officers in a jail and corrections officers in a prison setting.

Corrections Officers Perceptions Survey

The survey adapted for this study is the COPS and used a Likert scale for all questions. The current survey instrument was patterned after the original COPS (permission to adapt it was secured from the survey authors, see Appendix C).

Language in the COPS was changed to reflect questions for corrections officers in a prison. For instance, any particular question using the word jail, County Jail, or facility was replaced with state correctional facility. No names of any particular prison unit were used to maintain the anonymity of corrections officers. Any question reflecting a short stay of incarceration of under a year instead reflected longer incarceration times of 1 year or more. Sexual misconduct allegations and charges are appearing more in the investigations of corrections officers, and this is an issue that continues to be addressed in ethics training (Layman et al., 2000). Adding the questions of sexual misconduct allowed me to consider concerns addressed in the literature review section.

The COPS measured the workplace related morality of an officer based on the behavior an officer might engage in and what level of morality an officer may use to judge another officer's actions if he or she displayed immoral behavior on duty. In the revised Mesloh et al. (2003) survey, the three scenarios included are a theft scenario (e.g., taking supplies from the unit), a gift scenario (e.g., accepting gifts from inmates), and a sexual misconduct scenario (e.g., having inappropriate sexual relations with an inmate).

The COPS was designed for use in a jail setting, but the current survey was modified for a prison environment. Scenario questions regarding officers engaging in sexual behavior with an inmate were added to the current design. Questions regarding

experience in varying security levels of the prison environment were added to the survey to determine if there is a significant difference in morality awareness among the demographic variables of age, gender, education level, ethnicity, marital status, and years of experience in the current level of security and total experience in corrections overall.

The willingness to report, or awareness of morality, included two additional questions for each scenario in the COPS. The first question asked the participant if he or she would report another officer acting inappropriately in the scenario. The second question asked the participant if they think most officers would report to supervision the officer in the scenario acting inappropriately.

The second scenario in the modified COPS used for this study was designed by this author and was patterned after the scenarios of the original survey. The design of both scenarios is similar.

Because the survey was initially used in the Mesloh et al. study (2003), it measured the responses given by officers from that particular format. It is unknown if the original survey, and its format, was used in other studies. The psychometric properties for this measure are unknown and it is unknown if the validity and reliability of this measure has been tested. This measure has only been used in its original form once to this author's knowledge. With the revisions, the survey had validity since no other construct accounts as well for the combination of findings than moral awareness. The COPS showed consistency since this survey was modified, yet still replicated from the original survey.

Defining Issues Test-2nd Edition

The purpose of the DIT-2 survey was to measure the general morality of corrections officers. When compared to the modified COPS, the DIT-2 indicated if the workplace specific morality of corrections officers is correlated with their general morality. The data collected determined a positive correlation of awareness of morality with officers taking both surveys. The results determined if the officers completing the DIT-2 with the COPS showed an increased awareness of morality in their work environment compared to their personal environment outside of their employment.

The DIT-2 survey asked questions on scenarios outside of a correctional environment such as candidates in a presidential election, a village short of food in India, a reporter who discovers information about a candidate running for office, a member of the school board dealing with a financial concern, a cancer patient, and a student who is deciding to protest on products received from a opposing nation of the United States.

The DIT-2 measured the responses given by officers from its standard format. The original survey, and its format, was used in other studies such as the study from Texas Tech University (Office of planning and assessment, 2008). The survey had validity because it accounts well for the combination of findings of moral awareness. The persuasiveness of validity for the DIT-2 comes from the combination of criteria for construct validity many researchers have found, not just one finding with one criterion. The values of Cronbach's alpha and test-retest correlation coefficients change in the range of .53 to .60. Reliability of the DIT-2 was shown since this was modified from the original DIT and could be replicated. The DIT-2 was used in different professional areas

such as psychology and business and results were similar in all areas of profession. The DIT-2 is listed in Appendix D.

Demographic Data Collection

To validate that the corrections officer population is otherwise comparable to the general population of corrections officers in the state of Ohio, and thereby make it possible to draw inferences about the correlation between awareness of morality in the prison and outside of the prison, demographic data were collected. The information collected included educational level, age, work experience and gender. This data were compared to that of the general population of corrections officers using Ohio data on corrections officers in the state of Ohio.

Data Collection and Analysis

Data Collection

I delivered flyers of the study to the corrections officers, explaining the purpose of the study and providing instructions for accessing the survey online. The flyers were distributed to corrections officers while they were entering the prison unit or leaving the prison unit. Consent forms and surveys were provided on the SurveyMonkey website. Completion of the survey was considered consent to participate. Supervisors did not have access to information about participants or the results of the survey. I am the only person who had access to the raw data.

The officers were asked to complete the survey on their own time. Officers were instructed to complete the survey on their own time and on their personal devices to

prevent unauthorized interception or tracking of survey responses (as might occur on state-owned computers), understanding that no monetary compensation was provided.

Data Analysis

A quantitative correlational study examined the relationship between morality awareness in regards to general and prison-specific situations. The inner-group assessment independent variables studied are employment in a corrections facility in general and at one of three security levels. The three levels were corrections officers who work in minimum security prison units, corrections officers who work in medium security prison units, and corrections officers who work in maximum security prison units.

The dependent variables in all assessments were scores on the COPS and the DIT-2. Each response on the COPS and the DIT-2 was assigned a number from “1” being the lowest and the corresponding number of total responses to be the highest which is not changed from the original designs. Any response omitted, or not answered, was assigned a “0.” After all numbers were entered into the SPSS system, an analysis was run to determine if there was any correlation of corrections officers based on the security level of the prison unit the officer works in. The hypotheses were tested with the SPSS program to determine if the correlation exists as a positive correlation between the two surveys, no correlation or a negative correlation between the two surveys. The correlation was matched with the security level of the prison units to determine if the positive correlation is with a minimum, medium, or maximum security level. This was tested if the negative correlation exists with each security level, or no correlation exists with each

security level. These data were representative of the population of the corrections officers in the state of Ohio.

Statistical tests were used to analyze data on an SPSS software program. The multiple regression analysis was used to determine if there is a correlation between morality awareness and the security level of the prison unit worked. To compare the morality levels on the DIT-2 with the COPS, the personal interest stage on the DIT-2 represented the scenarios to compare with the scenarios in the COPS and the maintain norms stage represented the discipline compared to the discipline in the COPS. An alpha level of .05 was used to minimize the probability of Type II errors. Results were evaluated to determine whether or not there was a difference among those demographics of employees and their prison-specific morality. Data were examined to determine if it meets the underlying assumptions of the tests (normalcy, homoscedasticity, etc.). Once assumptions were met, multivariate analysis and paired sample *t* tests were used to evaluate the data for significant correlations.

Threats to Validity

Babbie (2004) indicated there are possible threats to validity that should be addressed for this study. Babbie stated the highest threat in studies is instrumentation; which is the COPS instrument for this study. The COPS used in this study was not standardized. Because the survey was not standardized, there can be differences in interpretation of concepts. As an example, definitions for the surveys were provided, but participants may have defined concepts from personal experience.

Babbie stated the medium threats include history. History for this study included the history of the corrections officer. The survey was administered during an open period until a proper sample of corrections officers were retrieved and then remained open for 1 week afterwards. The likelihood of a significant event that occurred to a corrections officer within this open period is moderate. Supervisors might have volunteered to take the surveys and with their training and experience, their views could skew the results. Statistical regression indicated there was a danger that participants in management, or supervisors, may have an extreme perception of morality prior to the distribution of the survey. They might have had a better understanding of the existing moral climate of the prison unit. Participants were not a part of a group consensus so there is no real threat of regression. Selection biases mean participants were not required to complete the survey, so completing the survey was voluntary. Participants completed it at their own will meaning this is a convenience sample. Demoralization indicated this study could result in participants feeling guilty or ashamed of their actions. This could have caused frustration and participants may have chosen to not complete the study. All of this was based on the history of the corrections officer and any events the officer was involved in during the history of their career.

The low threat is in experimental mortality. This indicated participants will be asked to participate, but they may have felt the need not to answer all the questions. If a survey was started, but not completed, it was noted as such in the data analysis. Scoring followed the instrument authors' rules for scoring the DIT-2. The minimal threats included maturation. This means this was not a longitudinal study; therefore, participants

did not significantly age during the open period. The survey was somewhat time consuming and it was possible the participants got bored and did not finish the survey.

There was no threat in the area of testing. The study involved causal time order meaning there was no experiment conducted for this study. This means the surveys were based on self-reported perceptions and morality of the corrections officer. There is no reason to suspect that the dependent variables caused any changes. Officers completing surveys in this study had diffusion. Diffusion or imitation of treatments meaning this study did not have a control group or a treatment group. Compensation indicated this study did not have a control group and participants were not paid to participate. No officers were compensated for this study. Compensatory rivalry meaning, again, this study did not have a control or treatment group. Overall, instrumentation, history, and demoralization could have been obstacles for the study design.

The particular prison units serve male inmates and the results were not generalized to other prison units or specialized units. The instrumentation that was used presented an obstacle to the reliability and validity of the proposed research design. The DIT-2 had issues with regards to variance being related to education level. Some of the questions asked in the DIT-2 are geared more for individuals in a college environment. Although the education level of the corrections officers were not known at the time, some corrections officers may have had a post-secondary education which was not a concern. I did not want to attempt to gauge the education level of all corrections officers, so the format of the DIT-2 remained in its original format. After the surveys were collected, if the results determined the format of the DIT-2 needed to be revised, this was discussed in

the discussion section. Despite these threats to validity, the anonymity afforded to participants of the study may have convinced and encouraged participants to provide honest answers relating to their morality awareness testing.

Ethical Protection of Participants

Participants were given an informed consent form on the welcome page on the website to save or print and their informed consent was indicated by completion of the survey; participation was voluntary. Anonymity was maintained due to the author not requesting identifying information such as names or badge numbers. A copy of the informed consent form is provided in Appendix E. Data were stored on an electronic storage device and was placed in a locked filing cabinet located in the researcher's home office for 5 years.

Summary

In this study data were collected from surveys to address the question in this paper. Security levels of the prison units were examined in this study. I visited different prison units and informed the corrections officers of that prison unit of the research opportunity. The officers participating in the study entered their responses on the survey located on the website. I collected the responses and entered the information on an SPSS program.

In this study the results of the data collected showed if the security level of the prison unit worked by the corrections officer had an effect on the correlation of morality awareness inside and outside of their work environment with the responses by the officers in the scenarios.

The results of this study and data analysis was examined in Chapter 4.

Chapter 4: Results

In this study, the intent was to examine varying levels of morality awareness of corrections officers. Comparisons were made based on age, gender, security level of prison unit worked, education, and length of service working as a corrections officer. There was an evaluation made on the surveys to determine whether there were any varying levels of morality awareness for a corrections officer outside of his or her working environment and inside his or her working environment. It was hypothesized that corrections officers, on average, would have the same levels of morality awareness outside of their working environment as well as inside their working environment, and there would be a positive correlation between workplace-related morality and morality in general.

This chapter begins with an overview of the actual data collection, including number of surveys completed and collected for both surveys. Descriptive statistics will be presented along with an overview of the demographic makeup of the sample. The results of the study of the hypotheses will be presented next.

Data Collection

Recruitment

Participants were recruited outside of their prison units on public property all over the state of Ohio (see Appendix E for survey announcement texts). Flyers were issued to corrections officers entering or exiting their prison unit. No incentives were provided or offered for participation. A second wave of recruitment, unexpectedly, occurred when

officers recognized me and spread the word to other corrections officers to assist in speeding up the data collection process.

Sample Size

To ensure adequate statistical power, as detailed in the sample size analysis in Chapter 3, the goal was to collect a minimum of 135 completed responses for each survey. The minimum amount of survey collection was met with a few extra surveys completed to total 153 for each survey. The surveys were examined first to identify and eliminate incomplete surveys.

Due to the brevity of the instruments and the effects that missing data can have on the results, a survey was judged to be incomplete if more than five questions on the COPS were left blank or if key questions in the morality areas of the surveys relevant to the hypotheses were skipped. This resulted in six surveys being eliminated. Those six were rejected due to partially completed surveys with entire sections missing (e.g., the respondent failed to complete the entire survey as opposed to merely skipping over a couple of questions; see Table 1 for detailed breakdown).

Another nine surveys were eliminated because the participant's responses were deemed invalid according to the DIT-2 results. According to Bebeau and Thoma (2003) the DIT-2 protocol is considered unreliable if issues fell under one of four categories. The first was a check of random responding. Random responding checks for consistency in participants' responses. It is noted there will be some inconsistency because a participant may change his or her mind after responding to individual questions, but overall consistency should maintain itself. The second category is missing data. If three questions

on the same scenario were unanswered or if a total of six ranks were incomplete, the survey was considered unreliable. The third was alien test-taking sets. The authors defined this as respondents who pick for style rather than for meaning or were not following instructions. The final criterion is nondiscrimination. The authors stated that this is a participant who selects the same response for all questions, such as selecting three for all responses. This resulted in a total of 138 completed surveys suitable for analysis based on the ability to compare results to corrections officers in the Ohio Department of Rehabilitations and Corrections and their morality levels working inside the prison and outside of the working environment. Table 1 illustrates the reasons for survey exclusion.

Table 1

Reasons for Survey Exclusion

Items	<i>n</i>	% of <i>N</i>
Survey started but no responses recorded past the consent form	7	4.5
Subtotal incomplete surveys	7	4.5
Surveys deemed unreliable per DIT-2 rules	8	5.2
Total unusable surveys	15	9.8

Note. These surveys were excluded from analyses for Hypotheses based on inability or unreliability to compare respondents demographically.

Results

Description of the Participant Response

General demographics. The mean age of the participants was 31.9 years old. The age range of respondents between 21 to 29 was 50.7% reporting. The age range of 30 to 39 in addition to the age range of 21 to 29 totaled 85.5% of respondents. They were

predominately male (76.8%), education level was below a bachelor's degree (78.3%), and they worked for a length of time of between 1 and 5 years (50%) in the Ohio Department of Rehabilitations and Corrections. Over one-half of respondents were currently in some college environment, either with a degree or some college experience.

Every prison security level was represented per requirements of this study. More medium and maximum security officers participated in this study, but the numbers were nearly even in representation of prison security level. There are more medium security units in Ohio than other levels, but this did not prevent the numbers from equal representation for security levels. Table 2 illustrates the sample demographics.

Table 2

Sample Demographics

Characteristics	<i>n</i>	% of <i>N</i>
Gender		
Male	106	76.8
Female	32	23.2
Education		
High school graduate/GED	55	39.9
Some college (no degree)	21	15.2
Associate's degree	32	23.2
Bachelor's degree	26	18.8
Advanced degree (Master's degree or beyond)	4	2.9
Age		
21-29	70	50.7
30-39	48	34.8
40-49	14	10.1
50-59	6	4.3
60+	0	0
Overall corrections experience		
Less than 1 year	55	39.9
1-5 years	21	15.2
6-10 years	32	23.2
11-15 years	26	18.8
More than 15 years	4	2.9

Analysis of Data

Descriptive Statistics

The normed-referenced mean DIT-2 score in the personal interest stage for participants is 25.48 ($n = 10,553$, $SD = 12.71$; Bebeau & Thoma, 2003). The mean DIT-2 score of the sample of participants in the personal interest stage is 32.19 ($n = 138$, $SD = 8.72$). This indicates corrections officers overall have an average higher level of morality in personal interest compared to the general participants who take the DIT-2. By security level, the mean DIT-2 score in the personal interest stage for minimum security is 33.55 ($n = 44$, $SD = 10.31$), medium security is 31.53 ($n = 47$, $SD = 7.86$), and maximum security is 31.83 ($n = 47$, $SD = 7.86$; See Table 3). The normed mean DIT-2 score in the maintain norms stage for participants is 32.73 ($n = 10,553$, $SD = 14.00$; Bebeau & Thoma, 2003). The mean DIT-2 score of the sample of participants in the maintain norms stage is 38.10 ($n = 138$, $SD = 10.02$). Corrections officers appear to hold a higher average of maintaining norms and discipline levels than the average participant who takes the DIT-2. By security level, the mean DIT-2 score in the maintain norms stage for minimum security is 37.23 ($n = 44$, $SD = 10.82$), medium security is 38.68 ($n = 47$, $SD = 9.01$), and maximum security is 38.34 ($n = 47$, $SD = 10.45$; See Table 3).

The normed mean COPS score in the gift scenario for participants is 24.50 ($n = 228$, $SD = 5.78$; Mesloh et al, 2003). The mean COPS score of the sample of participants is 19.96 ($n = 138$, $SD = 6.04$). The results of the COPS survey indicate, on an average, corrections officers from ODRC did not appear to believe that taking small gifts from an

inmate was a severe violation, or as severe as the general corrections officer participant. Breaking down the means by security level, the mean for minimum security is 20.84 ($n = 44$, $SD = 6.82$), medium security is 19.32 ($n = 47$, $SD = 4.64$), and maximum security is 19.77 ($n = 47$, $SD = 6.50$; See Table 3). The normed mean COPS score in the theft scenario for participants is 27.01 ($n = 228$, $SD = 5.13$). The mean COPS score of the sample of participants is 22.36 ($n = 138$, $SD = 4.53$). On an average, corrections officers in ODRC did not think taking items from the worksite was as severe as the average participant of the COPS. By security level, the mean score for minimum security is 22.70 ($n = 44$, $SD = 5.03$), medium security is 21.85 ($n = 47$, $SD = 3.93$), and maximum security is 22.55 ($n = 47$, $SD = 4.66$; See Table 3). The scenario of the officer having sexual relations with an inmate was not in the original survey by Mesloh et al (2003). In this survey, the scenario was added, and the sex with an inmate scenario resulted in a mean of 33.58 ($n = 138$, $SD = 3.18$). The range of these scores was a 12 to a 37 with 37 being the maximum. This indicates corrections officers, on an average, thought sexual relations with an inmate in ODRC was a severe violation. Compared to the two other scenarios, the sexual relations with an inmate scenario was more severe than the other two scenarios. By security level the mean for minimum security is 33.52 ($n = 44$, $SD = 3.97$), medium security is 33.57 ($n = 47$, $SD = 3.82$), and maximum security is 33.64 ($n = 47$, $SD = 6.19$; See Table 3). With a mean of 33.58 overall, these results show a high level of morality in not accepting the act of a corrections officer having sexual relations with an inmate. Table 3 illustrates the overall means and means by security level.

Table 3

Overall Means and Means by Security Level

Report		Stage 2/3 ^a	Stage 4	Gift	Theft	Sex	Discipline
Security level							
Max	Mean	31.8292	38.3404	19.7660	22.5532	33.6383	24.1064
	N	47	47	47	47	47	47
	Std. Dev.	7.85554	10.45337	6.49820	4.66163	2.48846	4.30487
	Variance	61.710	109.273	42.227	21.731	6.192	18.532
Med	Mean	31.5319	38.6809	19.3191	21.8511	33.5745	23.2553
	N	47	47	47	47	47	47
	Std. Dev.	7.85978	9.01474	4.64433	3.92859	3.04134	3.81911
	Variance	61.776	81.265	21.570	15.434	9.250	14.586
Min	Mean	33.5455	37.2273	20.8409	22.7045	33.5227	23.7273
	N	44	44	44	44	44	44
	Std. Dev.	10.30569	10.81959	6.81975	5.02820	3.96783	4.45841
	Variance	106.207	117.063	46.509	25.283	15.744	19.877
Overall	Mean	32.2754	38.1014	19.9565	22.3623	33.5797	23.6957
	N	138	138	138	138	138	138
	Std. Dev.	8.69329	10.05481	6.03502	4.53364	3.18255	4.18131
	Variance	75.573	101.099	36.421	20.554	10.129	17.483

Note. ^a Stage 2/3 is the personal interest stage in the DIT-2, Stage 4 is the maintaining norms stage in the DIT-2. Gift, theft, and sex titles are the scenarios in the COPS, and discipline is the discipline variable in the COPS surveys explaining whether a corrections officer should or would take appropriate action after observing another officer commit a violation from the scenarios.

General Analysis

The data were analyzed to determine if they met the assumptions of the tests to be performed. Scores for the DIT-2 and the COPS were both determined to be approximately symmetric. In addition, the scores on both tests maintained normality for the subsets based on the scenarios presented. Results were linear and monotonic, and evaluation of the variances indicated the differences in variance were not large enough to violate the assumption of homoscedasticity.

Hypothesis Testing

Hypothesis 1 indicated whether there was a significant difference between workplace morality (as measured by the COPS) and morality in general (as measured by the DIT-2) of corrections officers between security levels of prison units.

H1₀: There is no significant difference between workplace-related morality (as measured by the COPS) and morality in general (as measured by the DIT-2) of corrections officers between security levels of prison units.

Pollock (2012) discussed morality levels of officers and indicated an officer should regularly hold the same levels of morality inside and outside the workplace. In the literature review, it was noted that officers commit violations in the line of duty that can result in disciplinary sanctions up to and including termination of their employment. The analyzed data showed the means of the DIT-2 and the COPS surveys. The normed-referenced mean DIT-2 score in the personal interest stage for participants is 25.48 ($n = 10,553$, $SD = 12.71$; Bebeau & Thoma, 2003). The mean DIT-2 score of the sample of participants in the personal interest stage is 32.19 ($n = 138$, $SD = 8.72$). The normed mean DIT-2 score in the maintain norms stage for participants is 32.73 ($n = 10,553$, $SD = 14.00$; Bebeau & Thoma, 2003). The mean DIT-2 score of the sample of participants in the maintain norms stage is 38.10 ($n = 138$, $SD = 10.02$; See Table 3).

The normed mean COPS score in the gift scenario for participants is 24.50 ($n = 228$, $SD = 5.78$; Mesloh et al., 2003). The mean COPS score of the sample of participants is 19.96 ($n = 138$, $SD = 6.04$). The normed mean COPS score in the theft scenario for participants is 27.01 ($n = 228$, $SD = 5.13$). The mean COPS score of the sample of

participants is 22.36 ($n = 138$, $SD = 4.53$; See Table 3). The sex with an inmate scenario resulted in a mean of 33.58 ($n = 138$, $SD = 3.18$). The range of these scores was a 12 to a 37 with 37 being the maximum.

A multiple regression analysis was conducted to determine if there was a relationship between security levels, general morality, and workplace morality. The multiple regression analysis showed that the participants in the DIT-2 did not score apparently significantly higher than average on the COPS, and there was no apparent significance between security levels (see Table 4). Thus, based on the results of this multiple regression analysis, the null hypothesis that morality in general is not significantly different than workplace morality was accepted. The data indicated corrections officers had the same morality levels outside of the workplace as well as inside the workplace regardless of security level worked. Table 4 illustrates the multiple regression analysis of morality between security levels.

Table 4

Multiple Regression Analysis Between Security Levels of Morality

ANOVA ^a		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig
Model						
1	Regression	64.906	1	64.906	.858	.356 ¹
	Residual	10288.630	136	75.652		
	Total	10353.536	137			
Model						
2	Regression	25.199	1	25.199	.690	.408 ¹
	Residual	4964.540	136	36.504		
	Total	4989.739	137			
Model						
3	Regression	.407	1	.407	.020	.889 ¹
	Residual	2815.477	136	20.702		
	Total	2815.884	137			
Model						
4	Regression	.304	1	.304	.030	.863 ¹
	Residual	1387.319	136	10.201		
	Total	1387.623	137			

Note. ^a The ANOVA models are from the scenarios. Model 1 is the dependent variable from the personal stage scenarios from the DIT-2. Models 2, 3, and 4 are the dependent variables from the COPS scenarios. Model 2 is the gift from an inmate scenario, Model 3 is the theft from unit scenario, and Model 4 is the sex with an inmate scenario. The significance is the predictor (constant) of the security levels of the prison units.

Hypothesis 2 indicated whether there was a significant difference between workplace-related morality (as measured by the COPS) and morality in general (as measured by the DIT-2) of corrections officers within minimum security prison units.

H2₀: There is no significant difference between workplace-related morality (as measured by the COPS) and morality in general (as measured by the DIT-2) of corrections officers within minimum security prison units.

The next three hypotheses indicated if there was an apparent significant difference within the particular security level worked and general and workplace morality. The normed mean DIT-2 score in the personal interest stage for participants is 25.48 ($n =$

10,553, $SD = 12.71$; Bebeau & Thoma, 2003). The mean DIT-2 score of the sample of participants who work in a minimum security prison unit in the personal interest stage is 33.55 ($n = 44$, $SD = 10.31$). A one sample t test showed that corrections officers that work in a minimum security prison unit did not as a whole score significantly higher than average on the DIT-2 personal interest stage.

The normed mean COPS score in the gift scenario for participants is 24.50 ($n = 228$, $SD = 5.78$; Mesloh et al, 2003). The mean COPS score of the sample of participants who work in a minimum security prison unit is 20.84 ($n = 44$, $SD = 6.82$). The normed mean COPS score in the theft scenario for participants is 27.01 ($n = 228$, $SD = 5.13$). The mean COPS score of the sample of participants who work in a minimum security prison unit is 22.70 ($n = 44$, $SD = 5.03$). A one sample t test showed that corrections officers working in a minimum security prison unit did not as a whole score significantly higher than average on the COPS gift and theft scenarios.

The sex with an inmate scenario resulted in a mean of 33.58 ($n = 138$, $SD = 3.18$). The mean COPS score of the sample of participants who work in a minimum security prison unit is 33.52 ($n = 44$, $SD = 3.97$). These results show that corrections officers working in a minimum security prison unit did not score significantly higher than the total sample of corrections officers.

Thus, based on the results of the tests, the null hypothesis that morality in general is not significant different than workplace morality for corrections officers working in a minimum security prison unit was accepted. The data indicated corrections officers had

the same morality levels outside of the workplace as well as inside the workplace (See Table 3).

Hypothesis 3 indicated whether there was a significant difference between workplace-related morality (as measured by the COPS) and morality in general (as measured by the DIT-2) of corrections officers within medium security prison units.

H_{3_0} : There is no significant difference between workplace-related morality (as measured by the COPS) and morality in general (as measured by the DIT-2) of corrections officers within medium security prison units.

The normed mean DIT-2 score in the personal interest stage for participants is 25.48 ($n = 10,553$, $SD = 12.71$; Bebeau & Thoma, 2003). The mean DIT-2 score of the sample of participants who work in a medium security prison unit in the personal interest stage is 31.53 ($n = 47$, $SD = 7.86$). A one sample t test showed that corrections officers that work in a medium security prison unit did not as a whole score significantly higher than average on the DIT-2 personal interest stage.

The normed mean COPS score in the gift scenario for participants is 24.50 ($n = 228$, $SD = 5.78$; Mesloh et al, 2003). The mean COPS score of the sample of participants who work in a medium security prison unit is 19.32 ($n = 47$, $SD = 4.64$). The normed mean COPS score in the theft scenario for participants is 27.01 ($n = 228$, $SD = 5.13$). The mean COPS score of the sample of participants who work in a medium security prison unit is 21.85 ($n = 47$, $SD = 3.93$). A one sample t test showed that corrections officers working in a medium security prison unit did not as a whole score significantly higher than average on the COPS gift and theft scenarios.

The sex with an inmate scenario resulted in a mean of 33.58 ($n = 138$, $SD = 3.18$). The mean COPS score of the sample of participants who work in a medium security prison unit is 33.57 ($n = 47$, $SD = 3.04$). These results show that corrections officers working in a medium security prison unit did not score significantly higher than the total sample of corrections officers.

Thus, based on the results of the tests, the null hypothesis that morality in general is not significant different than workplace morality for corrections officers working in a medium security prison unit was accepted. The data indicated corrections officers had the same morality levels outside of the workplace as well as inside the workplace (See Table 3).

Hypothesis 4 indicated whether there was a significant difference between workplace-related morality (as measured by the COPS) and morality in general (as measured by the DIT-2) of corrections officers within maximum security prison units.

H4₀: There is no significant difference between workplace-related morality (as measured by the COPS) and morality in general (as measured by the DIT-2) of corrections officers within maximum security prison units.

The normed mean DIT-2 score in the personal interest stage for participants is 25.48 ($n = 10,553$, $SD = 12.71$; Bebeau & Thoma, 2003). The mean DIT-2 score of the sample of participants who work in a maximum security prison unit in the personal interest stage is 31.83 ($n = 47$, $SD = 7.86$). A one sample *t* test showed that corrections officers that work in a maximum security prison unit did not as a whole score significantly higher than average on the DIT-2 personal interest stage.

The normed mean COPS score in the gift scenario for participants is 24.50 ($n = 228$, $SD = 5.78$; Mesloh et al, 2003). The mean COPS score of the sample of participants who work in a maximum security prison unit is 19.77 ($n = 47$, $SD = 6.50$). The normed mean COPS score in the theft scenario for participants is 27.01 ($n = 228$, $SD = 5.13$). The mean COPS score of the sample of participants who work in a maximum security prison unit is 22.55 ($n = 47$, $SD = 4.66$). A one sample t test showed that corrections officers working in a maximum security prison unit did not as a whole score significantly higher than average on the COPS gift and theft scenarios.

The sex with an inmate scenario resulted in a mean of 33.58 ($n = 138$, $SD = 3.18$). The mean COPS score of the sample of participants who work in a maximum security prison unit is 33.64 ($n = 47$, $SD = 6.19$). These results show that corrections officers working in a maximum security prison unit did not score significantly higher than the total sample of corrections officers.

Thus, based on the results of the tests, the null hypothesis that morality in general is not significant different than workplace morality for corrections officers working in a maximum security prison unit was accepted. The data indicated corrections officers had the same morality levels outside of the workplace as well as inside the workplace (See Table 3).

There was no apparent significant difference between the security level of the prison unit worked and levels of morality in general and levels of morality in the workplace with corrections officers. All scenarios in the COPS and the DIT-2 showed no apparent significant difference in any scenario.

Additional Analyses

According to Mesloh et al. (2003) corrections officers tend to recognize violations, but may not be as apt to report the violation or provide a proper sanction according to the rules and regulations. The DIT-2 has a stage listed for maintain norms. According to Bedau and Thoma (2003) the maintaining norms stage is similar to the discipline section of the COPS. It was important to note if there was a significant difference between and within security levels for maintaining norms and discipline. Separating discipline as a factor from the COPS was another new area that was not performed originally on the COPS survey from Mesloh et al. (2003). The discipline questions within each COPS scenario was scored separately to determine if corrections officers would or should impose discipline sanctions on corrections officers if they caught a peer committing a violation in the scenario. The maximum score is a 37 on all discipline scales from the COPS.

The normed mean DIT-2 score in the maintain norms stage for participants is 32.73 ($n = 10,553$, $SD = 14.00$; Bebeau & Thoma, 2003). The mean DIT-2 score of the sample of participants in the maintain norms stage is 38.10 ($n = 138$, $SD = 10.02$). The overall mean score for discipline in the COPS scenarios was a 23.70 ($n = 138$, $SD = 4.18$). A multiple regression analysis was run to determine if there was a relationship between maintaining norms outside of the workplace and assigning appropriate discipline in the workplace. The multiple regression analysis showed the participants in the DIT-2 did not score apparently significantly higher than average on the COPS and there was no apparent significance between maintaining norms generally and discipline in the

workplace (see Table 5). Thus, based on the results of this multiple regression analysis, maintaining norms is not significantly different than discipline in the workplace.

Within security level the mean score for minimum security is 23.73 ($n = 44$, $SD = 4.46$), medium security is 23.25 ($n = 47$, $SD = 3.82$), and maximum security is 24.11 ($n = 47$, $SD = 4.30$; See Table 3). The mean results support Mesloh et al. (2003) on the theory that corrections officers will generally maintain norms away from the workplace and recognize violations in the workplace, but are hesitant to apply an appropriate sanction to the officer who commits the violation. Table 5 illustrates the multiple regression analysis between security levels of norms and discipline.

Table 5

Multiple Regression Analysis Between Security Levels of Norms and Discipline

ANOVA ^a		Sum of Squares	<i>df</i>	Mean Square	<i>F</i>	Sig
Model						
1	Regression	27.159	1	27.159	.267	.606 ¹
	Residual	13823.421	136	101.643		
	Total	13850.580	137			
Model						
2	Regression	3.529	1	3.529	.201	.655 ¹
	Residual	2391.689	136	17.586		
	Total	2395.217	137			

Note. ^a The ANOVA models are from the scenarios. Model 1 is the dependent variable from the maintain norms from the DIT-2. Model 2 is the dependent variable of discipline from the COPS scenarios. The significance is the predictor (constant) of the security levels of the prison units.

Summary

This research was conducted in an effort to discover whether or not there was a significant difference between morality in general and workplace morality of corrections officers working in the Ohio Department of Rehabilitations and Corrections. Four pairs

of hypotheses were tested in this study; each pair representing a hypothesis keyed for either an overall significant difference or a significant difference of the security level of the prison unit the corrections officer work for. A statistically significant difference between morality in general and workplace morality were compared to the population of the Ohio Department of Rehabilitations and Corrections. Furthermore, inner-group analyses found no apparent significant difference overall or between the security level of the prison unit worked. There does not appear to be a negative correlation found between morality in general and workplace morality.

Chapter 5 presents the major conclusions of this study and conclusions drawn from the data. It examines the implications of social change and shows potential application of these findings, including recommendations for future action and further study.

Chapter 5: Discussion, Conclusions, and Recommendations

The purpose of the present study was to examine varying levels of morality awareness among corrections officers and to address limitations of previous studies. Previous studies focused on other law enforcement agencies and their employees and have been qualitative and quantitative in nature. This current study was beneficial because it researched the varying levels of morality awareness in corrections officers and indicated results administrators have concerns regarding corrections officers.

This chapter begins with an overview interpreting the data results, an interpretation of the findings from the data results, limitations of the study with internal, external, and statistical validity. Recommendations from the study, including action and future research, and implications for positive social change will be discussed from this study.

Overview

The morality awareness levels were measured on two instruments: the DIT-2 and the COPS. The average DIT-2 scores of individuals were not significantly higher than average compared to all individuals who took the DIT-2 on the personal interest stage, nor was it significantly higher than average on the maintain norms stage. These results showed that corrections officers have the same levels of morality as the general public inside and outside of their work environment. There was no significant difference between any of the security levels of prison units in which corrections officers worked, and no one security level showed more significance in general morality than the others.

These results showed general morality of corrections officers outside of their work environment was not significantly different based on the security level of the prison unit.

The average COPS scores of individuals were not significantly higher than average on any of the scenarios. Corrections officers did not feel any one of the scenarios was significantly different than the others in terms of morality and making a decision on the scenario. The gift scenario and the theft scenario average were not significant in the difference between security levels of the prison unit's corrections officers' work. Those who worked in a minimum security prison unit did not significantly average higher in the gift scenario ($M = 20.84$) or the theft scenario ($M = 22.70$) than those who worked in a medium security prison unit for the gift scenario ($M = 19.32$) or the theft scenario ($M = 21.85$) or in the maximum security prison unit for the gift scenario ($M = 19.77$) or the theft scenario ($M = 22.55$). The sex with an inmate scenario was not in the original Mesloh et al. (2003) survey, but in this measurement, there was no significant difference between officers who worked in the minimum security unit ($M = 33.52$) compared to officers who worked in a medium security unit ($M = 33.57$) or officers who worked in a maximum security unit ($M = 33.64$). The scores were higher based on the range of scores indicating corrections officers take this scenario more seriously as a violation than the other two scenarios. There was no significant difference between security levels in terms of a difference between general morality and morality in the workplace.

Interpretation of the Findings

Morial (2006) discussed that inmates are consistently observing corrections officers, and thus it is important officers are cognizant in their actions and behaviors.

Training, or refreshers, is important to remind an officer of his or her morals and ethics. Morality surveys may bring about positive behavioral changes in corrections officers, and that morality surveyed incorporates a wide variety of task-specific dimensions that are present in corrections officers (e.g., reporting, security duties, and interactions with inmates; Pollock, 2012). Indicated by the results of these surveys, it is noted that officers have no apparent significant difference with morality outside or inside their work environment based on the security level of prison unit they are currently assigned.

Individual dimensions of morality may have a synergistic effect on other dimensions, and the overall morality survey results support a number of areas, including appropriate workplace behavior, general morality, and proper discipline. Ingstrup (2000) stated that a person's ethics and values are tested when a difficult situation arises. The situations in the surveys were not unique but can happen inside and outside the workplace. The only positive effects of morality are that corrections officers tend to recognize the violations of behavior in their units, and officers are aware of their morals inside and outside of the workplace. Unfortunately, inside the workplace, they are still slightly unwilling to report the behavior to their supervisors as indicated in previous research from Mesloh et al. (2003). The scenario of taking gifts from an inmate scenario averaged a lower mean score than the theft from the facility scenario, but it was not a significant difference in scores. This would appear that officers might feel if the gift is small or of little worth and no favors are exchanged, the small gift of no value is viewed as less severe than the theft scenario. Corrections officers feel that stealing from the facility is not acceptable, but with a lower mean score some officers might feel taking

small items such as pencils, pens, or paper is not a real violation and excuses this behavior. The scenario of sexual relations with an inmate scored higher than the means of the taking gifts from an inmate scenario and stealing from the facility scenario. It is important to note that corrections officers take this violation more seriously and were more willing to report this violation than the other violations. An explanation for these results of data could be from the Prison Rape Elimination Act of 2003 and the training by correctional agencies to enforce these rules. Corrections officers may take this violation more seriously because of the act and work to ensure no violation of this act occurs due to sanctions that can be enforced for violating the act.

An individual with high morality proposes that a person's ethical reasoning will assist them in making proper decisions for the benefit of self and others (Pollock, 2012). This can be directly related to the experiences of what officers train and prepare for in scenarios. Refresher training on a regular basis incorporates and reminds officers of the moral decisions and actions they need to incorporate in their daily lives. This morality correlates from the work environment to the personal life environment and includes the social component to improve one's life and decision-making. Pollock (2012) stated that as morality training combines activities with intellectual pursuits, it increases the probability that it may positively influence both morality and decision-making. The findings support the hypothesis that there is no significant difference between morality in the workplace and morality in general, regardless of security level of prison unit in which a corrections officer is working.

Limitations of the Study

External Validity

Threats to external validity were minimized to the greatest extent possible. The survey instruments had good construct validity, founded in the theory of morality with clearly operational definitions and measurable indicators. Participants completed the surveys in settings of their choosing, increasing ecological validity by allowing participants to participate in their natural settings. The primary limitations to the generalizability of the results concern the volunteer effect and nonprobability, convenience nature of the sample. It is possible that those who volunteered to participate in the study had higher levels of morality or interest in the topic due to other factors, leading them to participate in the study.

The sample of corrections officers presented in this study was gathered from prison units all over the state of Ohio, recruited in person on public property outside of the prison units. Word of mouth between corrections officers was another way of word being passed through the system to gather data, but those efforts were initiated from the corrections officers and unknown to the researcher. While efforts were made to collect a statewide sample of respondents that was representative of the population of corrections officers in Ohio, there is no list of corrections officers that could have been used to draw a truly random sample. Thus, the results may not be generalizable to the population of corrections officers as a whole. It is possible there is a sector of corrections officers who did not know of the study through recruitment methods due to vacations, significant sick time, or administrative reasons that prevented them from being at the work site compared

to those who participated, and this portion of the population may differ significantly from the sample in general and morality. Replication of the study should support the validity of these results and improve the generalizability.

Internal Validity

Threats to internal validity were addressed with equal concern. The sample's internal consistency was high for both of the results of the DIT-2 and the COPS. Since the study was a one-time measurement of morality levels, threats to internal validity from security levels and the survey scores were nonexistent because it is a relationship between variables and not based on causation. Instrumentation was standardized by having all participants take the surveys using the Internet format. No paper copies were printed for use in any prison units. Participants were chosen without prior knowledge of their morality levels because one cannot randomly assign morality. Subjects were selected by their profession as a corrections officer, but the sample was not restricted to the length of service. No variables were manipulated in this study.

While the survey was 40 minutes long, only seven participants neglected to complete the entire survey. All participants acknowledged the consent form by participating in the survey online. It is possible that those who chose not to complete the survey were frustrated at the length of the survey or felt their responses would be shared with their supervisors despite being informed their information was anonymous. A couple may have reviewed the survey, considered their responses, and then returned to complete the survey by only answering particular questions or providing false responses.

The sample of norms on which the DIT-2 is based is predominantly male, while the population of corrections officers for this study was predominantly male. While the designers of the DIT-2 reported that the results of male and female respondents were not significantly different (Bebau & Thoma, 2003), it is possible that there is indeed a significant difference between morality awareness levels for males and females, and this would affect the results of the analyses performed.

Statistical Validity

Initial analysis of the sample data verified that it conformed to the underlying assumptions of the analyses to be performed. The sample size was more than the required minimum for effect size, reducing the potential for sampling error and increasing the statistical power of the test. The study itself may have limitations in the statistics in the method conducted to acquire the data. Corrections officers may have indicated what they say they would feel and do versus what they actually feel and do about the scenarios presented. This would affect the statistical validity in the results about how morality and decisions officers would make in respect to if they would actually report another officer or impose proper discipline if that officer were caught committing the act. In self-report measures, a participant can state on a survey what the researcher may want to hear instead of what they really feel and want to do in situations (Babbie, 2004).

Recommendations

No significant difference between morality in general and workplace morality has been found, and no significant difference was found between security levels of a prison unit. The first step in determining future studies would be to replicate this one and verify

the results. Working with multiple state prison units or prison units on a national level might provide a more varied sample. Once a significant difference between morality in general and workplace morality has been verified, a causal effect could be hypothesized and examined as to why the significant difference in morality occurred with corrections officers.

An experimental design with a pretest-posttest control group design could be used to enhance the effects of morality in general and workplace morality scores. If the same effect size as used in this study is assumed, 45 participants will be needed for an experimental group with 45 more in a control group, for a total of 90 participants, multiplied by three levels of security for a total of 270 participants. This would make six groups of 45 participants each, a size ideal for the officers' environment, and allow for the social involvement necessary for researching morality awareness.

It was important to establish if age, gender, or an education level of a corrections officer could be expected to result in any significant difference between a security level in terms of general morality awareness and morality in the workplace. It is possible age, gender, and a higher education level may have a minor effect on morality in general and in the workplace, but no significant difference was observed in this study. An investigation measuring the differences in morality levels would help establish if there is a significant difference for corrections officers between their general morality and workplace morality based on age, gender, and education level. It would also help to note if there is a difference in the reporting levels of corrections officers observing if a corrections officer is more likely to report another corrections officer for violating

policies and procedures at the prison unit being worked in. Corrections officers were not as likely to report another corrections officer for violating policies in this study, but it is unknown what a corrections officer would actually do in their workplace.

Other relationships to consider is length of service overall and length of service at the prison unit currently being worked in. These data were collected for this study, and no significant difference was noted between morality in general and morality in the workplace. This is an area that can be researched further to determine if length of service overall has any significance in varying levels of morality. Length of service at the current unit may have a significant difference if a corrections officer is assigned to a particular unit for a certain length of time. The difference can be noted for an officer who may have served a length of time overall but was recently assigned to a new unit because of promotion or transfer. Corrections officer can have a renewed sense of job performance upon promotion or transfer. A new environment can be mentally stimulating that prevents complacency to the job. The data collected for these variables can be explored in more detail in future studies with these questions as a possible hypothesis. It is possible any one of these, with research, may have a significant difference on morality in general and morality in the workplace. Researchers may also discover if there is a significant difference in whether a corrections officer is more willing to report another corrections officer for violating policies and procedures.

In the process of completing this study, 138 surveys were collected from corrections officers in Ohio. Although this study focused on corrections officers in Ohio, this data would be a good start for a comparative study of corrections officer nationwide

in other state facilities and federal facilities. A simple study of the means showed there were no significant differences. While the DIT-2 has been extensively studied with different college populations, the COPS was not standardized for all corrections populations and may not provide valid data. Many corrections facilities may have developed different types of security levels that may not reflect a standard minimum, medium, and maximum security level and the COPS would have to be designed differently to reflect another prison's standards of security levels. Future researchers using this literature and research study may want to consider the setup of the prison system in the state they are researching. Not every prison system uses the same standard security level of minimum, medium and maximum. Some systems may have numbered levels or a tier system that has been recently implemented. Future researchers need to consider the classification system of that prison system. Other considerations are the survey tools and procedures to be used to acquire data from corrections officers. Time is critical and researchers need to remember officers are sometimes mandated to overtime and may not have a lot of time to complete surveys. A final consideration is the training for PREA as prescribed by the state prison system.

Implications for Positive Social Change

Morality is an important part of a person's lifestyle and assists in decision-making. It may have the potential to improve an individual's life experience not only for themselves, but for their families and others around them. As noted in the previous literature review, there is a causal link between morality and how a person performs their duties in law enforcement (Pollock, 2012) in which those with higher levels of morality

tend to perform their job with better relations with others and a high regard for performing under the policies and procedures outlined in their job description. Individuals who abide by morality standards tend to stay employed and have fewer complaints reported against them (Pollock, 2012).

It is good for society to have correctional officers who are highly moral and ethical because they are standard setters for inmates in the prison system. Inmates see corrections officers all day and the inmates observe the officers' actions. According to Cheeseman, Mullings and Marquart (2001) if an officer is moral and ethical, a standard is set inmates may follow and may assist inmates not to become a statistic of recidivism. Changing the culture of prison and prison inmates is important to reduce recidivism. Cocoran (2005) states if an officer is immoral and unethical, inmates may feel officers are no better than they are and may not feel a need to change their ways. Pollock (2012) states officers are role models for populations of all areas, including cities, suburbs and prisons. A question to think about for future research and implications for positive social change is to come up with a method of testing for significant differences in morality levels inside and outside the workplace. If a method of testing could be made, it could be used in the prescreening process for hiring corrections officers helping to eliminate unethical corrections officers and preventing more possible violations and disciplinary actions against officers. Screening could initiate during psychological testing to look for patterns of unethical behavior in addition to the standard psychological testing used in departments today. These preventions could help save departments money in training

new officers to replace terminated ones and save money in court costs if there is no lawsuit to present for unethical behavior.

Corrections officers who are highly moral and ethical will also save money for the system they are employed and are less likely to incur expensive lawsuits. In a time where government budgets are in question for spending, a criminal justice agency is looking to save as much taxpayer money as possible and provide sufficient services to inmates for rehabilitation. Corrections officers with high morality are not as likely to commit violations meaning they are as likely to remain employed saving money on training new officers to replace the ones terminated for unethical acts. According to Anderson, Dyson, Burns and Taylor (1998) law enforcement agencies spend a lot of money in their budget to train new officers and screen potential candidates to get ready for a new job. Some of these new potential candidates do not make it through the employment screening process and a small percentage drop out of training after completing the prescreening process costing a department money that could have been used for a potential candidate who would stay. If an officer does not need to be replaced, the department saves money in training new officers. Another area to save money is from civil litigation from inmates. If an officer commits a civil violation against an inmate, the corrections officer in question could face a lawsuit against them and the department they are employed. If the officer is found guilty and the state is found liable, the state has to pay damages to the inmate. This money could have been saved if the corrections officer were adhering to moral and ethical standards.

If these findings are supported by future research, then in practice mental health professionals at all levels might recommend or support extended hours of ethics and morality training for all professionals in the criminal justice field. This would be important for those who feel they are stagnant in their career and becoming complacent in their duties as a corrections officer or any other part of the criminal justice field. This would be especially important in annual refresher training or in formal situations of discipline where an employee committed a minor infraction of rules and procedures and was given a second chance to improve their professional relations. It would aid those who maintain a high level of morality of reminding them of policies and procedures and how to handle relations with any individual whom they encounter in their profession and not to compromise their morals with inmates or other criminals. Socially competent and ethical individuals in the profession of criminal justice are better able to deal with life stressors and take proper action against any and all individuals when needed and required.

Conclusion

According to the ethical climate theory, an individual's ability to take proper actions, or react appropriately, to a situation is influenced by the moral standards one believes in (Pollock, 2012). Morality awareness is relevant in many different circumstances, with a wide range of categories in addition to the overall general sense of morality. With incidents occurring in the criminal justice system in all agencies, it is important to ensure that individuals react appropriately when dealing with others, do not use excessive force, and do not compromise their integrity and professional standards.

Morality awareness encourages individuals to assess any situation, prepare for the worst situation, and try to de-escalate an incident before it gets out of control and requires force to resolve it. The opportunity to resolve an incident peacefully and without further incident is good for psychological health, but also for improving general and workplace morality in a supportive, enjoyable environment.

References

- Anderson, J., Dyson, L., Burns, J., & Taylor, K. (1998). Preemployment screening and training could reduce excessive force litigation cases. *Journal of Police and Criminal Psychology, 13*(1), 12-24. doi:10.1007/bf02819063
- Babbie, E. (2004). *The practice of social research* (10th ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth/Thomson.
- Bailey, K. D. (1994). *Methods of social research* (4th ed.). New York, NY: The Free Press.
- Barker, T. (2011). *Police ethics: Crisis in law enforcement* (3rd ed.). Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas LTD.
- Bebau, M. J., & Thoma, S. J. (2003). *Guide for DIT-2: A guide for using the defining issues test, version 2*. Center for the Study of Ethical Development. University of Minnesota.
- Bedau, H. A. (2004). *Killing as punishment: Reflections on the death penalty in America* (1st ed.). York, PA: Maple Press.
- Burkholder, G. (2007). Sample size analysis for quantitative studies [Electronic version]. Retrieved from <http://sylvan.live.college.com>
- Cheeseman, K. A., Mullings, J. L., & Marquart, J. W. (2001). Inmate perceptions of security staff across various custody levels. *Corrections Management Quarterly, 5*(2), 41. Retrieved from the Proquest Database.
- Corcoran, R. (2005). Changing prison culture. *Corrections Today, 67*(2), 24-27. Retrieved from the Ebscohost database.

- Creswell, J. W. (2007). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five traditions* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Dumond, R. (2000). Inmate sexual assault: The plague that persists. *Prison Journal*, 80(4), 407-414. doi:10.1177/0032885500080004006
- Dutton, G. (2004, July 18). Workers evade charges despite sex allegations. *The Columbus Dispatch*. Retrieved from <http://nl.newsbank.com/nl-search/we/Archives>
- Farkas, M. (1999). Correctional officer attitudes toward inmates and working with inmates in a “get tough” era. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 27(6), 495-506. doi:10.1016/s0047-2352(99)00020-3
- Farkas, M. (2001). Correctional officers: What factors influence work attitudes? *Corrections Management Quarterly*, 5(2), 20-26. Retrieved from the Proquest Database.
- Forty percent of sex assaults in jails involve officers. (2005). *Juvenile Justice Digest*, 33(15), 4. Retrieved from the National Institute of Corrections Website.
- GAO study finds staff sexual misconduct underreported in women’s prisons. (2000). *Corrections Forum*, 9(1), 34. Retrieved from the National Institute of Corrections Website.
- Haarr, R. N. (2001). The making of a community policing officer: The impact of basic training and occupational socialization on police recruits. *Police Quarterly*, 4(4), 402-433. doi:10.1177/109861101129197923
- Hemmens, C., & Stohr, M. (2001a). Attitudes of correctional staff. *Corrections Management Quarterly*, 5(2), VI-VII. Retrieved from the National Institute of

Corrections Website.

Hemmens, C., & Stohr, M. (2001b). Correctional staff attitudes regarding the use of force in corrections. *Corrections Management Quarterly*, 5(2), 27-40. Retrieved from the National Institute of Corrections Website.

Henry, M. (1998). Unethical staff behavior. *Corrections Today*, 60(3), 112-117. Retrieved from the Proquest Database.

Hickman, M., Piquero, A., & Greene, J. (2000). Discretion and gender disproportionality in police disciplinary systems. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management*, 23(1), 105-116. doi:10.1108/13639510010314643

Hunter, R. (1999). Officer opinions on police misconduct. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice*, 15(2), 155-170. doi:10.1177/1043986299015002004

Ingstrup, O. (2000). *Making ethics work*. American Correctional Association Annual Meeting. San Antonio, TX.

Katzer, J., Cook, K., & Crouch, W. (1998). *Evaluating information: A guide for users of social science research*. New York, NY: McGraw Hill.

Kleinig, J., & Smith, M. L. (2005). Discretion, community, and correctional ethics. *Criminal Justice Ethics*, 24(1), 63. Retrieved from the Proquest Database.

Klockars, C. B., Ivkovich, S. K., & Haberfeld, M. R. (2007). *Enhancing police integrity* (2nd ed.). The Netherlands: AA Dordrecht.

Klofas, J. (1986). Discretion among correctional officers: The influence of urbanization, age, and race. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 30(2), 111-124. Retrieved from the Ebscohost Database.

- Klofas, J., & Toch, H. (1982). Guard subculture myth. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 19(2), 238-254. doi:10.1177/002242788201900207
- Lambert, E., Hogan, N., & Barton, S. (2002). Building commitment among correctional staff. *Corrections Compendium*, 27(3), 1-10. Retrieved from the Ebscohost Database.
- Layman, E., McCampbell, S., & Moss, A. (2000). Sexual misconduct in corrections. *American Jails*, 14(5), 23. Retrieved from the Ebscohost Database.
- Lersch, K., & Mieczkowski, T. (2000). An examination of the convergence and divergence of internal and external allegations of misconduct filed against police officers. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management*, 23(1), 54-68. doi:10.1108/13639510010314616
- Lipsey, M. W., & Wilson, D. B. (1993). The efficacy of psychological, educational, and behavioral treatment. *American Psychologist*, 48(12), 1181-1209. doi:10.1037/0003-066x.48.12.1181
- Maahs, J., & Pratt, T. (2001). Uncovering the predictors of correctional officers' attitudes and behaviors: A meta-analysis. *Corrections Management Quarterly*, 5(2), 13-19. Retrieved from the Ebscohost Database.
- Macvean, A., & Cox, C. (2012). Police education in a university setting: Emerging cultures and attitudes. *Policing*, 6(1), 16-25. doi:10.1093/police/par060
- Maxfield, M., & Babbie, E. (2001). *Research methods for criminal justice and criminology*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth/Thomson.
- Mesloh, C., Wolf, R., & Henych, M. (2003). Perceptions of misconduct: An examination

of ethics at one correctional institution. *Corrections Compendium*, 28(5), 1-19.

Retrieved from the Ebscohost Database.

Metcalf, B., & Dick, G. (2000). Is the force still with you? Measuring police commitment. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 15(8), 812-832.
doi:10.1108/02683940010379369

Milks, R. (2007). Inmate escort: Maintaining professionalism at all times. *Corrections Today*, 69(1), 16-17. Retrieved from the Ebscohost Database.

Mohr, G. C. (2011). *The Ohio Department of Rehabilitations and Corrections Annual Report*. [Electronic version]. Retrieved from
http://www.drc.ohio.gov/web/drc_2011_annual_report.pdf

Morial, M. (2006, June 28). Transforming prison culture. *The Seattle Medium*.

National Institute of Justice. (2007). About the Prison Rape Elimination Act. Retrieved from <http://www.nij.gov/topics/corrections/institutional/prison-rape/prea.html>

Ohio's Custodial Sexual Misconduct Statute. *Prisoners in 1999*, Bureau of Justice Statistics Bulletin, August 2000 NCJ 183476.

Palmiotto, M. (2001). *Police misconduct: A reader for the 21st century*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Pollock, J. M. (2012). *Ethical Dilemmas and Discussions in Criminal Justice* (7th ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Reynolds, S. J. (2006). Moral awareness and ethical predispositions: Investigating the role of individual differences in the recognition of moral issues. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91(1), 233-243. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.91.1.233

- Rothwell, G. R., & Baldwin, N. (2007). Ethical climate theory, whistle-blowing, and the code of silence in police agencies in the State of Georgia. *Journal of Business Ethics, 70*(4), 341-361. doi:10.1007/s10551-006-9114-5
- Sexual assaults in prison during 2004. (2005). *Corrections Forum, 14*(5), 5. Retrieved from the National Institute of Corrections Website.
- Stohr, M., Hemmens, C., Kifer, M., & Schoeler, M. (2000). We know it, we just have to do it: Perceptions of ethical work in prisons and jails. *The Prison Journal, 80*(2), 126-150. doi:10.1177/0032885500080002002
- Stohr, M., Hemmens, C., Marsh, R., Barrier, G., & Palhegyi, D. (2000). Can't scale this? The ethical parameters of correctional work. *The Prison Journal, 80*(1), 56-79. doi:10.1177/0032885500080001004
- Stojkovic, S., Kalinich, D., & Klofas, J. (2002). *Criminal Justice Organizations* (3rd ed.). West/Wadsworth Publishing.
- Stop Prisoner Rape Report. (2003). *The sexual abuse of female inmates in Ohio*. Los Angeles, CA: Stop Prisoner Rape Report.
- Struckman-Johnson, C., & Struckman-Johnson, D. (2002). Sexual coercion reported by women in three Midwestern prisons. *Journal of Sex Research, 39*(3), 217-228. doi:10.1080/00224490209552144
- Swope, R. (2001). Bad apples or bad barrel? *Law and Order, 49*(1), 80-86. Retrieved from the Ebscohost Database.
- Tellier, C., Dowden, C., Fournier, J., & Franson, J. (2001). *Correctional officers professional orientation scales*. Correctional Service, Canada: Research Branch.

- Toch, H., & Klofas, J. (1982). Alienation and desire for job enrichment among correction officers. *Federal Probation, 46*(1), 35-43. Retrieved from the ProQuest database.
- Weisburd, D., Greenspan, R., Hamilton, E., Williams, H., & Bryant, K. (2000). *Police attitudes toward abuse of authority: Findings from a national study*. Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice.
- Worrall, J. L., & Morris, R. G. (2011). Inmate custody levels and prison rule violations. *The Prison Journal, 91*(2), 131-157. doi:10.1177/0032885511404380
- Wright, K. (1999). Leadership is the key to ethical practice in criminal justice agencies. *Criminal Justice Ethics, 18*(2), 2, 68-69. doi:10.1080/0731129x.1999.9992069

Appendix A: Original Mesloh et al. Survey

We are seeking your assistance to evaluate and better understand the various aspects of the Jail and your work experiences. The information you provide will be used as part of a broader study that will help to design programs and implement positive changes. Your answers are completely confidential and will be released only as summaries so that no individual's answers can be identified. Your cooperation is appreciated.

START HERE

1. Do you think your commitment to the department has increased, decreased, or remained the same since you came to the department?
 Increased
 Decreased
 Remained the same

 2. Do you feel your decision to work for this organization was a mistake on your part?
 Yes
 No

 3. Does the department inspire the very best in the way of job performance?
 Yes
 No

 4. Are you glad that you chose this department to work for rather than other agencies you may have considered?
 Yes
 No

 5. Could you just as well be working for a different department as long as the type of work was similar?
 Yes
 No

 6. During the last year, have **YOU** received more than three official complaints?
 Yes
 No

 7. During the last **THREE YEARS**, have **YOU** received more than four official complaints?
 Yes
 No
-

PLEASE INDICATE HOW STRONGLY YOU AGREE OR DISAGREE WITH THE FOLLOWING STATEMENTS

8. Corrections officers are not allowed to use as much force as may be necessary.

- Strongly agree
- Somewhat agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Somewhat disagree
- Strongly disagree

9. It is sometimes acceptable to use more force than is allowed to control someone who physically assaults an officer.

- Strongly agree
- Somewhat agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Somewhat disagree
- Strongly disagree

10. Corrections officers in your agency sometimes use more force than is necessary.

- Strongly agree
- Somewhat agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Somewhat disagree
- Strongly disagree

11. An officer who reports another officer's misconduct is likely to be given the cold shoulder by his or her fellow officers.

- Strongly agree
- Somewhat agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Somewhat disagree
- Strongly disagree

12. Corrections officers always report violations involving abuse of authority by fellow officers.

- Strongly agree
- Somewhat agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Somewhat disagree
- Strongly disagree

13. Unfair or incompetent administration contributes to officer misconduct.

- Strongly agree
- Somewhat agree
- Neither agree nor disagree

- Somewhat disagree
- Strongly disagree

14. It is not unusual for a corrections officer to turn a blind eye to improper conduct by other officers.

- Strongly agree
- Somewhat agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Somewhat disagree
- Strongly disagree

15. If an administrator takes a strong position against abuses of authority, he or she can make a big difference in preventing officers from abusing authority.

- Strongly agree
- Somewhat agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Somewhat disagree
- Strongly disagree

16. Good front line supervision can help prevent corrections officers from abusing their authority.

- Strongly agree
- Somewhat agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Somewhat disagree
- Strongly disagree

17. Officers in this facility report violations by staff when they are aware of them.

- Strongly agree
- Somewhat agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Somewhat disagree
- Strongly disagree

18. Training in human diversity or cultural awareness would be effective in preventing abuse of authority.

- Strongly agree
- Somewhat agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Somewhat disagree
- Strongly disagree

19. At the County Jail corrections officer misconduct is a real problem.

- Strongly agree

- Somewhat agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Somewhat disagree
- Strongly disagree

20. A good means of regulating officer conduct is developing professional (ethical) standards.

- Strongly agree
- Somewhat agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Somewhat disagree
- Strongly disagree

21. A good means of improving officer conduct is better training.

- Strongly agree
- Somewhat agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Somewhat disagree
- Strongly disagree

FOR THE FOLLOWING HYPOTHETICAL SITUATIONS, PLEASE CHECK THE ANSWER THAT BEST REFLECTS YOUR PERCEPTIONS OF THE CONDITIONS AT THE COUNTY JAIL

22. How often would an officer in your department report another officer for sleeping on duty?

- Always
- Sometimes
- Rarely
- Never

23. How often would an officer in your department report another officer for excessive force?

- Always
- Sometimes
- Rarely
- Never

24. How often would an officer in your department report another officer for sex with an **INMATE**?

- Always
- Sometimes
- Rarely
- Never

25. How often would an officer in your department report another officer for sex with a **STAFF MEMBER**?

- Always
 Sometimes
 Rarely
 Never

26. How often would an officer in your department report another officer for not accurately documenting an incident?

- Always
 Sometimes
 Rarely
 Never

27. How often would an officer in your department report another officer for drinking before duty?

- Always
 Sometimes
 Rarely
 Never

PLEASE READ THE FOLLOWING TWO SCENARIOS AND MARK THE RESPONSE THAT APPLIES MOST

A corrections officer routinely takes supplies home from work (for example, dining plates, glasses, coffee, toilet paper, etc).

28. How serious do **YOU** consider this behavior to be?

Not at all serious Very serious
 1 2 3 4 5

29. How serious do **MOST OFFICERS IN YOUR AGENCY** consider this behavior to be?

Not at all serious Very serious
 1 2 3 4 5

30. Would this behavior be regarded as a violation of official policy in your agency?

Definitely not Definitely yes
 1 2 3 4 5

31. If an officer in your agency engaged in this behavior and was discovered doing so, what if any discipline do **YOU** think **SHOULD** follow?

- None

- Verbal reprimand
- Written reprimand
- Suspension
- Demotion in rank
- Dismissal

32. If an officer in your agency engaged in this behavior and was discovered doing so, what if any discipline do **YOU** think **WOULD** follow?

- None
- Verbal reprimand
- Written reprimand
- Suspension
- Demotion in rank
- Dismissal

33. Do you think **YOU** would report a fellow officer who engaged in this behavior?

Definitely not Definitely yes
 1 2 3 4 5

34. Do you think **MOST OFFICERS IN YOUR AGENCY** would report a fellow officer who engaged in this behavior?

Definitely not Definitely yes
 1 2 3 4 5

A corrections officer routinely accepts free food, candy, and other gifts of small value from inmates. The officer does not ask for these gifts and does not give special treatment to the gift givers.

35. How serious do **YOU** consider this behavior to be?

Not at all serious Very serious
 1 2 3 4 5

36. How serious do **MOST OFFICERS IN YOUR AGENCY** consider this behavior to be?

Not at all serious Very serious
 1 2 3 4 5

37. Would this behavior be regarded as a violation of official policy in your agency?

Definitely not Definitely yes
 1 2 3 4 5

38. If an officer in your agency engaged in this behavior and was discovered doing so, what if any discipline do **YOU** think **SHOULD** follow?

- None

- Verbal reprimand
- Written reprimand
- Suspension
- Demotion in rank
- Dismissal

39. If an officer in your agency engaged in this behavior and was discovered doing so, what if any discipline do **YOU** think **WOULD** follow?

- None
- Verbal reprimand
- Written reprimand
- Suspension
- Demotion in rank
- Dismissal

40. Do you think **YOU** would report a fellow officer who engaged in this behavior?

Definitely not Definitely yes

1 2 3 4 5

41. Do you think **MOST OFFICERS IN YOUR AGENCY** would report a fellow officer who engaged in this behavior?

Definitely not Definitely yes

1 2 3 4 5

PLEASE INDICATE HOW STRONGLY YOU **AGREE** OR **DISAGREE** WITH THE FOLLOWING STATEMENTS

42. I am satisfied with my current work schedule.

- Strongly agree
- Somewhat agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Somewhat disagree
- Strongly disagree

43. The canine unit (K9) is an effective method for controlling drug use in the jail.

- Strongly agree
- Somewhat agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Somewhat disagree
- Strongly disagree

44. The current system of employee evaluation is fair.

- Strongly agree
- Somewhat agree

Neither agree nor disagree

Somewhat disagree

Strongly disagree

45. I am satisfied with my level of pay (SALARY & BENEFITS).

Strongly agree

Somewhat agree

Neither agree nor disagree

Somewhat disagree

Strongly disagree

46. I am appropriately rated and scored for my merit raise.

Strongly agree

Somewhat agree

Neither agree nor disagree

Somewhat disagree

Strongly disagree

47. I am satisfied with the way my merit rating is scored on the Performance Evaluation Scale.

Strongly agree

Somewhat agree

Neither agree nor disagree

Somewhat disagree

Strongly disagree

48. I fully understand the written policies and procedures for my agency.

Strongly agree

Somewhat agree

Neither agree nor disagree

Somewhat disagree

Strongly disagree

49. At the County Jail, corrections officers often treat whites better than blacks or other minorities.

Strongly agree

Somewhat agree

Neither agree nor disagree

Somewhat disagree

Strongly disagree

50. Racism is present within the County Jail.

Strongly agree

Somewhat agree

Neither agree nor disagree

Somewhat disagree

Strongly disagree

51. I perform my duties in accordance with the agencies mission statement.

Strongly agree

Somewhat agree

Neither agree nor disagree

Somewhat disagree

Strongly disagree

52. The canine unit (K9) is a waste of money.

Strongly agree

Somewhat agree

Neither agree nor disagree

Somewhat disagree

Strongly disagree

53. Using the telephone at work to make personal long distance calls is common.

Strongly agree

Somewhat agree

Neither agree nor disagree

Somewhat disagree

Strongly disagree

54. I find it hard to believe that the canine unit (K-9) can consistently locate concealed drugs.

Strongly agree

Somewhat agree

Neither agree nor disagree

Somewhat disagree

Strongly disagree

55. Should the number of hours spent on defensive tactics training increase, decrease, or remain the same.

Increase

Decrease

Remain the same

56. Have you ever been physically assaulted in the County Jail?

Yes

No

57. Do you think the training provided by the department has adequately prepared you to handle assaults from inmates?

- Yes
- No

58. How old are you?

- Less than 20
- 20-29
- 30-39
- 40-49
- 50-59
- 60+

59. What is your rank/position?

- Corrections officer
- Supervisor/Manager
- Probation
- Security
- Support Staff
- Administrative Staff
- Medial Staff

60. How many years have you been working in corrections?

- Less than 1
- 1-5
- 6-10
- 11-15
- More than 15

61. How many years have you worked at the County Jail?

- Less than 1
- 1-5
- 6-10
- 11-15
- More than 15

62. How much education have you completed?

- High school graduate (or G.E.D.)
- Some college
- Associate Degree
- Bachelors Degree
- Advanced Degree (Masters degree or beyond)

63. Are you cross-trained in other areas? (Check all that apply)

- Emergency medical technician
- Law Enforcement certification
- Instructor

- Breath Testing
- Field Training Officer
- Other _____ (Description)

64. What is your gender?

- Male
- Female

65. What is your race?

- White
- Black
- Hispanic
- Other

66. Have you answered all of these questions as honestly as possible?

- Yes
- No

END

THANK YOU FOR TAKING THE TIME TO COMPLETE THIS QUESTIONNAIRE. IF YOU HAVE ADDITIONAL COMMENTS ABOUT THIS SURVEY OR THIS RESEARCH STUDY, PLEASE DO SO IN THE SPACE PROVIDED BELOW.

Appendix B: Corrections Officers Perceptions Survey

I am seeking assistance from correctional officers to evaluate and understand the various aspects of your state correctional facility and your work experiences. The information you provide may be used to design programs and implement positive changes for your state correctional facility. Your answers are anonymous and confidential and will be released only in summaries so no individual's answers can be identified. Your cooperation is greatly appreciated.

START HERE

1. Do you think your commitment to your state correctional facility has increased, decreased, or remained the same since you started employment as a corrections officer?
 Increased
 Decreased
 Remained the same

2. Do you feel your decision to work for a state correctional facility was a mistake?
 Yes
 No

3. Does this state correctional facility inspire the very best in job performance?
 Yes
 No

4. Are you glad that you chose this state correctional facility to work for rather than other correctional facilities you may have considered?
 Yes
 No

5. During the **LAST 12 MONTHS**, have **YOU** been a focus of more than two official complaints?
 Yes
 No

6. During the last **THREE YEARS**, have **YOU** been the focus of more than three official complaints?
 Yes
 No

7. With the responses to the above questions, do you feel your morality working as a correction officer has increased, decreased or remained the same?
 Increased
 Somewhat increased
 Remained the Same

- Somewhat decreased
 - Decreased
-

PLEASE INDICATE HOW STRONGLY YOU AGREE OR DISAGREE WITH THE FOLLOWING STATEMENTS:

8. Corrections officers are not allowed to use as much force as may be necessary.

- Strongly agree
- Somewhat agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Somewhat disagree
- Strongly disagree

9. It is sometimes acceptable to use more force than is allowed to control someone who physically assaults a corrections officer.

- Strongly agree
- Somewhat agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Somewhat disagree
- Strongly disagree

10. Corrections officers in your state correctional facility sometimes use more force than is necessary.

- Strongly agree
- Somewhat agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Somewhat disagree
- Strongly disagree

11. Corrections officers in your state correctional facility sometimes do not act with enough force to de-escalate a situation.

- Strongly agree
- Somewhat agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Somewhat disagree
- Strongly disagree

12. A corrections officer who reports another corrections officer's misconduct is likely to be given the cold shoulder by his or her fellow corrections officers.

- Strongly agree
- Somewhat agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Somewhat disagree
- Strongly disagree

13. Corrections officers always report violations involving abuse of authority by fellow corrections officers.

- Strongly agree
- Somewhat agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Somewhat disagree
- Strongly disagree

14. Unfair or incompetent administration contributes to corrections officers misconduct.

- Strongly agree
- Somewhat agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Somewhat disagree
- Strongly disagree

15. It is not unusual for a corrections officer to turn a “blind eye” to improper conduct by other corrections officers.

- Strongly agree
- Somewhat agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Somewhat disagree
- Strongly disagree

16. If an administrator takes a strong position against abuses of authority, he or she can make a big difference in preventing corrections officers from abusing authority.

- Strongly agree
- Somewhat agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Somewhat disagree
- Strongly disagree

17. Good front line supervision can help prevent corrections officers from abusing his or her authority.

- Strongly agree
- Somewhat agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Somewhat disagree
- Strongly disagree

18. Corrections officers in this state correctional facility report violations by staff when they are aware of them.

- Strongly agree
- Somewhat agree

- Neither agree nor disagree
- Somewhat disagree
- Strongly disagree

19. Training in human diversity or cultural awareness would be effective in preventing abuse of authority.

- Strongly agree
- Somewhat agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Somewhat disagree
- Strongly disagree

20. At this state correctional facility, corrections officer misconduct is a real problem.

- Strongly agree
- Somewhat agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Somewhat disagree
- Strongly disagree

21. A good means of regulating corrections officers' conduct is developing professional (ethical/moral) standards.

- Strongly agree
- Somewhat agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Somewhat disagree
- Strongly disagree

22. A good means of improving corrections officers' conduct is better training.

- Strongly agree
- Somewhat agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Somewhat disagree
- Strongly disagree

23. After answering the recent set of questions, do you feel additional training would increase an awareness of morality in this area for corrections officers?

- Increased
- Somewhat increased
- Remained the same
- Somewhat decreased
- Decreased

FOR THE FOLLOWING HYPOTHETICAL SITUATIONS, PLEASE CHECK THE ANSWER THAT BEST REFLECTS YOUR PERCEPTIONS OF THE CONDITIONS AT YOUR STATE CORRECTIONAL FACILITY:

24. How often would a corrections officer in your state correctional facility report another corrections officer for sleeping on duty?

- Always
- Sometimes
- Rarely
- Never

25. How often would an corrections officer in your state correctional facility report another corrections officer for excessive force?

- Always
- Sometimes
- Rarely
- Never

26. How often would a corrections officer in your state correctional facility report another corrections officer for sex with an **INMATE**?

- Always
- Sometimes
- Rarely
- Never

27. How often would a corrections officer in your state correctional facility report another corrections officer for not accurately documenting an incident?

- Always
- Sometimes
- Rarely
- Never

28. How often would a corrections officer in your state correctional facility report another corrections officer for drinking before duty?

- Always
- Sometimes
- Rarely
- Never

29. After answering the recent set of questions, do you feel additional training would increase an awareness of morality in this area for corrections officers?

- Increased
- Somewhat increased
- Remained the same

- Somewhat decreased
 Decreased

PLEASE READ THE FOLLOWING THREE SCENARIOS AND MARK THE RESPONSE THAT APPLIES MOST:

SCENARIO #1: A corrections officer routinely takes supplies home from work (e.g., pens, paper, coffee, toilet paper, etc).

30. How serious do **YOU** consider this behavior to be?

Not at all serious *Very serious*
1 2 3 4 5

31. How serious do **MOST CORRECTIONS OFFICERS IN YOUR STATE CORRECTIONAL FACILITY** consider this behavior to be?

Not at all serious *Very serious*
1 2 3 4 5

32. Would this behavior be regarded as a violation of official policy in your state correctional facility?

Definitely not *Definitely yes*
1 2 3 4 5

33. If a corrections officer in your state correctional facility engaged in this behavior and was discovered doing so, what if any discipline do **YOU** think **SHOULD** follow?

- None
 Verbal reprimand
 Written reprimand
 Suspension
 Demotion in rank
 Dismissal

34. If a corrections officer in your state correctional facility engaged in this behavior and was discovered doing so, what if any discipline do **YOU** think **WOULD** follow?

- None
 Verbal reprimand
 Written reprimand
 Suspension
 Demotion in rank
 Dismissal

35. Do you think **YOU** would report a fellow correctional facility who engaged in this behavior?

Definitely not *Definitely yes*
 1 2 3 4 5

36. Do you think **MOST CORRECTIONS OFFICERS IN YOUR STATE CORRECTIONAL FACILITY** would report a fellow correctional officer who engaged in this behavior?

Definitely not *Definitely yes*
 1 2 3 4 5

37. After answering the recent set of questions, do you feel additional training would increase an awareness of morality in this area for corrections officers?

- Increased
- Somewhat increased
- Remained the same
- Somewhat decreased
- Decreased

SCENARIO #2: A corrections officer routinely accepts gifts of small value from inmates (e.g., food, candy, drinks). The corrections officer does not ask for these gifts and does not give special treatment to the gift givers.

38. How serious do **YOU** consider this behavior to be?

Not at all serious *Very serious*
 1 2 3 4 5

39. How serious do **MOST CORRECTIONS OFFICERS IN YOUR STATE CORRECTIONAL FACILITY** consider this behavior to be?

Not at all serious *Very serious*
 1 2 3 4 5

40. Would this behavior be regarded as a violation of official policy in your state correctional facility?

Definitely not *Definitely yes*
 1 2 3 4 5

41. If a corrections officer in your state correctional facility engaged in this behavior and was discovered doing so, what if any discipline do **YOU** think **SHOULD** follow?

- None
- Verbal reprimand
- Written reprimand
- Suspension
- Demotion in rank

Dismissal

42. If a corrections officer in your state correctional facility engaged in this behavior and was discovered doing so, what if any discipline do **YOU** think **WOULD** follow?

- None
 Verbal reprimand
 Written reprimand
 Suspension
 Demotion in rank
 Dismissal

43. Do you think **YOU** would report a fellow corrections officer who engaged in this behavior?

Definitely not *Definitely yes*
 1 2 3 4 5

44. Do you think **MOST CORRECTIONS OFFICERS IN YOUR STATE CORRECTIONAL FACILITY** would report a fellow corrections officer who engaged in this behavior?

Definitely not *Definitely yes*
 1 2 3 4 5

45. After answering the recent set of questions, do you feel additional training would increase an awareness of morality in this area for corrections officers?

- Increased
 Somewhat increased
 Remained the same
 Somewhat decreased
 Decreased

SCENARIO #3: A corrections officer has engaged in inappropriate sexual relations with an inmate. You have overheard their conversation about having sexual relations in another room/area.

46. How serious do **YOU** consider this behavior to be?

Not at all serious *Very serious*
 1 2 3 4 5

47. How serious do **MOST CORRECTIONS OFFICERS IN YOUR STATE CORRECTIONAL FACILITY** consider this behavior to be?

Not at all serious *Very serious*
 1 2 3 4 5

48. Would this behavior be regarded as a violation of official policy in your state correctional facility?

Definitely not *Definitely yes*
 1 2 3 4 5

49. If a corrections officer in your state correctional facility engaged in this behavior and was discovered doing so, what if any discipline do **YOU** think **SHOULD** follow?

- None
- Verbal reprimand
- Written reprimand
- Suspension
- Demotion in rank
- Dismissal

50. If a corrections officer in your state correctional facility engaged in this behavior and was discovered doing so, what if any discipline do **YOU** think **WOULD** follow?

- None
- Verbal reprimand
- Written reprimand
- Suspension
- Demotion in rank
- Dismissal

51. Do you think **YOU** would report a fellow corrections officer who engaged in this behavior?

Definitely not *Definitely yes*
 1 2 3 4 5

52. Do you think **MOST CORRECTIONS OFFICERS IN YOUR STATE CORRECTIONAL FACILITY** would report a fellow corrections officer who engaged in this behavior?

Definitely not *Definitely yes*
 1 2 3 4 5

53. After answering the recent set of questions, do you feel additional training would increase an awareness of morality in this area for corrections officers?

- Increased
 - Somewhat increased
 - Remained the same
 - Somewhat decreased
 - Decreased
-

PLEASE INDICATE HOW STRONGLY YOU AGREE OR DISAGREE WITH THE FOLLOWING STATEMENTS:

54. I am satisfied with my current work schedule.

- Strongly agree
- Somewhat agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Somewhat disagree
- Strongly disagree

55. The current system of evaluations for corrections officers is fair.

- Strongly agree
- Somewhat agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Somewhat disagree
- Strongly disagree

56. I am satisfied with my level of pay (SALARY & BENEFITS).

- Strongly agree
- Somewhat agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Somewhat disagree
- Strongly disagree

57. I fully understand the written policies and procedures for my state correctional facility.

- Strongly agree
- Somewhat agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Somewhat disagree
- Strongly disagree

58. Do you feel your morality is higher, lower, or remains the same inside your work environment compared to outside of the prison unit?

- Increased
- Somewhat increased
- Remained the same
- Somewhat decreased
- Decreased

59. Do you feel you adhere more to moral standards outside of the prison unit or inside the prison unit or do they remain the same after completing both surveys?

- More outside of the prison unit than inside the prison unit
- More inside the prison unit than outside of the prison unit

Remains the same in both areas

60. At this state correctional facility, corrections officers often treat whites better than blacks or other minorities (staff and/or inmates).

- Strongly agree
- Somewhat agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Somewhat disagree
- Strongly disagree

61. Racism is present in this state correctional facility.

- Strongly agree
- Somewhat agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Somewhat disagree
- Strongly disagree

62. I perform my duties in accordance with the state correctional facility's mission statement.

- Strongly agree
- Somewhat agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Somewhat disagree
- Strongly disagree

63. Do you think the training provided by the department has adequately prepared you to handle assaults from inmates?

- Yes
- No

64. After answering the recent set of questions, do you feel additional training would increase an awareness of morality in this area for corrections officers?

- Increased
- Somewhat increased
- Remained the same
- Somewhat decreased
- Decreased

65. After answering all the questions, do you feel your morality awareness is higher, lower or the same working in a prison unit compared to your life outside of the prison unit?

- Higher
- Lower
- Remained the same

66. What is the level of security in the state correctional facility you work in?
- Minimum
 - Medium
 - Maximum
67. What is your gender?
- Male
 - Female
68. How old are you?
- 21-29
 - 30-39
 - 40-49
 - 50-59
 - 60+
69. How many years have you been working in corrections overall?
- Less than 1
 - 1-5
 - 6-10
 - 11-15
 - More than 15
70. How many years have you worked at the current prison unit you are assigned to?
- Less than 1
 - 1-5
 - 6-10
 - 11-15
 - More than 15
71. How much education have you completed?
- High school graduate (or G.E.D.)
 - Some college
 - Associate Degree
 - Bachelors Degree
 - Advanced Degree (Masters degree or beyond)
72. Have you answered all of these questions as honestly as possible?
- Yes
 - No

THANK YOU FOR TAKING THE TIME TO COMPLETE THIS QUESTIONNAIRE.
IF YOU HAVE ADDITIONAL COMMENTS ABOUT THIS SURVEY OR THIS
RESEARCH STUDY, PLEASE DO SO IN THE SPACE PROVIDED BELOW.

END

Appendix C: Mesloh, et al. Permission

Subject : RE: Permission request

Date : Tue, Jun 05, 2012 09:20 AM CDT

From : [Ross Wolf >](#)

To : [William Hanna <](#)

Attachment :  [image001.gif](#)



William-

I can provide you with the permission to use the survey, however, I am not sure if we still have copies of the original format any longer. I'd have to look for that. However, if you just wanted to use the questions as listed in the Corrections Compendium article, I do not see a problem with that at all.

Please let me know specifically if you need the original, or if you are just asking to use the questions as listed in the article. Please also let me know what type of permission you would need (I assume you would need something on letterhead and hard-copy). I understand that you are looking to utilize the existing survey with changes.

Dr. Ross Wolf

Associate Professor

Graduate Program Coordinator, Department of Criminal Justice

Executive Fellow, College of Health and Public Affairs

University of Central Florida

Appendix D: DIT-2

Famine:

The small village in northern India has experienced shortages of food before, but this year's famine is worse than ever. Some families are even trying to feed themselves by making soup from tree bark. Mustaq Singh's family is near starvation. He has heard that a rich man in his village has supplies of food stored away and is hoarding food while its price goes higher so that he can sell the food later at a huge profit. Mustaq is desperate and thinks about stealing some food from the rich man's warehouse. The small amount of food that he needs for his family wouldn't even be missed.

What should Mustaq Singh do? Do you favor the action of taking the food?

- Should take the food
- Can't decide
- Should not take the food

Rate the following issues in terms of importance:

1.) Is Mustaq Singh courageous enough to risk getting caught for stealing?

- Great
- Much
- Some
- Little
- No

2.) Isn't it only natural for a loving father to care so much for his family that he would steal?

- Great
- Much
- Some
- Little
- No

3.) Shouldn't the community's laws be upheld?

- Great
- Much
- Some
- Little
- No

4.) Does Mustaq Singh know a good recipe for preparing soup from tree bark?

- Great
- Much
- Some
- Little

- No
- 5.) Does the rich man have any legal right to store food when other people are starving?
- Great
 - Much
 - Some
 - Little
 - No
- 6.) Is the motive of Mustaq Singh to steal for himself or steal for his family?
- Great
 - Much
 - Some
 - Little
 - No
- 7.) What values are going to be the basis for social cooperation?
- Great
 - Much
 - Some
 - Little
 - No
- 8.) Is the epitome of eating reconcilable with the culpability of stealing?
- Great
 - Much
 - Some
 - Little
 - No
- 9.) Does the rich man deserve to be robbed for being so greedy?
- Great
 - Much
 - Some
 - Little
 - No
- 10.) Isn't private property an institution to enable the rich to exploit the poor?
- Great
 - Much
 - Some
 - Little
 - No

11.) Would stealing bring about more total good for everybody concerned or wouldn't it?

- Great
- Much
- Some
- Little
- No

12.) Are laws getting in the way of the most basic claim of any member of society?

- Great
- Much
- Some
- Little
- No

Consider the 12 issues above and rank which issues are the most important (Select issue by number 1-12).

- Most important item _____
- Second most important _____
- Third most important _____
- Fourth most important _____

Cancer:

Mrs. Bennett is 62 years old and in the last phases of colon cancer. She is in terrible pain and asks the doctor to give her more pain-killer medicine. The doctor has given her the maximum safe dose already and is reluctant to increase the dosage because it would probably hasten her death. In a clear and rational mental state, Mrs. Bennett says that she realizes this, but she wants to end her suffering even if it means ending her life. Should the doctor give her an increased dosage?

Do you favor the action of giving more medicine?

- Should give Mrs. Bennett an increased dosage to make her die
- Can't decide
- Should not give her an increased dosage

Rate the following issues in terms of importance:

1.) Isn't the doctor obligated by the same laws as everybody else if giving an overdose would be the same as killing her?

- Great
- Much
- Some
- Little
- No

- 2.) Wouldn't society be better off without so many laws about what doctors can and cannot do?
- Great
 - Much
 - Some
 - Little
 - No
- 3.) If Mrs. Bennett dies, would the doctor be legally responsible for malpractice?
- Great
 - Much
 - Some
 - Little
 - No
- 4.) Does the family of Mrs. Bennett agree that she should get more painkiller medicine?
- Great
 - Much
 - Some
 - Little
 - No
- 5.) Is the painkiller medicine an active heliotropic drug?
- Great
 - Much
 - Some
 - Little
 - No
- 6.) Does the state have the right to force continued existence of those who don't want to live?
- Great
 - Much
 - Some
 - Little
 - No
- 7.) Is helping to end another's life ever a responsible act of cooperation?
- Great
 - Much
 - Some
 - Little
 - No

8.) Would the doctor show more sympathy for Mrs. Bennett by giving the medicine or not?

- Great
- Much
- Some
- Little
- No

9.) Wouldn't the doctor feel guilty from giving Mrs. Bennett so much drug that she died?

- Great
- Much
- Some
- Little
- No

10.) Should only God decide when a person's life should end?

- Great
- Much
- Some
- Little
- No

11.) Shouldn't society protect everyone from being killed?

- Great
- Much
- Some
- Little
- No

12.) Where should society draw the line between protecting life and allowing someone to die if the person wants to?

- Great
- Much
- Some
- Little
- No

Consider the 12 issues above and rank which issues are the most important (Select issue by number 1-12).

- Most important item _____
- Second most important _____
- Third most important _____
- Fourth most important _____

Reporter:

Molly Dayton has been a news reporter for the Gazette newspaper for over a decade. Almost by accident, she learned that one of the candidates for Lieutenant Governor for her state, Grover Thompson, had been arrested for shop-lifting 20 years earlier. Reporter Dayton found out that early in his life, Candidate Thompson had undergone a confused period and done things he later regretted, actions which would be very out-of-character now. His shoplifting had been a minor offense and charges had been dropped by the department store. Thompson has not only straightened himself out since then, but built a distinguished record in helping many people and in leading constructive community projects. Now, Reporter Dayton regards Thompson as the best candidate in the field and likely to go on to important leadership positions in the state. Reporter Dayton wonders whether or not she should write the store about Thompson's earlier troubles because in the upcoming close and heated election, she fears that such a news story could wreck Thompson's chance to win.

Do you favor the action of reporting the story?

- Should report the story
- Can't decide
- Should not report the story

Rate the following issues in terms of importance:

1.) Doesn't the public have a right to know all the facts about all the candidates?

- Great
- Much
- Some
- Little
- No

2.) Would publishing the story help Reporter Dayton's reputation for investigative reporting?

- Great
- Much
- Some
- Little
- No

3.) If Dayton doesn't publish the story, wouldn't another reporter get the story anyway and get the credit for investigative reporting?

- Great
- Much
- Some
- Little
- No

4.) Since voting is such a joke anyway, does it make any difference what Reporter Dayton does?

- Great
- Much
- Some
- Little
- No

5.) Hasn't Thompson shown in the last 20 years that he is a better person than his earlier days as a shop-lifter?

- Great
- Much
- Some
- Little
- No

6.) What would best serve society?

- Great
- Much
- Some
- Little
- No

7.) If the story is true, how can it be wrong to report it?

- Great
- Much
- Some
- Little
- No

8.) How could Reporter Dayton be so cruel and heartless as to report the damaging story about Candidate Thompson?

- Great
- Much
- Some
- Little
- No

9.) Does the right of "habeas corpus" apply in this case?

- Great
- Much
- Some
- Little
- No

10.) Would the election process be more fair with or without reporting the story?

- Great
- Much
- Some
- Little
- No

11.) Should Reporter Dayton treat all candidates for office in the same way by reporting everything she learns about them, good or bad?

- Great
- Much
- Some
- Little
- No

12.) Isn't a reporter's duty to report all the news regardless of the circumstances?

- Great
- Much
- Some
- Little
- No

Consider the 12 issues above and rank which issues are the most important (Select issue by number 1-12).

- Most important item _____
- Second most important _____
- Third most important _____
- Fourth most important _____

School Board:

Mr. Grant has been elected to the School Board District 190 and was chosen to be Chairman. The district is bitterly divided over the closing of one of the high schools. One of the high schools has to be closed for financial reasons, but there is no agreement over which school to close. During his election to the school board, Mr. Grant had proposed a series of "Open Meetings" in which members of the community could voice their opinions. He hoped that dialogue would make the community realize the necessity of closing one high school. Also he hoped that through open discussion, the difficulty of the decision would be appreciated and that the community would ultimately support the school board decision. The first Open Meeting was a disaster. Passionate speeches dominated the microphones and threatened violence. The meeting barely closed without fist fights. Later in the week, school board members received threatening phone calls. Mr. Grant wonders if he ought to call off the next Open Meeting.

Do you favor calling off the next Open Meeting?

- Should call off the next open meeting
- Can't decide
- Should have the next open meeting

Rate the following issues in terms of importance:

1.) Is Mr. Grant required by law to have Open Meetings on major school board decisions?

- Great
- Much
- Some
- Little
- No

2.) Would Mr. Grant be breaking his election campaign promises to the community by discontinuing the Open Meetings?

- Great
- Much
- Some
- Little
- No

3.) Would the community be even angrier with Mr. Grant if he stopped the Open Meetings?

- Great
- Much
- Some
- Little
- No

4.) Would the change in plans prevent scientific assessment?

- Great
- Much
- Some
- Little
- No

5.) If the school board is threatened, does the chairman have the legal authority to protect the board by making decisions in closed meetings?

- Great
- Much
- Some
- Little
- No

6.) Would the community regard Mr. Grant as a coward if he stopped the open meetings?

- Great
- Much
- Some
- Little
- No

7.) Does Mr. Grant have another procedure in mind for insuring that divergent views are heard?

- Great
- Much
- Some
- Little
- No

8.) Does Mr. Grant have the authority to expel troublemakers from the meetings or prevent them from making long speeches?

- Great
- Much
- Some
- Little
- No

9.) Are some people deliberately undermining the school board process by playing some sort of power game?

- Great
- Much
- Some
- Little
- No

10.) What effect would stopping the discussion have on the community's ability to handle controversial issues in the future?

- Great
- Much
- Some
- Little
- No

11.) Is the trouble coming from only a few hotheads, and is the community in general really fair-minded and democratic?

- Great
- Much

- Some
- Little
- No

12.) What is the likelihood that a good decision could be made without open discussion from the community?

- Great
- Much
- Some
- Little
- No

Consider the 12 issues above and rank which issues are the most important (Select issue by number 1-12).

- Most important item _____
- Second most important _____
- Third most important _____
- Fourth most important _____

Demonstration:

Political and economic instability in a South American country prompted the President of the United States to send troops to “police” the area. Students at many campuses in the U.S.A. have protested that the United States is using its military might for economic advantage. There is widespread suspicion that big oil multinational companies are pressuring the President to safeguard a cheap oil supply even if it means loss of life. Students at one campus took to the streets in demonstrations, tying up traffic and stopping regular business in the town. The president of the university demanded that the students stop their illegal demonstrations. Students then took over the college’s administration building completely paralyzing the college. Are the students right to demonstrate in these ways?

Do you favor the action of demonstrating in this way?

- Should continue demonstrating in these ways
- Can’t decide
- Should not continue demonstrating in these waysw

Rate the following issues in terms of importance:

1.) Do the students have any right to take over property that doesn’t belong to them?

- Great
- Much
- Some
- Little
- No

2.) Do the students realize that they might be arrested and fined and even expelled from school?

- Great
- Much
- Some
- Little
- No

3.) Are the students serious about their cause or are they doing it just for fun?

- Great
- Much
- Some
- Little
- No

4.) If the university president is soft on students this time, will it lead to more disorder?

- Great
- Much
- Some
- Little
- No

5.) Will the public blame all students for the actions of a few student demonstrators?

- Great
- Much
- Some
- Little
- No

6.) Are the authorities to blame by giving in to the greed of the multinational oil companies?

- Great
- Much
- Some
- Little
- No

7.) Why should a few people like Presidents and business leaders have more power than ordinary people?

- Great
- Much
- Some
- Little
- No

8.) Does this student demonstration bring about more or less good in the long run to all people?

- Great
- Much
- Some
- Little
- No

9.) Can the students justify their civil disobedience?

- Great
- Much
- Some
- Little
- No

10.) Shouldn't the authorities be respected by students?

- Great
- Much
- Some
- Little
- No

11.) Is taking over a building consistent with principles of justice?

- Great
- Much
- Some
- Little
- No

12.) Isn't it everyone's duty to obey the law, whether one likes it or not?

- Great
- Much
- Some
- Little
- No

Consider the 12 issues above and rank which issues are the most important (Select issue by number 1-12).

- Most important item _____
- Second most important _____
- Third most important _____
- Fourth most important _____

In terms of your political views, how would you characterize yourself?

- Very Liberal
- Somewhat Liberal
- Neither Liberal nor Conservative
- Somewhat Conservative
- Very Conservative

Are you a citizen of the United States?

- Yes
- No

Is English your primary language?

- Yes
- No

How many previous or current ethics courses have you taken?

- 0
- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4 or more

Test Taking Environment

Music was playing while I completed the survey

- Yes
- No

The TV was on while I completed the survey

- Yes
- No

I received phone calls while completing the questionnaire

- Yes-more than one
- Yes-just one
- No

I made a phone call while completing the questionnaire

- Yes-more than one
- Yes-just one
- No

I received emails/text messages while completing the questionnaire

- Yes-more than one
- Yes-just one

No

I responded to emails/text messages while completing the questionnaire

Yes-more than one

Yes-just one

No

I stopped and talked to friends while completing the questionnaire

Yes-more than one

Yes-just one

No

Compared to how I take surveys in the classroom, I took this questionnaire

The same way-not different at all

About the same way-I had a minimal amount of distractions

Not the same way- I had distractions that made me stop and start the questionnaire

Not at all the same way- I completed the questionnaire when I could while doing other things

Are you currently a community advisor or a community academic mentor?

Yes

No

Are you currently a student government representative?

Yes

No

Are you currently an active member of a Greek Sorority or Fraternity?

Yes

No

Are you currently a representative of a registered student organization?

Yes

No

Are you currently employed part time on campus or another area?

Yes

No

Are you currently living on a college campus?

Yes

No

Appendix E: IRB-Approved Consent Form

CONSENT FORM

You are invited to take part in a research study of Corrections Officers' Morality Awareness. The researcher is inviting all Corrections Officers of any rank in the Ohio Department of Rehabilitations and Corrections to be in the study. This form is part of a process called "informed consent" to allow you to understand this study before deciding whether to take part.

This study is being conducted by a researcher named William Hanna, who is a doctoral student at Walden University. This study is William Hanna's dissertation topic.

Background Information:

The purpose of this study is to correlate the level of morality awareness and the security level of the prison unit the corrections officer works in.

Procedures:

If you agree to be in this study, you will be asked to:

Go online to SurveyMonkey at the prescribed site and answer survey questions on two different surveys.

Each survey will take 20-30 minutes to complete.

Data will be collected once from each officer who volunteers. No names or badge numbers will be collected on these surveys.

Here are some sample questions:

- A good means of regulating corrections officers' conduct is developing professional standards

- Training in human diversity or cultural awareness would be effective in preventing abuse of authority
- Isn't it only natural for a loving father to care so much for his family that he would steal?

Voluntary Nature of the Study:

This study is voluntary. Everyone will respect your decision of whether or not you choose to be in the study. No one at The Ohio Department of Rehabilitations and Corrections will treat you differently if you decide not to be in the study. If you decide to join the study now, you can still change your mind later. You may stop at any time.

Risks and Benefits of Being in the Study:

Being in this type of study involves some risk of the minor discomforts that can be encountered in daily life, such as fatigue, becoming upset or stress. Being in this study would not pose risk to your safety or wellbeing. The study's potential benefits include Corrections Officer being increasingly aware of their morality and the decisions they make.

Payment:

Participants will not be compensated for participating in this study.

Privacy:

Any information you provide will be kept anonymous. The researcher will not use your personal information for any purposes outside of this research project. Also, the researcher will not include your name or anything else that could identify you in the study reports. Data will be kept secure by saved data on a USB device that is password

protected and kept in a lock box. Data will be kept for a period of at least 5 years, as required by the university.

Contacts and Questions:

You may ask any questions you have now. Or if you have questions later, you may contact the researcher via. If you want to talk privately about your rights as a participant, you can call Dr. Leilani Endicott. She is the Walden University representative who can discuss this with you. Her phone number is 612-312-1210. Walden University's approval number for this study is 07-03-14-0165211 and it expires on July 2, 2015. If a participant wants a copy of the study results, they should contact the researcher at william.hanna@waldenu.edu

Please print or save this consent form for your records.

Statement of Consent:

I have read the above information and I feel I understand the study well enough to make a decision about my involvement. By returning a completed survey, I understand that I am agreeing to the terms described above.

Appendix F: Survey Announcements

Corrections Officers Wanted!!!

To take part in a 30-40 minute survey

Be part of a psychological research study of morality awareness.

This study is being conducted by a researcher named William Hanna, who is a doctoral student at Walden University. Mr. Hanna worked in the criminal justice field for a total of twelve and a half years and wants to work with criminal justice personnel after he graduates.

Please visit the following websites and complete two surveys online:

<https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/whanna> and

<https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/whanna2>

Questions??

Contact William Hanna

M.S. Criminal Justice Administration

M.S. Forensic Psychology