

**ATTITUDES OF CORRECTIONAL OFFICIALS
TOWARDS THE REHABILITATION AND HUMANE
TREATMENT OF OFFENDERS: LEEUWKOP
CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION**

By

AMANDA NOMZAMO ROZANI

Dissertation submitted in fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

MAGISTER ARTIUM

in

PSYCHOLOGY

in the

FACULTY of HUMANITIES

at the

UNIVERSITY of JOHANNESBURG

SUPERVISOR: MRS. F. H. KALDINE

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to my supervisor Mrs F. H. Kaldine. Your support, your belief and patience in me even when I had lost hope in myself have pulled me through. Thank you very much.

I would like to thank the HSRC for giving an opportunity to grow academically, but mostly the CYFSD Pretoria office for their input into this research, guidance and constant support: YOU ARE THE BEST!

The statcon team: Anneli Hardy, Robert Crawford and Jaclyn Smith, thank you very much. Your valuable input in this study has made it a success.

Mr. Van Niekerk, Cilla Nel and Riette Eiselen, thank you very much for your assistance.

To the Department of Correctional Services- Research Directorate in Pretoria, thank you for granting this life time opportunity to do my research at Leeuwkop Correctional Institution.

To Mr. Zwane at Leeuwkop Correctional Centre, thank you very much for your assistance, patience and your positive attitude.

To the correctional officials at Leeuwkop Correctional Centre, without your assistance this research would be incomplete. The help that you have given me by participating in my study humbles me and I will cherish it forever. Thank you very much.

To the Head of the Centres at Leeuwkop Management Area, thank you very much for welcoming, and allowing me to conduct my research in your centres.

To the personnel offices in all the centres at Leeuwkop Management Area for your assistance with the samples.

Thank you to my friends and colleagues at the Johannesburg Management Area at Medium A Hospital who supported me all the way, may you all continue to be the great people that you are.

To Magdeline Phala you have been my guide all the way, thank you very much for your continuous support. You have added value in this study, as you do in my life.

I would also like to extend a very big thank you to my family: my mom and my sisters- Ntsikie, Vuvu, and Ntutu without you I would not be where I am today. You are the pillars of my strength and I love you all.

To my nephews and nieces Mpholoza, Nololo, Yamkela and Nhiza you have been my inspiration and have always motivated me to do my best. I love you guys.

To my love Kwanele Mafanya: Thank you for walking the journey with me from beginning to end. Your support and love was stupendous and has helped me to survive.

To my daughter Siyamthanda, thank you for your patience with me, and understanding that I needed to do this. For all the time I have been away from you, you have been on my mind and heart always. I love you.

SUMMARY

The Department of Correctional Services (DCS) has adopted legislation that advocates for the rehabilitation and humane treatment of offenders. However, high incidences of assault and inhumane treatment of inmates by correctional officials were reported between 2005 and 2006. Furthermore the statistics of recidivism in South African Correctional Institutions is estimated to be more than 50% indicating that the rehabilitation of inmates in correctional institutes is of limited success. The aim of this study is to provide some insight into the ill-treatment of offenders as well as the rationale behind the high rate of recidivism in the South African Correctional institution by exploring the attitudes of correctional officials towards the rehabilitation and humane treatment of offenders. Understanding the attitudes of the correctional officials could be a crucial first step in understanding the ill-treatment and abuse of offenders by correctional officials and the limited success of offender rehabilitation as these attitudes have the potential to promote or hinder the successful implementation of the new legislation in this regard.

An exploratory research survey was conducted among a sample of correctional officials at Leeuwkop Correctional Institution. The sample consisted of 121 male and 61 female correctional officials. The participants were selected from all major racial groups in South Africa (black, white, coloured and indian). Data was collected by means of a survey questionnaire. The questionnaire was designed by the researcher to elicit the overall attitude of correctional officials towards rehabilitation and humane treatment of

offenders (whether it was positive or negative). In addition the factors that could potentially influence the attitude of correctional officials towards rehabilitation and humane treatment of offenders were also investigated.

The results revealed that correctional officials have an overall positive attitude towards rehabilitation and humane treatment of offenders. Furthermore it was revealed that factors like gender, age, educational qualification, work experience and the type of offender under the correctional officials' care have no impact on the attitudes of correctional officials towards rehabilitation and humane treatment of offenders. It was noted that some of these factors have no influence on the attitude of correctional officials when examined individually, however when some of the factors are correlated they have an impact on the attitude of correctional officials.

For example, when gender and type of offenders under the correctional officials' care were correlated together significant results were noted. Men had more positive results than women and correctional officials with medium offenders under their care had more positive results than correctional officials with juvenile and maximum offenders under their care. The results further revealed that correctional officials supported rehabilitation of offenders, but were not necessarily as positive about the humane treatment of offenders.

The results of this study indicate that the theoretical link between attitudes and behaviour should be viewed with circumspection. The overall finding that most correctional

officials display positive attitudes towards the rehabilitation and humane treatment of offenders is surprising given the high levels of abuses committed against inmates by correctional officials and the rate of re-offending behaviour by former inmates. Furthermore, gender differences in the attitudes of correctional officials when certain variables are correlated point to the importance of taking into account various factors when studying the link between attitudes and behaviour.

This study was an initial step in attempting to explain the high levels of ill-treatment of offenders by correctional officials in spite of legislation which advocates strongly against this. The findings from this study could potentially form the foundation for future studies that seek to investigate the role of attitudes in this regard.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgements.....	i
Summary.....	iv
Table of Contents.....	vii
List of Tables	xii

CHAPTER 1: An overview of the study

1.1 Introduction.....	1
1.2 Motivation of the study.....	3
1.3 Research problem.....	4
1.4 Aims and objectives of the study.....	7
1.5 Definition of the terms and constructs.....	7
1.5.1 Attitude.....	7
1.5.2 Correctional official.....	7
1.5.3 Rehabilitation.....	8
1.5.4 Humane Treatment.....	8
1.6 Chapter delineation.....	8

CHAPTER 2: Historical review of the treatment of offenders in South Africa

2.1. Introduction.....	10
2.2.1 The adoption of imprisonment as a form of punishment	10
2.2.2 Uniform treatment of offenders.....	12
2.3. Correctional system under apartheid South Africa.....	13

2.4 Correctional system within the democratic South Africa.....	16
2.4.1 Offenders’ rights.....	17
2.4.2 Correctional management strategies based on the human rights culture.....	22
2.4.2.1 Restorative justice.....	22
2.4.2.2 Rehabilitation.....	25
2.5 Conclusion.....	27

Chapter 3: Attitudes and the factors that influence the correctional officials’ attitudes towards the treatment of offenders

3.1 Introduction.....	29
3.2 Theoretical background on attitudes.....	30
3.2.1 Attitudes.....	30
3.2.2 Implicit attitudes	31
3.2.3 Explicit attitudes.....	32
3.3 Formation of attitudes: Nature versus socialisation.....	33
3.4 The attitude of correctional officials envisaged in the legislation.....	35
3.5 Factors that influence correctional officials’ attitudes towards the treatment of offenders.....	37
3.5.1 Gender.....	38
3.5.2 Age	40
3.5.3 Race.....	41
3.5.4 Educational background.....	43
3.5.5 Work experience.....	45
3.5.6 Type of offenders.....	46

3.6 Conclusion.....49

CHAPTER 4: Research design and methodology

4.1 Introduction.....50

4.2 Research design.....52

4.3 Survey research method.....53

4.4 Sampling.....55

4.5 Measuring instruments.....56

4.5.1 Demographics.....57

4.5.2 The Overall Attitude Measure57

4.5.3 The Attitude Towards Rehabilitation Measure.....58

4.5.4 The Attitude Towards Humane Treatment Measure.....59

4.6 Pilot testing.....59

4.7 Data gathering.....60

4.8 Data analysis.....61

4.9 Ethical considerations.....62

4.10 Conclusion.....63

CHAPTER 5: Presentation of data

5.1. Introduction.....64

5.2 Description of the sample.....64

5.2.1 Gender.....64

5.2.2 Age.....65

5.2.3 Race.....	66
5.2.4 Educational background.....	67
5.2.5 Work experience	69
5.2.6 Type of offenders.....	70
5.3 The overall attitude of correctional officials towards rehabilitation and humane treatment of offenders.....	70
5.4 Factors that could potentially influence the attitudes of correctional officials towards rehabilitation and humane treatment of offenders.....	77
5.4.1 Gender.....	77
5.4.2 Age.....	78
5.4.3 Educational background.....	80
5.4.4 Work experience.....	80
5.4.5 Type of offenders.....	83
5.5 The differences between the attitudes of correctional official towards rehabilitation and the attitudes of correctional officials towards humane treatment of offenders.....	85
5.6 Conclusion	86

CHAPTER 6: Main findings of the study and conclusion

6.1 Introduction.....	87
6.2 Discussion of results.....	87
6.3 Recommendations.....	95
6.4 Conclusion.....	97

References.....99

APPENDICES

Appendix A: Letter of Approval to conduct the study from the DCS.....113

Appendix B: Consent form for the participants.....114

Appendix C: Questionnaire.....116

Appendix D: The Mann-Whitney-U test according to age.....120

LIST OF TABLES

Table 5.1: Distribution of participants according to age.....	65
Table 5.2: Distribution of participants according to race.....	67
Table 5.3: Distribution of participants according to educational background.....	68
Table 5.4: Distribution of participants according to work experience.....	69
Table 5.5: Frequency distribution of the overall attitudes of correctional officials.....	71
Table 5.6: Mean scores of the overall attitude of the categories of the correctional officials.....	72
Table 5.7: Factor analysis for the overall attitude of correctional officials.....	74
Table 5.8: Regression analysis for the overall attitude of the correctional officials.....	76
Table 5.9 Differences in the attitudes of correctional officials according to gender.....	78
Table 5.10 Independent samples t test of the attitudes of correctional officials according to age.....	80
Table 5.11: Independent samples t test of correctional officials according to educational qualification.....	81
Table 5.12: Independent samples t test according to work experience.....	82
Table 5.13 Differences in the attitudes of correctional officials according to the type of offenders.....	84

Table 5.14 Paired samples t test about the differences between the attitudes of correctional officials towards rehabilitation and their attitudes towards humane treatment of offenders.....86

CHAPTER 1

AN OVERVIEW OF THE STUDY

1.1 Introduction

For many years the functioning of the prison system in South Africa was guided by the apartheid system. During this era prison served to reinforce the apartheid regime because a large number of offenders detained were political and the pass-law offenders who were opposed to the government of the era (DCS, 2005). While in custody these offenders were subjected to physical and psychological torture, harassment, humiliation, and were sometimes even murdered (Kagee, 2005). One's racial background determined the type of treatment one received while in prison. White offenders were treated better than other racial groups, while the black offenders received the worst treatment. The ill treatment of offenders remained largely unchallenged until democratic rule. The democratic government introduced new legislation to govern the country. Amongst the legislation introduced was the new South African constitution (Act 108 of 1996) that was adopted in 1996.

In terms of correctional services, the highlight of the new constitution is that for the first time it acknowledged the rights of the offenders. Offenders' rights are enshrined in the bill of rights along with the rights of other South African citizens. The adoption of the new constitution has led to a tremendous change in the South African prison system. The name changed from Department of Prisons to Department of Correctional Services

(DCS), employees are no longer called prison warders but correctional officials, prisons are now called correctional institutions or management areas, and prisoners are now referred to as offenders or inmates. However, the most important change is the change in the role of the DCS.

The Department of Correctional Services' role is no longer about locking offenders away from the society and enforcing punishment given by the courts. The role of the DCS is to correct offending behaviour through the rehabilitation process in an environment that promotes the humane treatment of offenders. The rehabilitation of offenders is believed to be the remedy for the high crime rate in South Africa as well as the solution for recidivism (DCS, 2005). Through rehabilitation offenders are equipped with skills that enable them to find employment so that they can take care of themselves and their families when they are released from the correctional institutions.

The paradigm shift requires that correctional officials change their attitudes regarding the treatment of offenders. The idea of punishment has been replaced by rehabilitation. Offenders are to be treated with respect and dignity throughout their stay in the correctional institutions. It is believed that protecting the offenders' human dignity will facilitate the process of rehabilitation and decrease the tendency to resort to criminal behaviour to maintain a living (DCS, 2005). The aim of this study is to explore the attitudes of correctional officials towards the rehabilitation and humane treatment of offenders. Their attitudes and behaviour can either promote or inhibit the success of the DCS' role of rehabilitation and correcting offending behaviour.

1.2 Motivation for the study

In South Africa there are no exact statistics available on recidivism. It is estimated that the rate of recidivism is higher than 50%. This means that half of all offenders are repeat offenders (Gaum, Hoffman & Venter, 2006; Sekhonyane, 2002). Furthermore, between 2005 and 2006, 4755 cases of offenders assaulted by correctional officials were reported. There were 5291 reported cases of inhumane treatment of offenders which included corporal punishment, solitary confinement, dietary punishment and additional labour (Fagan, 2006). The reported cases are in stark contradiction to the spirit and principles of the South African Constitution of 1996. The South African Constitution stipulates that offenders have the right to conditions of detention that are consistent with human dignity, including at least exercise, and the provision, at state expense of adequate reading material, nutrition and medical treatment (Dissel & Ellis, 2002).

The purpose of this study is to determine the correctional officials' attitude towards their new role in rehabilitation, and the treatment of offenders with respect and dignity. The researcher believes that determining the attitudes of correctional officials towards the rehabilitation and humane treatment of offenders may give some insights into the high number of incidences of human rights violations and the high rate of recidivism in the South African correctional institutions. In particular, negative attitudes towards the rehabilitation and humane treatment of offenders may highlight barriers to successful implementation of relevant policies and legislation. Lambert, Barton and Hogan (1999) argue that employees' negative attitudes are detrimental and even devastating to

organizations like correctional institutions, because these institutions rely heavily on the humane character of their employees.

While there is a considerable amount of literature about the correctional system, very little, if anything, has been written about attitudes of correctional officials towards rehabilitation and humane treatment of offenders. This study aims to fill this gap by identifying the attitudes that correctional officials have towards the changes in the DCS, and how these attitudes affect the process of transformation in the DCS. Highlighting the attitudes of correctional officials can help in developing strategies to overcome the problems identified and develop programmes that will facilitate and enhance the effective contribution of correctional officials towards the rehabilitation of offenders in the future.

1.3. Research problem

The Prison's Act 8 of 1959 that governed prisons during the apartheid era was characterized by an emphasis on the punishment of offenders and consequent human rights violations. This degrading treatment of offenders was promoted by the Prison's Act. Apartheid ideologies were fully implemented, and perpetrators faced no consequences. With the advent of democracy in South Africa, the Prison's Act was replaced by the Correctional Services Act 111 of 1998 (DCS, 2005). The Correctional Services Act outlines the functions and the control of the DCS, with emphasis on its societal obligation to protect the community from offenders through incarceration.

Guided simply by this perceived role of correctional institutions as places of punishment and protection of society, some correctional service officials ill-treat offenders by physically assaulting them, subjecting offenders to unpaid additional labour, as well as subjecting them to solitary confinement (Dissel & Ellis, 2002; Luyt, 2002). This type of behaviour is a possible manifestation of retributive justice. Retributive justice is punishment without consideration of the severity of the punishment on the grounds that it is seen as deserved (Rossum & Rossum, 2003). Retribution assumes that offenders must be taught a lesson so that they will never commit any other offence.

Recently, both nationally and internationally the trend has been to move away from retributive justice towards restorative justice. In South Africa this trend culminated in the Prison's Act 8 of 1959 being replaced by the Correctional Services Act 111 of 1998 (DCS,1998). The Correctional Services Act 111 contradicts to the former Act which was based on retributive justice and apartheid policies and was characterized by the punishment of offenders and major human rights violation. Instead, the Correctional Services Act 111 emphasizes the rehabilitation of offenders and advocates for the respect of the rights of offenders.

Furthermore the White Paper on Corrections which complements the Correctional Services Act was also adopted in 2005. The aim of the White Paper on Corrections is to present the new vision and mission of the DCS, which is to provide rehabilitation to offenders as a fundamental contribution to societal correction as well as the provision of education and development programmes that will enable offenders to be employable after

being released from correctional institutions, thereby preventing poverty which leads to recidivism (DCS, 2005). It is the objective of the DCS that all offenders released from South African correctional institutions be rehabilitated and that those who remain in custody are treated with respect and dignity. The DCS has asserted that every correctional official is a rehabilitator, and that the successful rehabilitation of offenders depends on the correctional officials' attitudes and behaviour. The role of correctional officials is crucial in the work of corrections and the positive interaction between correctional officials and inmates can facilitate the kind of regeneration envisaged by the Correctional Services Act and the White Paper on Corrections (Gillespie, 2003).

Even though the DCS has a policy framework in place, it requires the correct understanding and implementation, as well as the positive attitudes of the correctional officials for it to succeed. The Judicial Inspectorate of Prisons continues to receive daily reports and complaints from offenders and their families of assaults and intimidation by fellow prisoners and prison gangs (Erasmus, 2007). According to Erasmus (2007) this indicates the lack of ability or willingness by some correctional officials to protect, and to ensure the safe detention of offenders. Furthermore, lack of rehabilitation programmes has been identified as a prevalent factor in South African correctional institutions (Erasmus, 2007). Thus, the aim of this study is to identify and understand the attitudes of correctional officials, as these attitudes might have an impact on the changes implemented by the DCS.

1.4 Aims and objectives of the study

This study aims to:

- Explore the overall or general attitude (positive or negative) of correctional officials towards rehabilitation and humane treatment of offenders.
- Examine the attitude of correctional officials towards rehabilitation of offenders and the attitude of correctional officials towards humane treatment of offenders.
- Determine if there are specific factors that have an influence on the attitudes of correctional officials.

1.5 Definition of the terms and constructs

1.5.1 Attitude

An attitude is defined as an opinion, a thought and a feeling that an individual has about a particular object known as the attitude object (Huskinson & Haddock, 2006).

1.5.2 Correctional official

A correctional official is an individual employed to work in the Department of Correctional Services (DCS, 1998).

1.5.3 Rehabilitation

It is the process aimed at changing the attitudes and the behaviour of offenders through social, moral, spiritual, and educational processes (DCS, 2005).

1.5.4 Humane Treatment

Humane treatment refers to an act of detaining offenders in safe and secure environments, protecting offenders from harm, and treating them with decency, respect, humanity, and fairness (DCS, 2005).

1.6 Chapter Delineation

Chapter 2: A historical review of the treatment of offenders in South Africa. This chapter focuses on the treatment of offenders during the apartheid era, the impact of the changes resulting from the changes in legislation with regard to the treatment of offenders, and the reasons for the changes in the legislation.

Chapter 3: The chapter contains a literature review that provides theoretical background on attitudes, looks at the attitude of correctional officials envisaged by the legislation and comments on certain factors that impact the attitudes of correctional officials towards the rehabilitation and humane treatment of offenders.

Chapter 4: A description of the research methodology and design which includes a description of participants and the instrument used in the study.

Chapter 5: A presentation of the research data obtained.

Chapter 6: Discussion of the results, recommendations and the conclusion.

Appendices consist of the Department of Correctional Services' letter of approval for the study to be conducted, a consent form, and the questionnaire that was distributed to the participants.

CHAPTER 2
HISTORICAL REVIEW OF THE TREATMENT OF OFFENDERS IN
SOUTH AFRICA

2.1 Introduction

Correctional institutions, commonly known as prisons, are usually built within densely populated areas yet the community knows little about these institutions (Roberts & Hough, 2005). Before democratic government, the South African correctional system was a closed system. Inspection by outsiders or taking photos of the correctional institutions was not allowed (DCS, 2005). This was a contributing factor in the community's lack of awareness of the functioning of these institutions.

This chapter aims to develop awareness about the South African correctional system, focusing on the treatment of offenders under both the apartheid and democratic governments. The history of the South African correctional system is important for this study, because it creates an understanding of the need for transformation in the treatment of offenders in correctional institutions.

2.2.1 The adoption of imprisonment as a form of punishment

The South African correctional system has been subjected to major changes as a result of the changes in the country's legislation. Previously the correctional system was regulated

by Act 8 of 1959, and it is currently governed by Act 111 of 1998. Unlike Act 8 of 1959, which was based on apartheid policies and characterized by the punishment of offenders and major violations of human rights, the Correctional Services Act 111 of 1998 outlines the functions as well as the control of the Department of Correctional Services (DCS) and the rights of offenders (DCS, 1998), ensuring that they are incarcerated under humane and safe conditions. This major paradigm shift in government's approach to the management of the correctional system and the treatment of offenders impacts on the role played by correctional officials (DCS, 2005).

The existence of correctional institutions dates back to several centuries. Their existence can be traced through the middle ages back to the Roman era. In South Africa the first offenders were detained when the Cape was first occupied by the Dutch in 1652 (Oppler, 1998; Mubangizi, 2001). During this era imprisonment was not regarded as a primary form of punishment as there was no customary law which used imprisonment as punishment (Van Zyl Smit, 1992). In fact, prisons were used worldwide to detain awaiting trial offenders, and not as punishment after conviction. Mutilation, death, outlawing and compensation in cash were general punishments for convicted criminals (Pugh, 1968 cited in Mubangizi, 2001). The penal system at that time was clearly not about imprisonment but about physical harm.

The British occupation of the Cape in 1785 abolished the penal system based on physical harm as punishment, and replaced it with the incarceration of people for a fixed period of time depending on the type of offence committed. It is at this period that the British

colonial states globally reformed their penal systems, declaring imprisonment as the main form of punishment. The adoption of imprisonment as a form of punishment did not differ greatly from the penal system of physical harm. Offenders continued to be exploited and mistreated. They were made to provide hard labour, building roads and ships without remuneration as long as they were incarcerated (Oppler, 1998). Imprisonment was used to warehouse offenders so that they could be easily accessible to provide physical labour.

2.2.2 Uniform treatment of offenders

The weakness of the South African penal system of imprisonment that was introduced in 1875 was that the provincial ordinances of the time used different penal approaches (DCS, 2005). This created problems in that there was no right or wrong way of treating the offenders. Each provincial ordinance treated offenders in the way that it thought was the best. The unification of South African penal system happened in 1910 and in 1911 the Prisons and Reformatories Act 13 was adopted. The Prisons and Reformatories Act brought change as a uniform system for the entire South African penal system was initiated and was governed at a national level. Amongst the changes brought by this act was the partial recognition of offenders' rights. This was evidenced by the fact that the courts started to play a major role in the development of prison laws, and offenders who felt unfairly treated were allowed to approach the courts of law and voice their complaints (DCS 2005). Offenders with good behavior were released early, and those who transgressed in prison were punished for their behavior (DCS, 2005).

Although the unification of the South African penal system introduced some recognition of offenders' rights, no improvement was noted in the actual treatment of offenders. Offenders continued to be assaulted and treated inhumanely. During this era the purpose of imprisonment was retribution. Retribution is based on the premise that individuals should be made responsible for their actions by being punished and having their freedom restricted (Rossum & Rossum, 2003). Individuals are viewed as having to pay the debt they owe to the society for the crimes committed. The severity of the punishment was never considered, as it was felt that the offender had wronged the community and deserved to be punished. Act 13 of 1911 created a foundation for the apartheid system in South Africa because it prescribed and enforced racial segregation of offenders in correctional institutions (DCS, 2005).

2.3 Correctional system under apartheid South Africa

The adoption of Act 13 of 1911 did not provide any solutions to the problems experienced in the South African penal system. The ill-treatment of offenders continued unabated. The labour provided by offenders was sought after by private contractors thus increasing the high demands for these offenders. As the courts were involved in the management of correctional institutions they declared the provision of labour by offenders without compensation, assaults, and ill-treatment of offenders unlawful (DCS, 2005). The Landsdowne Commission on Penal and Prison Reform was appointed in 1945 in the hope that the situation would be remedied, offenders would be treated humanely and that their rights would finally be considered and respected. Amongst the revelations

made by the Landsdowne Commission was that Act 13 of 1911 did not introduce any changes in the South African penal system but maintained the pre-existing harsh and inequitable conditions (Oppler, 1998; DCS, 2005).

The Landsdowne Commission's report led to the drafting and adoption of Act 8 of 1959. When this latter act was adopted it was envisaged that the South African correctional system would be transformed. This new legislation emphasized the rehabilitation of offenders, and abolished the provision of labour by offenders replacing it with awarding parole to offenders for good behavior (DCS, 2005). However, this act was adopted after the election of the National Party. This meant that the correctional system was not immune to the apartheid policies that enforced racial segregation, discrimination, oppression and exploitation of an indigenous majority by an immigrant minority (Franchi, 2003). Racial segregation of offenders was the dominant aspect in prison, with white offenders being given preferential treatment. Black offenders received worse treatment than other offenders. Offenders from different racial groups were not allowed to interact. White offenders lived in separate better cells, and had healthier diets than their black counterparts. This resulted in tension and continuous conflict between correctional officials and offenders (Luyt, 2001).

After Act 8 of 1959 was introduced there was an influx of political offenders who were opposed to the ruling government of the era. Some of the detained offenders had transgressed the pass laws. During this era the prisons were used to control the political unrest that was present in South Africa (DCS, 2005). Often political offenders were badly

treated and extensively punished in order to make them comply with whatever terms and conditions that were given to them. They were physical and mentally assaulted, punished by the withholding of medical attention or food, and often attack dogs and teargas were used as an intensive form of punishment (Anonymous, 2002; Kagee, 2005). Complaints lodged by the offenders about these brutal assaults and violations of their rights were ignored, and as a result some of these offenders died in detention (Merrett, 1990). The death of the political activist Steve Biko is an example of the impact of the brutal assault endured by the offenders while in custody (Jenkins & McLean, 2004). Offenders who survived the assaults were denied access to their legal representatives until their wounds had healed, and evidence of abuse had disappeared (Anonymous, 2002).

The gross violation of these offenders' rights was encouraged by legislation because parliament, not the courts, was the supreme institution of the country. Its duty was to draft and implement legislation regardless of how irrational or oppressive the laws were. The courts had no powers to challenge the legislation, and there was no jurisdiction in place to challenge these unjust laws (Mubangizi, 2001; Plasket, 2006). Even though Act 8 of 1959 prioritized rehabilitation, crucial aspects of rehabilitation and human rights including the abolishment of corporal punishment were ignored (DCS, 2005).

The introduction of Act 8 of 1959 imposed and safe guarded apartheid policies within the correctional system, and this led to serious disregard of offenders' rights (Mubangizi, 2001). The correctional system was an institution where all the apartheid ideologies were fully implemented, and it was thus characterized by a general disrespect for human rights

and the inhumane treatment of offenders, particularly political offenders. This situation was challenged when South Africa became a democratic country.

2.4 Correctional system within the democratic South Africa

The 1980's were characterized by constant conflict between the South African government and the people who opposed the apartheid policies (DCS, 2005). During this era the South African government enforced compliance to these policies despite the growing resistance. As a result of political violence in South Africa the country was intensely ungovernable. One consequence of this situation was that many of these citizens were detained, resulting in overcrowded prisons (Mubangizi, 2002). The inflation in the prison population led to chaos in South African prisons, the deterioration in prison living conditions resulted in inevitable deaths. The chaotic political unrest in South Africa continued until the long process of negotiations culminating in elections. Violence, unrest and even civil war remained the possibilities throughout this period until South Africa was declared democratic (Thotse & Grobler, 2003).

An interim South African constitution was drafted in 1993, and adopted in 1994. This constitution took into cognizance the fundamental rights of all citizens of the country. The year 1994 signified a fundamental break with the apartheid past, a new beginning based on a non-racial democratic system, a supreme constitution and an advanced set of enforceable and justifiable human rights, including the rights of offenders (Malherbe,

2003). This resulted in the recognition of a human rights culture within South African correctional institutions.

The present South African constitution was adopted in 1996. This constitution obliged all government departments, including the DCS, to align their core functions with the ideology of this constitution. As a result the new legislation of the DCS, Act 111 was drafted and adopted in 1998. This latter act differs from Act 8 of 1959 because it has been aligned to the new constitution, thus ensuring that offenders are detained in safe and secure custody under humane conditions. Another important aspect of this new legislation is that it clearly states that the role of the DCS is not to keep offenders under lock and key but to rehabilitate them.

2.4.1 Offenders' rights

Human rights are the rights and freedoms which everybody has from the moment of birth, simply because they are human beings. They are not privileges which need to be won, they apply equally to everybody regardless of age, sex, race, ethnicity, wealth or social standing. Because they are rights, they cannot be taken away from anyone by the government (although they can be limited and sometimes suspended during states of emergency) (Human Rights Commission, 1999).

The idea that people have basic rights such as the right to life emerged after the Second World War. During this war many people, including Jews, gypsies and homosexuals,

were tortured and killed on a massive scale by Nazi soldiers (Human Rights Commission, 1999). In South Africa, as in many other countries, these rights are listed in the Bill of Rights, which is part of the constitution, Act 108 of 1996. This is done to record which rights are protected, and to make them part of the highest law of the land so that they are difficult to change or take away from people, and to ensure that everyone can use them in court to protect themselves.

The adoption of the South African constitution in 1996 has given new meaning to the culture of the correctional system. The constitution of South Africa embodies the values of human dignity, justice for all and the promotion and advancement of human rights (Morodi, 2001). This ideology of human rights gave rise to the concept of offenders rights. The bill of rights recognizes and acknowledges offenders as part of society, and therefore their rights need to be respected. During the apartheid era human rights were often not spoken about or recognized. The culture of human rights was not discussed in connection with the prison environment. Some members of the public still feel that offenders' rights are unnecessary and that offenders do not deserve them (Mubangizi, 2004). However, human rights are natural and everyone deserves them, even if they are offenders.

Every South African citizen is entitled to common rights which include the right to life, the right to freedom, the right to dignity, the right to own property (limiting when government may intrude), citizenship rights that include voting, nationality and participation in public life, rights to standards of good behavior by government and

social, economic and cultural rights (Pete, 1997). Offenders are also entitled to these common rights, as well as rights that are specific and applicable only to them. The rights of detained and arrested persons are listed in section 35 of Act 108 of 1996. Offenders' rights include rights to dignity, freedom and security of the person, privacy, the right to a fair trial, the right to remain innocent until proven guilty, and if found guilty the right to conditions of detention that are consistent with human dignity and not to be subjected to cruel, inhumane and degrading treatment (Dissel & Ellis, 2002; Malherbe, 2003).

Even though inmates are entitled to fundamental human rights, some of these rights can be and are limited by means of the residuum principle. The residuum principle means that the limitation of these rights is due to the fact that an individual is in prison (Singh & Maseko, 2006). The limitation of rights clause should, as stipulated in section 36 (1) of the constitution, be implemented in a constitutionally acceptable way, and be based on human dignity, equality and freedom. The limitation must be reasonable and justifiable in an open and democratic society. Before rights are limited certain factors such as the type of the right to be limited, the importance of the purpose of the limitation, the nature and extent of the limitation, the relation between the limitation and its purpose and less restrictive means to achieve the purpose should be taken into consideration (Singh & Maseko, 2006).

Correctional authorities usually make decisions that affect the rights of offenders, for example they decide when to search and transfer offenders, grant visitation rights to the offenders and when they can eat or sleep. These decisions sometimes lead to the violation

of offenders' rights (Zinger, 2006). Both the South African government and the Department of Correctional Services are obliged to protect and promote the rights of offenders, and to make them a reality, as prescribed in the legislation. Acknowledging that offenders are still members of the society, and allowing them to retain most of the rights that society enjoys while granting some rights that are applicable only to them, is an act of humane treatment towards offenders and can actually contribute to decreasing the rate of offending behaviour (Plasket, 2006). Correctional institutions with a human rights culture are suitable places for positive change, and this may increase the possibility of releasing responsible individuals (Zinger, 2006).

Treating offenders with dignity and respect is not only about doing what is required by the constitution, but also sends a message to the community that offenders are human beings and need to be treated as such. Adopting a human rights culture in correctional institutions leads to an improvement in the way offenders are treated by correctional officials. This paradigm shift in the treatment of offenders is not only applicable in South Africa, but is a requirement for countries internationally. All countries should meet international standard called The Standard Minimum Rules (DCS, 2005). This international move indicates that maintaining the rights of offenders is not a choice but a necessity for the South African correctional system.

To show the DCS' commitment to adopting a human rights culture in its institutions an independent statutory body was established. "The Judicial Inspectorate of Prisons (The Inspectorate) was established as an independent statutory body in terms of section 85 of

the Correctional Services Act 111 of 1998 to monitor the conditions in prisons and the treatment of prisoners” (Fagan, 2006, p.6) and “any corrupt and dishonest practices which might exist in prison” (Pete, 1997, p.239). Monitoring of the prison conditions is achieved by appointing Independent Prison Visitors (IVPs’), whose role is to visit offenders and try to resolve any complaints. If the complaint cannot be resolved it has to be submitted to the Inspection Judge. The Inspectorate not only monitors the situation in correctional institutions but also provides annual reports to the President of the country, as well as to the Minister and the Deputy Minister of the DCS about the state of prison conditions with a special focus on matters that relate to the treatment of offenders.

The Inspectorate is not the only watchdog institution that monitors adherence to human rights culture in correctional institutions. Other organizations that also uphold the bill of rights are The South African Human Rights Commission, Human Rights Watch, Lawyers for Human Rights, and the South African Prisoners’ Organization for Human Rights (Morodi, 2001). The mandate of these institutions is to ensure that the human rights outlined in the constitution are made a reality (Horsten, 2006). The details about these institutions are obtained from chapter 9 of the South African constitution. These institutions are in partnership with the DCS in ensuring that the correctional management strategies, which are founded on the human rights principles embodied in the constitution, are upheld.

2.4.2 Correctional management strategies based on the human rights culture

The South Africa correctional system is currently based on human rights principles which oppose the reinforcement of order by punishment of offenders. The DCS has adopted approaches such as restorative justice and rehabilitation to manage offenders. It is believed that the criminal offence committed affects not only the victim and the offender but also the community. Therefore, restorative justice aims to restore the offenders and victims to wellness, and to restore the balance in the community that has been unsettled by the commission of crime. Restorative justice aims to instill a sense of belonging and safety to both the offenders and the victims, in the process restoring family relationships, and cultivating relationships between victims and offenders where possible (Miler & Schater, 2000). The restoration of offenders will be achieved by rehabilitating the offenders through correctional interventions and development programmes, which will enable offenders to serve the society in socially responsible ways, and eliminate anti-social addictions that may be contributing to the inability of the offenders to make alternative choices (DCS, 2005).

2.4.2.1 Restorative justice

Different authors define restorative justice in different ways, but they all agree that it is a comprehensive approach to the criminal justice system in that it involves the offenders, the victims and the community (Roach, 2000). This approach combines legislative, prosecutorial, defense, judicial and correctional functions in response to the harm caused

by crime (Naude, 2006). For the DCS, restorative justice is important and better than punitive justice because it attempts to reintegrate the offenders, the victims, the families and the supporters of the offenders and victims, as well as the community at large without stigmatizing or isolating offenders.

The DCS adopted restorative justice after the Correctional Services Act 111 of 1998 was promulgated. Restorative justice appears to be a new concept within the criminal justice system in South Africa. Studies reveal that it has ancient roots in aboriginal and non-aboriginal societies (Roach, 2000). Restorative justice was the dominant criminal justice model in ancient Greek, Roman and Arab civilizations as well as among indigenous communities in South Africa, Australia, New Zealand and Canada (Naude, 2006). It was adopted by Western countries in the mid 1970s, and by the end of the 1990s most Western countries including South Africa had legalized restorative justice programmes (Naude, 2006). Restorative justice appears to be the most popular and favoured correctional approach internationally. The most significant aspect of restorative justice is its grounding in human rights principles that stipulate that offenders should be treated with respect and dignity (DCS, 2005; Ward & Langlands, 2008).

Restorative justice is linked to human rights because through restorative justice offenders are treated as moral human beings capable of taking responsibility and making amends for their actions (Ward & Langlands, 2008). Through this process the offenders' right to dignity is maintained. Giving an offender a chance to correct his or her behavior restores the dignity of an offender, and further promotes healing and the rehabilitation of

offenders. Furthermore, offenders are protected from torture and degrading treatment by making sure that the punishment given to the offender is equivalent to the offence committed (Naude, Prinsloo & Ladikos, 2003). A balance is struck between the offence committed and the punishment given thus ensuring that offenders are not severely punished unnecessarily.

The right to freedom of choice and security is granted to offenders by allowing them to participate in restorative proceeding voluntarily. Unlike in the conventional justice system, offenders may also choose to withdraw from the proceedings at anytime. The freedom of choice given to offenders emphasizes the fact that they are human beings who are capable of making the right choices to make amends for their offending behavior. Most importantly offenders should be and are, treated with respect and dignity throughout the restorative justice process. Even though no studies have been conducted in South Africa, studies conducted worldwide reveal that positive results have been achieved through the restorative justice process. Offenders who were involved in the restorative justice programmes revealed that they were treated fairly, and the rate of recidivism decreased (Naude, 2006).

Restorative justice is an important aspect of the DCS' strategy to reduce the high crime and recidivism rates in South Africa. However, restorative justice alone is an insufficient solution to combat the offenders' challenges when released from correctional institutions. Offenders also need to be empowered through rehabilitation programmes that will enhance positive development of offenders (DCS, 2005).

2.4.2.2 Rehabilitation

The concept of rehabilitation of offenders has consistently led to debates in the public, with some people supporting rehabilitation while some people are against it (Roberts & Hough, 2005). Some people argue that offenders do not need to be rehabilitated because they have harmed the society, and others believe that for crime to decrease offenders need to be rehabilitated. As correctional institutions have existed for centuries in South Africa, society is puzzled by this new concept of rehabilitation of offenders. People often raise the question of why a person who has wronged society should be rehabilitated (Roberts & Hough, 2005). The concept of rehabilitation has emanated from an increase in the prison population as a result of high rates of crime and recidivism. Offending behavior is believed to be caused by social factors like illiteracy, poverty and unemployment. Rehabilitation is considered a viable solution because it addresses the above social factors, thus causing the offenders to be employable when released from correctional institutions. Hence rehabilitation, as opposed to the warehousing of offenders, is seen as necessary for the offenders' well-being (Gaum, Hoffman & Venter, 2006).

Rehabilitation is defined as “the result of a process that combines the correcting of offending behavior, human development and the promotion of social responsibility and values that involve both the departmental responsibilities of the government and the social responsibilities of the nation” (DCS, 2005, p.37). Rehabilitation is viewed as a holistic approach to preventing crime and repeat offending, promoting social

responsibility and social justice as well as the empowering with life skills and other skills in order to be able to contribute in making South Africa a better place to live (Hesselink-Louw, Joubert & Maree, 2003).

Rehabilitation consists of activities designed to change offenders into law-abiding citizens. It includes educational courses while the offenders are incarcerated, teaching employment skills and counseling sessions with a psychologist or social worker (Mubangizi, 2002). Rehabilitation benefits not only offenders but the society at large, in that the offenders who are rehabilitated leave correctional institutions having gained an increased level of literacy and education, thus increasing their employment opportunities, and reducing the rate of crime in the community (Bruyns & Nieuwehuizen, 2003).

It should be highlighted that rehabilitation is not a single event but a process that begins when the offender is admitted, and ends at the end of the sentence (Cilliers & Smit, 2007). The onus is on the DCS to ensure that this process becomes a success. The DCS acknowledges its responsibility to rehabilitate offenders and, to demonstrate its seriousness about the issue, the White Paper on Corrections has been drafted to give guidelines as to how this process must be implemented. It should be emphasized that the rehabilitation process is a partnership between offenders and correctional officials, and it is the responsibility of both parties to make rehabilitation a reality.

2.5 Conclusion

The South African correctional system has transformed the idea of punishment of offenders into one of rehabilitation and humane treatment of offenders. In order to implement this transformation, efforts have been made by the DCS to create a human rights culture within correctional institutions. The recognition of offenders' rights ensures that offenders are detained under humane conditions, thus strengthening the safety and security of these offenders (DCS, 2005).

The DCS believes that a correctional system that acknowledges the rights of offenders will facilitate the reformation of offenders through restorative justice and rehabilitation programmes (Pete, 1997). It is the role of correctional officials to ensure that offenders are treated with respect and dignity. The interaction between the correctional officials and the offender should facilitate the rehabilitation and humane treatment of offenders while in custody (Gillespie, 2003).

The human rights culture within the South African correctional system was adopted more than 10 years ago, but cases of assaults and ill treatment of offenders by correctional officials are still reported (Fagan, 2006). This study aims to investigate the factors that lead to the ill treatment of offenders. Attitude is one of the important determinants of behaviour and thus correctional officials' attitudes have the potential to either promote or inhibit the rehabilitation of offenders. The successful implementation of the DCS' vision and mission is dependent on the correctional officials' correct understanding and

implementation of this vision and mission, and their positive attitude towards the rehabilitation of the offenders under humane conditions.

CHAPTER 3

LITERATURE REVIEW ON ATTITUDES

3.1 Introduction

Attitudes continuously pervade people's thinking by providing them with a summary of their evaluation of their favorable and unfavorable objects (Ajzen, 2001). An evaluation is always made with respect to an entity or thing known as the attitude object. The evaluation of the attitude objects serves as a behavioural guide, because it influences how people make critical decisions, and how they behave towards other people (Holland, Verplanken & Van Knippenberg, 2002). Attitudes can be positive, negative or neutral. Individuals usually view information that is consistent with their attitudes positively, and information that is inconsistent with their attitudes negatively (Sotirovic, 2001).

This chapter provides the background information about the key construct in this study, that is, correctional officials' attitudes towards a specific policy. A description of attitudes is provided and the means by which individuals acquire these attitudes is discussed. Furthermore, a literature review of the factors that could potentially influence the attitudes of correctional officials towards rehabilitation and humane treatment of offenders is provided. For many years correctional institutions have been known as places of punishment where offenders were degraded, physically harmed and humiliated. The idea of punishment has changed to that of rehabilitation and the humane treatment of offenders, and the correctional officials are expected to implement this idea (DCS, 2005).

Understanding the attitudes of correctional officials is important for the DCS' successful transformation of the correctional system.

3.2 Theoretical background on attitude

There are several definitions used to explain attitudes. Attitudes are defined according to their characteristics, their functions, as well as the type of attitude. Attitudes are categorized into implicit and the explicit attitudes. Theoretical definitions of an attitude and the types of attitudes are discussed so as to create an understanding of the concept of attitude.

3.2.1 Attitudes

An attitude is a single entity that consists of certain characteristics. These characteristics are that an attitude relates to a particular object known as the attitude object, an emotion is expressed towards the attitude object (that is, whether an individual likes or dislikes the attitude object), cognition about the attitude tends to be evaluative in nature, and there is a tendency to behave in a certain way towards the attitude object (George & Jones, 1997; Huskinson & Haddock, 2006). In summary an attitude consists of an affective, cognitive and the behavioural component.

Different authors provide varying opinions as to what attitudes are, but they agree that expressing an attitude involves making an evaluative judgment about an attitude object

as good or bad, harmful or beneficial, pleasant or unpleasant and likable or dislikable (Haddock, 2003; Petty, Wegner & Fabrigar, 1997). Thus Van Harreveld, Van Der Pligt, De Vries and Andreas (2000), argue that the concept of attitude refers to a set of feelings, memories and beliefs about the attitude object. The evaluation of the attitude object is spontaneous and inevitable (Ajzen, 2001). Attitudes predict many forms of social behavior, in that if a person has a positive attitude towards something, he or she will like or be more positive towards that object. Alternatively, when the person has a negative attitude towards a particular object, he or she will dislike or be resistant towards that particular object.

People tend to behave in a manner that is consistent with their attitudes, because positive attitudes result into positive behaviour, likewise negative attitudes generate negative behaviour (Sotirovic, 2001). Furthermore, attitudes are categorized as either implicit or explicit attitudes depending on the awareness that people have about the attitude as well as the way the attitude is activated.

3.2.2 Implicit attitudes

“Implicit attitudes are judgments or evaluations of social objects that are automatically activated, often without the individual’s conscious awareness of causation” (Geer & Robertsons, 2005, p.671). The studies on implicit attitudes reveal that people are not consciously aware of them, and that the activation of these attitudes is automatic and cannot be controlled when an attitude object is encountered (Rydell & McConnell, 2006).

The fact that people are unaware of these attitudes means that they cannot provide reports about these attitudes. Implicit attitudes are measured indirectly without asking the participant to indicate his or her attitude, through the observation of the person's response times to stimuli (Perugini, 2005).

For example, when measuring the implicit attitude of the correctional officials towards offenders from different racial groups, the participant would be shown pictures of offenders from different racial groups. The participant will then be asked to indicate the positive or negative adjectives that they associate with the pictures shown. An important aspect of this evaluation is the speed with which the participant indicates the responses. Implicit negative attitudes may also emerge from non-verbal behaviour (Bohner & Wanke, 2002; Haddock, 2003). For instance, the presentation of pictures of the black offenders could activate a rapid responding rate of negative responses, thus indicating that the participant has negative attitudes towards black offenders. In the current study explicit measures were used to determine the attitude of correctional officials.

3.2.3 Explicit attitudes

An explicit attitude is a conscious, thoughtful or deliberative response to the attitude object. Within the realm of attitude measurement, explicit attitude measures directly ask respondents to indicate their attitudes through verbal or written reports (Fazio & Olson, 2003). The explicit attitudes of correctional officials will be measured in this study by asking the participants to indicate in writing their attitudes towards the treatment of

offenders. In this study the affective, cognitive and behavioural components of the correctional officials' explicit attitudes towards rehabilitation and humane treatment of offenders will be examined. It is hypothesized that some correctional officials will be positive towards the rehabilitation and humane treatment of offenders, while others will be negative. In the following section an overview of the origins of attitudes is provided.

3.3 Formation of attitudes: nature versus socialization

Attitudes are formed through the direct and indirect experiences of the individuals. Attitude formation is attributed to genetic influences and socialization. A brief review of how attitudes are formed is provided as the researcher believes that this information provides a better understanding of the concept of attitudes. Literature reveals that attitudes are formed in the following ways:

Reinforcement: This process is also called instrumental conditioning. People learn attitudes early in life by practicing the behaviours that cause them to be rewarded and avoiding the behaviours that cause them to be punished (Bonner & Wanke, 2002; Baron & Byrne, 1997). People will hold their attitudes based on whether they will be rewarded or punished for those attitudes. For example, correctional officials could participate more in rehabilitative programmes for offenders if they are rewarded with an increase in salary, or if they avoid losing their jobs as a result of refusing to rehabilitate the offenders.

Modeling: Attitude modeling occurs when people observe how other people behave, and then imitate them. If a person sees his or her role model expressing an attitude, people tend to adopt that attitude as they consider it to be the correct attitude. Regardless of how negative the attitude is the fact that it is expressed by their role model will lead them to imitate it. In behavior modeling behavior is imitated especially if the results are seen by the protégé as beneficial (Cardinal, 2001).

Social Comparison: Social comparison refers to people's tendency to compare themselves to others to judge whether their view of social reality is correct or not. If a person's attitudes are similar to those of their social group, that person will automatically conclude that his or her attitude is correct. There is always pressure on group members to conform to the accepted norms of the social group. Conforming to the attitude of the social group does not only confirm the correctness of our attitudes, but it also ensures our belonging to that social group (Smith & Terry, 2003).

Direct Instruction: As opposed to social comparison, direct instruction involves being told what attitudes to have by parents, schools, community organizations, religious doctrine and friends. People are not given an option, they are forced to follow the instructions given by others. When people are constantly exposed to a particular set of attitudes they ultimately adopt these attitudes (Bohner & Wanke, 2002).

Genetic influence: Recent studies indicate that certain genetic factors influence the formation of attitudes (Petty, Wegner & Fabrigar, 1997). However, there is no specific

gene for a specific attitude, and no mechanism in which the genes influence the formation of attitudes (Bohner & Wanke, 2002; George & Jones, 1997). “Genes may establish general predispositions that shape environmental experiences in ways that increase the likelihood of the individual developing specific attitudes” (Albarracin, Johnson & Zanna, 2005, p.334). The link between genetic influence and attitude formation is neither well understood nor well researched. However, Bohner and Wanke (2002, p.85) state that studies show that this link is “mediated by other genetically co- determined factors such as sensory structures [like] taste, hearing etc, body chemistry, intelligence, temperament, and others”.

3.4 The attitude of correctional officials envisaged by the South African legislation

A correctional official is an employee of the DCS appointed in terms of the Correctional services Act 111 of 1998 to implement the mandate and functions of the DCS (DCS, 1998). All correctional employees, regardless of their educational background or occupational rank, are regarded as rehabilitators. Due to the nature of the rehabilitation programmes offered to offenders which consist of therapeutic, academic and vocational training components, the DCS employs professionals like social workers, psychologists and spiritual workers to render these services. This results in a lack of clarity about the role of the ordinary correctional officials. Many of these correctional officials are uncertain about their role as rehabilitators because it is not clearly defined in either the White Paper on Corrections, or in the literature about the South African correctional system (Cilliers & Smit, 2007).

There is an abundance of information written about the rehabilitation of offenders but not much information about correctional officials as service providers (Cilliers & Smit, 2007; Dissel & Ellis, 2002). Some of the correctional officials do not have the necessary educational background and skills to render rehabilitation to offenders (Gaum, Hoffman & Venter, 2006). The lack of appropriate educational background may lead to correctional officials being unable to accomplish their rehabilitative role. However, the lack of clarity in defining the rehabilitative role of correctional officials does not mean that correctional officials are redundant. It should be emphasized that the correctional officials' role in the rehabilitation process is as crucial as that of the professional psychologists, social workers and spiritual care workers employed by the DCS. The fact that correctional officials spend more time with offenders than any other DCS employees means that their presence can be advantageous for the success of the rehabilitation process (DCS, 2005). It is the responsibility of correctional officials to ensure that they comply with and uphold the vision of the correctional services Act 111 of 1998 and the White Paper on Corrections of 2005 (DCS, 2005). Correctional officials can act as role models to offenders, and demonstrate confidence that rehabilitation can work.

Correctional officials need to adopt a positive attitude towards the treatment of offenders and treat offenders with respect and dignity. The provision of a safe and humane environment for offenders creates a positive environment that facilitates rehabilitation. Treating offenders humanely includes creating a human rights culture within correctional institutions, as this enforces real transformation (Roman, 2003). Correctional institutions are known to be places of extreme violence, where offenders fight with one another and

with correctional officials. Therefore, creating a human rights culture will teach offenders to deal with their conflicts in a non-violent manner (Roman, 2003). Correctional officials' attitude towards rehabilitation and humane treatment of offenders is a crucial variable in the successful functioning of the DCS. However, certain factors influence the attitudes of correctional officials, causing a negative impact on how correctional officials treat offenders.

3.5 Factors that could potentially influence correctional officials' attitudes towards the rehabilitation and humane treatment of offenders

Correctional officials' attitudes towards rehabilitation and humane treatment of offenders are influenced by their individual characteristics. Demographic factors such as gender, age, race, educational qualifications and the type of offenders under the care of correctional officials may cause the correctional officials to have positive or negative attitudes towards the humane treatment of offenders (Payne, Gainey, Triplett & Danner, 2004; Applegate, Cullen & Fisher, 2002). In this study these factors are examined to determine if they impact on the attitude of correctional officials. The study further considers whether the differences in the attitude of correctional officials are as a result of the demographic characteristics of the correctional officials.

3.5.1 Gender

Men and women have different attitudes towards a variety of social issues like crime, punishment and correction. As in other social issues, gender differences in attitudes towards the treatment of offenders were noted in the literature (Spratt, 1999). Women are known to have less punitive attitudes towards offenders than men (Payne, Gainey, Triplett & Danner, 2004; Applegate, Cullen & Fisher, 2002). Studies reveal that male correctional officials support the punishment of offenders while female correctional officials support the rehabilitation of offenders (Spratt, 1999). This causes female correctional officials to relate better to offenders than their male colleagues, thus having more positive attitudes towards rehabilitation and humane treatment of offenders (Payne, Gainey, Triplett & Danner, 2004).

Historically, in South Africa and globally, correctional employees were exclusively male. Although females are now employed as correctional officials, males are still in the majority (Mitchell, Mackenzie, Gover & Styve, 2001). When women were initially employed in correctional institutions they were not allowed to work directly with offenders. They were regarded as providing support services to the institution, and were involved in duties such as clerical work, and nursing of offenders rather than guarding offenders and maintaining order in the institution (Stohr, Lovrich & Wood, 1996).

Sociopolitical changes, such as the recognition of equal rights by the constitution, affirmative action and gender mainstreaming, have created an opportunity for females to

work in correctional institutions. Internationally, extensive research on female correctional officials' attitudes has been conducted. Studies reveal that employing females in correctional centres to work directly with offenders has more positive than negative effects. Women, unlike men, have better communication skills and tend to practice a nurturing and sensitive style when working with offenders (Stohr, Lovrich & Wood, 1996). Because women are usually calmer than men, they can stop offenders' fights more easily and more quickly than men can (Thompson, 2006).

The impact women working in correctional centres have on offenders can be explained by the influence of the "importation – differential experiences model" (Van Voorhis, Cullen, Link & Wolfe 1991, p.474). This model implies that women import their warm, motherly attitude to work, which has a calming effect on offenders. These characteristics cause them to relate positively towards offenders. Consequently female correctional officials have been observed to have positive attitudes towards the humane treatment of offenders (Payne, Gainey, Triplett & Danner, 2004; Van Voorhis, Cullen, Link & Wolfe, 1991).

On the contrary, research conducted by Farkas (1999) revealed that although female correctional officials working directly with offenders in particular male offenders - were positive towards the humane treatment of offenders they minimized their interaction with offenders so as to avoid any conflict with these offenders. The minimal time that female correctional officials spend with the offenders make it seem that they have more positive and less punitive attitudes towards offenders than their male colleagues. In the current

study the attitude of female and male correctional officials was compared to determine if gender has a bearing on the attitude of South African correctional officials towards rehabilitation and humane treatment of offenders.

3.5.2 Age

The literature has been dominated by the effect of the offenders' age and age-related factors on their criminal behavior. However, less attention has been paid to the impact of correctional officials' age on the correctional officials' attitudes toward rehabilitation and humane treatment of offenders. The limited data available reveals that older individuals have less punitive attitudes than younger individuals (Payne, Gainey, Triplett & Danner, 2004). Older correctional officials have been found to relate better to offenders, and to have more positive attitudes towards rehabilitation and humane treatment of offenders (Farkas, 1999; Robinson, Porporino & Simourd, 1997). In the current study, it is hypothesized that older South African correctional officials have more negative attitudes towards the rehabilitation and humane treatment of offenders than their younger counterparts. This is because the older correctional officials have experience in punishing the offenders as they were employed before the legislation on rehabilitation and humane treatment of offenders was adopted (Oppler, 1998).

3.5.3 Race

The apartheid policies in South Africa determined and influenced the functioning of government departments. The correctional system was no exception. The treatment of offenders was greatly influenced by apartheid policies. Offenders were treated differently depending on their racial background (Luyt, 2001). White offenders received preferential treatment. During the apartheid era in South Africa, the Prison's Act 8 of 1959 encouraged the differential treatment of offenders. This act allowed offenders, especially political and black offenders, to be ill-treated, degraded, severely punished and segregated (Dissel & Ellis, 2002). During that time the majority of correctional officials were white, while the majority of offenders were black.

The harsh treatment of offenders was influenced by racial policies that held that whites were superior to any other ethnic groups in South Africa, thus causing racial division and tension amongst South African citizens (Oppler, 1998). It is likely that this racial tension still exists, affecting the relationships between correctional officials and offenders. In order to try to reduce the racial hostility between offenders and correctional officials, correctional institutions employ correctional officials from different ethnic groups to work directly with the offenders (Jackson & Ammen, 1996). It has been observed that when correctional officials have the same race and cultural background as offenders, they are likely to be less punitive towards the offenders (Jackson & Ammen, 1996).

International studies reveal contradicting results, some indicate that some racial groups have more positive attitudes than others, and others indicate that race has no bearing on the attitudes of correctional officials towards rehabilitation and humane treatment of offenders (Jackson & Ammen, 1996; Jurik, 1985; Payne, Gainey, Triplett & Danner, 2004). A racial difference in the attitude of correctional officials towards the treatment of offenders has been indicated in the literature, with whites having more punitive attitudes than other racial groups (Jackson & Ammen, 1996). The less punitive attitudes correctional officials have towards offenders the more positive they are towards rehabilitation and humane treatment of offenders. Likewise the more punitive attitudes correctional officials hold, the more negative these correctional officials will be towards rehabilitation and humane treatment of offenders (Payne, Gainey, Triplett & Danner, 2004).

Van Voorhis et al. (1991) observed that African American officers demonstrated more favourable attitudes towards offenders and supported rehabilitation more than Caucasians did. Jurik (1985) also noted that the minority officers like African Americans, Hispanics and Native Americans, related more positively, and had a positive rehabilitative attitude towards offenders. These findings were also confirmed by Jackson and Ammen (1996), who found that African Americans have more positive attitudes towards their relationships with the offenders than other racial groups. In South Africa no study has been conducted to investigate the impact of race on the attitudes of correctional officials towards rehabilitation and humane treatment of offenders. The current study aims to fill

this gap as it examines the impact of race on the attitudes of South African correctional officials towards the treatment and the rehabilitation of offenders.

3.5.4 Educational background

Correctional officials with tertiary educational qualifications have been noted to have less punitive attitudes than individuals with no tertiary educational qualification (Rossi, Berk & Campbell, 1997). The former prefer that offenders be given less punishment, and be rehabilitated because they are aware that giving longer sentences to offenders has serious psychological and financial implications (Payne et al., 2004; Robinson, Porporino & Simourd, 1997). Lack of rehabilitation and ill treatment of offenders also has implications for the social and vocational reintegration of offenders into society after they have been released from correctional institutions (Gaum, Hoffman & Venter, 2006).

Correctional officials with tertiary educational qualifications have a good understanding of themselves as rehabilitators instead of custodial agents (Robinson, Porporino & Simourd, 1997). This results in correctional officials being more involved in the rendering of rehabilitative programmes to offenders. The positive attitude of correctional officials with tertiary education towards rehabilitation and humane treatment of offenders is believed to result from the fact that the attainment of a tertiary qualification encourages individuals to have individual and organizational professionalism (Leiber, Schwarze, Mack & Farnworth, 2002).

Individuals with tertiary educational qualifications especially those who specialize in social sciences, such as criminology, have a better understanding of the dynamics of crime and criminal behaviour. More specifically, people with higher educational qualifications are more likely to attribute crime to contextual factors such as illiteracy, unemployment and poverty, and are therefore more supportive of the rehabilitative approaches and humane treatment of offenders. Individuals with no higher educational qualifications and those with limited exposure to the social sciences are more likely to associate crime and criminal behaviour with the characteristics and the behaviour of the offender, and thus prefer more punitive approaches to the treatment of offenders. Thus, having a tertiary qualification is considered a significant factor in enhancing positive attitudes towards rehabilitation and humane treatment of offenders.

Research supports this positive association between the attainment of an educational qualification and the rehabilitation and humane treatment of offenders. For example, Robinson, Porporino and Simourd (1997) found that correctional official with tertiary educational qualifications were more supportive of the rehabilitation of offenders. In order for an individual to be employed in the DCS the minimum educational requirement is a matric certificate. In this study correctional officials with no tertiary educational qualification will be compared to correctional officials who have a tertiary educational qualification to determine if possessing a tertiary qualification has a bearing on the attitudes of correctional officials towards rehabilitation and humane treatment of offenders.

3.5.5 Work Experience

The legislation prescribing rehabilitation and humane treatment of offenders was adopted in 1998. This legislation aims to transform the DCS into a department that delivers correctional services with commitment, excellence and integrity. Most importantly the legislation aims to improve the treatment of offenders detained in South African correctional institutions (DCS, 2005). Literature on organizational change indicates that employees express varying attitudes towards change with some positive, some neutral and some negative. Most of the time employees have negative attitudes towards change. The reasons for resistance to change emanate from people's beliefs about the source of control over events that are affecting them as well as organizational commitment (Msweli-Mbanga & Potwana, 2006). People who believe that they have control over the change of events are not likely to resist change, whereas those who feel they have no control over events are likely to resist change. Harrison (1999, p.10) argues that "not only do people need to believe that change is a step forward but they also have to feel safe about it". Willingness to accept the organization's values, putting in an effort on its behalf, and the will to remain in the organization, indicate that an individual has accepted the organizational change (Alas & Sharifi, 2002).

The legislation is not specific about the exact duties of correctional officials as rehabilitators. Some of the correctional officials do not have the necessary formal educational qualifications to enable them to rehabilitate offenders. However, Gillespie (2003) and Oppler (1998) point out that most of the correctional officials currently

employed by the DCS have experience in punishing the offenders as they were employed before the new policy legislation was adopted. Therefore, to some correctional officials, rehabilitation and humane treatment of offenders is a new concept that they might not clearly understand. It is likely that some correctional officials, particularly those who were employed before 1998, feel that they have no control over the changes in the DCS. Correctional officials' attitudes are believed to be influenced by the experience they accumulate over the years on the job, causing them to have confidence in their abilities and the skills to manage offenders (Farkas, 1999). A feeling of a loss of control may result from the loss of confidence and comfort they currently experience in the execution of their duties (Dent & Goldberg, 1999). Ultimately this sense of loss of control may give rise to resistance towards the DCS's vision of rehabilitating inmates under humane conditions.

In this study correctional officials employed in the DCS before the change in legislation was compared with the correctional officials employed after the change in legislation to determine if work experience has an impact on the attitudes of South African correctional officials.

3.5.6 Type of offenders

Sentenced offenders incarcerated in South African correctional institutions are classified according to the DCS' security classification system (Giffard & Muntingh, 2007). The security classification is used to determine the extent to which an offender poses a

security risk, and to determine the type of correctional institution in which an offender should be detained (DCS, 1998). The nature of the offence, the number of previous convictions, escapes and sentence length are taken into consideration when classifying offenders (Fagan, 2006). Based on these criteria offenders score points that determine their security classification, and these offenders are either classified as medium or maximum offenders. Maximum offenders score higher points and serve longer sentences in correctional institution than medium offenders do.

Juvenile offenders are sentenced offenders between the ages of 14 and 25 (DCS, 1998). The DCS has the responsibility of detaining juvenile offenders separately from adult offenders to avoid exposing young offenders to negative influences. Separation of young offenders from adult offenders is also aimed at providing these offenders with custodial, development and treatment programmes, as well as spiritual care, in an environment conducive to the care, development and motivation of youths to participate and to develop their potential (DCS, 2005).

The long existence of retributive justice has caused it to be acknowledged by society as the best form of treatment for offenders (Naude, Prinsloo & Ladikos, 2003). Retributive justice is the punishment or the threat of punishment to control offending behaviour. When an individual offends the automatic and almost immediate reaction of society is that the individual must be punished severely and be made to pay for his or her actions. People believe that offenders should be punished so as to prevent them from re-offending (Rossum & Rossum, 2003).

However, the strength of the belief that offenders should be punished is determined by the type of the offence committed and the offending history of that particular offender (Payne, Gainey, Triplett & Danner, 2004). Individuals are less punitive towards juvenile offenders and more punitive towards violent crime and drug related offences. Mitchell, MacKenzie, Gover and Styve, (2001) further found that the belief that an offender can be rehabilitated has an impact on the officials' attitudes towards the offender. If correctional officials believe that an offender has the potential to change their behaviour, they usually have more positive attitudes towards that offender than when they do not believe that an offender can be rehabilitated.

Research has shown that offenders incarcerated for serious offences like rape or murder (maximum security offenders) tend to re-offend while they are in custody. They usually commit offences such as gang related riots, sodomy, theft and intimidation of correctional officials (Botha & Pienaar, 2006). The behaviour of these offenders forces the correctional officials to control them with physical measures. Thus, correctional officials who are responsible for the detention of maximum security offenders tend to have negative attitudes towards rehabilitation and humane treatment of inmates.

Working with maximum security offenders leads to high levels of stress that affect correctional officials negatively, when compared to working with medium or juvenile offenders (Pollak & Sigler, 1998). Correctional officials working with maximum security offenders tend to punish offenders more frequently. The punitive approach that these

correctional officials adopt is viewed as an attempt to reduce their personal stress levels, and as a way of ensuring their personal safety (Pollak & Sigler, 1998).

The extreme negative conduct of the maximum security offenders causes the correctional officials to overlook the fact that these offenders need to be rehabilitated and treated with respect and dignity and reinforces the belief that these offenders cannot be rehabilitated. Some correctional officials believe that rehabilitation of maximum security offenders is impossible (Gaum, Hoffman, & Venter, 2006). In the current study the attitudes of correctional officials towards the rehabilitation and treatment of offenders will be explored by investigating the influence of the type of offender under the correctional officials care on their attitudes.

3.6 Conclusion

In order for the DCS to achieve its objective of rehabilitating offenders under humane conditions, correctional officials need to embrace this goal with a positive attitude (Gordon, 1999). The success of an institution in rehabilitating and incarcerating offenders is contingent on the attitudes that correctional officials have toward the process. The research methodology and design used to explore the attitudes of correctional officials and the factors that influence the attitudes of correctional officials towards rehabilitation and humane treatment of offenders will be discussed in the following chapter.

CHAPTER 4

RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

4.1 Introduction

The research question that this study set out to answer was: What are the attitudes of correctional officials towards rehabilitation and humane treatment of offenders at the public correctional institutions in South Africa? Given the study's objective, to explore the attitudes and perceptions of correctional services employees, an exploratory cross-sectional survey research method was used. A survey study is normally undertaken to gather information on how people feel about a particular issue (Fowler, 2002). By means of a cross-sectional survey research method the researcher was able to assess the degree to which group differences exists between various groups of correctional officials with regards to their attitudes towards rehabilitation and humane treatment of offenders.

The hypotheses for the study were as follows:

Research hypotheses 1: Female correctional officials hold more positive attitudes towards rehabilitation and humane treatment of offenders than male correctional officials do.

Research hypotheses 2: Older correctional officials have more negative attitudes towards the rehabilitation and humane treatment of offenders when compared to younger correctional officials.

Research hypotheses 3: White correctional officials have more negative attitudes towards rehabilitation and humane treatment of offenders than black correctional officials do.

Research hypotheses 4: Correctional officials with a tertiary education qualification have more positive attitudes towards rehabilitation and treatment of offenders than correctional officials with no tertiary education qualification do.

Research hypotheses 5: Correctional officials employed before the change in correctional services legislation have more negative attitudes towards rehabilitation and humane treatment of offenders when compared to correctional officials employed after the change in legislation.

Research hypotheses 6: Correctional officials working with maximum security offenders have more negative attitudes towards rehabilitation and humane treatment of offenders than correctional officials working with juvenile or medium offenders do.

4.2 Research design

This study was based on the positivist research paradigm. Measurable data, obtained using quantitative research methods, was used to explain the attitudes of correctional officials towards the rehabilitation and humane treatment of offenders. Neuman (2003, p.541) defines the positivist approach as “an approach to social science that combines a deductive approach with the precise measurement of quantitative data so that researchers can discover and confirm causal laws that will permit predictions about human behaviour”. In this study empirical data was used to test several hypotheses. Furthermore the positivistic research approach aims at understanding and producing detailed knowledge about a specific construct (Cresswell, 1994). The researcher maintained objectivity throughout the study, and the results were not influenced by the researcher’s views, attitudes or beliefs. The results were determined from the data collected from the participants by means of the survey questionnaire.

Attitudes, like most psychological constructs, are not directly observable. They can only be inferred from individuals’ responses (Fazio & Olson, 2003). As a result social psychologists have needed to develop various methodologies in order to effectively assess individuals’ attitudes. Haddock (2003) distinguishes between explicit (that is direct) or implicit (that is indirect) measures of attitude. The distinction between explicit and implicit processes has a long history within psychology. Psychologists usually think of explicit processes as those that require conscious attention. In contrast, implicit processes are those that do not require conscious attention. Within the realm of attitude

measurement, explicit attitude measures directly ask respondents to indicate their attitude, whereas implicit attitude measures assess the attitudes without needing to directly ask the respondent for a verbal or written report (Fazio & Olson, 2003).

In this study an attitude survey, which is an explicit attitude measure, was used to directly assess the attitudes of correctional officials towards the rehabilitation and humane treatment of offenders. The researcher was interested in measuring the attitudes of correctional officials to obtain an overall picture of how these correctional officials evaluate the DCS' new approach of rehabilitation and the humane treatment of offenders. Survey research allows for the provision of a broad overview of a representative sample of the larger population (Mouton, 2001). It also makes it possible to identify attributes of a population from a relatively small group of individuals.

4.3 Survey Research Method

In this study, a cross-sectional survey research was conducted to investigate how correctional officials at South African correctional institutions feel about the rehabilitation and humane treatment of offenders. In a cross-sectional study data is collected from all the participants at a single point in time. A survey research method is quantitative in nature, and provides a broad overview of a representative sample of the larger population, (Cresswell, 1994; Mouton, 2001; Neuman 2003).

Pinsonneault and Kraemer (1993) describe the distinct characteristics of survey research as follows:

- To produce the quantitative descriptions of the aspects of the population that are being studied by analysing the relationships between the variables.
- Collecting information by asking people structured or predetermined questions about themselves or some other specific study issues, and their answers constitute the data to be analysed.
- Information is collected from a small part of the population known as the sample, and is collected in such a way as to be able to generalize the findings to the population.
- The sample should be big enough to allow extensive statistical analysis of the data collected.

A survey research method was chosen because the Department of Correctional Services has a large number of employees, and a sample of correctional officials at Leeuwkop Correctional Institution could provide a broad overview of the attitudes held by this large population concerning the rehabilitation and humane treatment of offenders. However, since only one correctional institution was surveyed, the information obtained from this survey cannot simply be generalized to the larger population of all correctional officials in South Africa.

4.4 Sampling

Since the objective of the study was to describe the attitudes and perceptions of the correctional officials, the target population was correctional officials in South African correctional institutions. However, correctional officials in managerial positions were excluded from the study because they do not work directly with the offenders, instead they are mostly involved with the administrative duties of the correctional institutions. The survey was conducted only at the Leeuwkop Correctional Institution situated north of Johannesburg due to budgetary constraints. Leeuwkop Correctional Institution was chosen because:

- It is one of the largest correctional institutions that incarcerate sentenced offenders in the country. The term sentenced offenders refers to offenders that have been found guilty by the court, and are sentenced to imprisonment (DCS, 1998).
- Leeuwkop Correctional Institution incarcerates sentenced offenders, thus the rehabilitation of offenders is supposed to be implemented. Correctional officials working in this correctional Institution would be able to give information about their attitudes towards the treatment of offenders in this correctional institution.

A stratified sampling method was used to select participants. The sample was divided into strata of correctional officials according to gender and race. A random sample from each population was then drawn. Stratified sampling was used because for many years all correctional employees were male. Some racial groups were more prominent than others

(Mitchell, et al., 2001). Even though females are now employed as correctional officials, male employees are still in the majority. Likewise black correctional officials are the largest racial group in this correctional institution. In total a sample of 185 correctional officials was selected. Participants are working in the centres within Leeuwkop Correctional Institution that incarcerate juvenile, medium and maximum security classification of the offenders. Participants were selected from all of these centres.

4.5 Measuring instruments

Data was collected by means of the survey questionnaire because it enabled the researcher to collect data from a large number of correctional officials. The questionnaire was designed by the researcher with the guidance of Statistical Consultation Services (Statcon) at the University of Johannesburg. During the process of designing the questionnaire the body of literature, and recent research pertaining to the attitudes of correctional officials, was carefully considered. The questionnaire was designed in such a way that information about the cognitive, behavioural and affective components of the correctional officials' attitudes would be elicited.

The questionnaire was a preferred method for data collection because it is easy and quick for participants to answer. Due to financial limitations, the questionnaire was an economical way of data collection as it was administered to a group of correctional officials at the same time (Neuman, 2003). The questionnaire contained closed questions,

where participants were asked to respond in a particular format to the questions provided by the researcher (Babbie & Mouton, 2001).

4.5.1 Demographics

Demographic questions like gender, age, ethnicity, educational background, work experience, and the type of offenders under the correctional officials' care was elicited by means of a demographic section in the questionnaire. The demographic questions were significant for this study because they provided background information about the participants. Responses to demographic questions were used to determine if the above mentioned factors had an influence on the attitude of correctional officials towards rehabilitation and humane treatment of offenders, and to assess the degree to which group differences exist with regard to their attitudes towards rehabilitation and humane treatment of offenders.

4.5.2 The Overall Attitude Measure

The overall attitude measure of the questionnaire consisted of questions that assessed the overall attitude of correctional official towards rehabilitation and humane treatment of offenders. These questions were asked to determine if the overall attitude was either positive or negative within and between the strata of correctional officials. Different types of scales were used to measure the items in this section. The scales included a dichotomous scale as well as rated responses. The dichotomous scale consisted of yes or

no responses while the rated responses consisted of a five-point Likert scale, with 1=To no extent, 2=To a small extent, 3= To a moderate extent, 4=To a large extent and 5=To a very large extent. Participants were required to answer this questionnaire such that they indicate the extent to which they believe offenders should be treated with respect and dignity. They were also required to indicate the extent to which they believe that offenders can and should be rehabilitated. Reliability was determined by means of an internal consistency test. The internal consistency coefficient for this measure was 0.832 with Cronbach alpha scores ranging from 0.773 to 0.829. The overall attitude measure is presented in section B of Appendix C.

4.5.3 The Attitude Towards Rehabilitation Measure

The attitude towards rehabilitation measure consisted of questions that related to the attitudes of correctional officials towards rehabilitation of offenders. This measure consisted of 14 items that assessed the attitudes of the participants towards rehabilitation of offenders. On this scale, participants were asked to indicate the extent to which they agree with each of the statements made regarding the rehabilitation of offenders. A five-point Likert scale ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree was used to determine the affective, cognitive and behavioural aspects of the attitude of correctional officials towards rehabilitation. The reliability was again determined by means of an internal consistency test. The attitude towards rehabilitation scale showed a reliability coefficient alpha of 0.863. The attitude towards rehabilitation scale is presented in section C of Appendix C.

4.5.4 The Attitude Towards Humane Treatment Measure

The attitude towards humane treatment scale also consisted of 14 items that assessed the attitude of participants towards humane treatment of offenders. On this scale participants were again asked to indicate the extent to which they agree with the statements made about humane treatment of offenders. A five-point Likert scale was used with responses ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree. This scale was used to determine the affective, cognitive and behavioural aspects of the attitude of correctional officials towards humane treatment of offenders. The attitude towards humane treatment scale showed a reliability coefficient value of 0.831. The attitude towards rehabilitation scale is presented in section D of Appendix C.

4.6 Pilot testing

After the questionnaire was designed a pilot test was conducted. A total of twenty participants were randomly selected from Leeuwkop Correctional Institution. The pilot study was conducted at Leeuwkop Correctional Institution because the participants in the pilot study had similar characteristics to those of the target population, for example job description, educational level and work experience (Nardi, 2006). The sample consisted of 14 males and 6 females from across the major racial groups within South Africa (16 blacks, 2 whites, 2 coloureds). After the participants were selected, the pilot test measuring the attitudes of the participants towards rehabilitation and humane treatment of offenders was conducted.

During the pilot test participants were asked whether questions were easy to understand, relevant and unambiguous. Participants were asked what they thought the purpose of the study was because “it is possible that what seems obvious to the researcher is invisible to the participants and that no one identifies the purpose of the study” (Schweigert, 1998, p.97). Data collected from the participants was analyzed by Statcon at the University of Johannesburg. The results of the pilot test revealed that the participants understood the questionnaire and that the questionnaire was a suitable measure for the study. The suggestions made by the participants during the pilot study were considered and the necessary changes were made to the questionnaire.

4.7 Data gathering

After analysis of the pilot study, the questionnaire was finalised and administered. The questionnaire was administered and collected immediately by the researcher after the participants had completed it. Data was collected over a two week period. The researcher opted to administer and collect the questionnaire because it improved the response rate of the participants. Data was collected during the morning parades because the researcher had to take into consideration the daily functioning of the correctional centres.

4.8 Data analysis

Descriptive analysis was conducted on the demographic and attitudinal data to describe patterns in the data, for example to describe the percentage of correctional service officials who have positive attitudes towards rehabilitation and humane treatment of offenders. Because data was collected from a large sample, descriptive statistics enabled the researcher to arrange and summarize the data for easy interpretation. Correlation analyses were used to determine relationships between demographic variables and attitudes of correctional service officials.

An independent samples t-test was used to test the differences in the attitudes of the categories of correctional officials. The categories included gender, age, race, work experience, educational qualifications and the type of offenders under the correctional officials' care. The average means of these categories of correctional officials were compared to determine if differences in their attitudes exist. Apart from determining the existence of differences in the attitudes of these correctional officials, the independent samples t-test was used to determine if the differences were real and not due to chance (Fink, 1995). An analysis of the variance (ANOVA) was used to test for significant differences in the attitudes among three [independent](#) groups of correctional officials. The correctional officials were categorized according to the type of offenders under their care. The average mean scores were used to determine whether an overall difference in attitudes of correctional officials existed between the groups of the correctional officials

(Fink, 1995). In order to guard against rejecting the null hypothesis, when it is actually true (Type 1 error) the significance level was set at $p = 0.05$ for these comparisons.

4.9 Ethical considerations

An application was made to the DCS to conduct a study at Leeuwkop Correctional Institution. Written permission was granted by the the Department of Correctional Services` Ethics Committee in Pretoria. The approval letter is presented in Appendix A. The heads of the correctional centres were further informed in writing about the study prior to the commencement of the study. Data obtained was used for the goals of the research and not for any other purpose. Correct reporting of the findings of the research was done with assistance and guidance from Statcon at the University of Johannesburg. The participants as well as the DCS management were briefed on the aims and objectives of the study and were assured that results will be made available in writing.

Informed consent was obtained from the selected participants. Before participants signed the consent form a face-to-face explanation about the study and the objective of the study was given. They were informed about their role in the study, which was to participate in the study by completing questionnaires. The decision to participate was voluntary, and participants were informed of their right to stop participating at any stage during the research. Anonymity and confidentiality of the participants was maintained at all times, and participants were treated with respect and dignity at all times. The consent form is attached in Appendix B.

4.10 Conclusion

This chapter described the research methodology which was based on a positivist research paradigm. This study aims to contribute to knowledge regarding the relationship between attitudes and behaviour by exploring whether the high rate of re-offending as well as high incidences of offender assault are influenced by these factors. Cross sectional survey research was found to be an appropriate method to investigate the attitudes of correctional officials towards rehabilitation and humane treatment of offenders. The details of how this research methodology was applied to the current study have been explained in this chapter and the results of the study are discussed in the following chapters.

CHAPTER 5

PRESENTATION OF DATA

5.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter presents the results of the statistical analysis performed on the quantitative data gathered from the participants by means of the survey questionnaire in the course of this study. It consists of the description of the sample, the results of the overall attitude of correctional officials towards rehabilitation and humane treatment of offenders as well as the factors that were hypothesized to influence these attitudes.

5.2 Description of the sample

The data obtained from the study was distributed as follows:

5.5.1 Gender

The sample for this study consisted of correctional officials from Leeuwkop Correctional Institution. A total of 185 participants took part in the survey of which 121 (66.5%) were males, and 61 (33.5%) were females. Three participants did not indicate their gender.

5.2.2 Age

From a total of 185 participants, 158 participants indicated their age while 27 participants did not indicate their age. The age of the participants ranged from 24 to 56 years old with a mean age of 35.06. For the purposes of this study correctional officials were divided into two categories, 'younger' and 'older' correctional officials. Younger correctional officials consisted of participants who were 35 years and younger while older correctional officials consisted of participants who were 36 years and older. Table 5.1 shows the distribution of participants in terms of age.

Table 5.1: Distribution of participants according to age

	Total
Participants	185
Valid	158
Missing	27
Mean	35.06
Median	35.00
Mode	36
Minimum	24
Maximum	56
35 years and younger	88
36 years and older	70

5.2.3 Race

From a total of 185 participants, blacks constituted 87.6 % (162) of the sample, whites 6.5% (12), coloureds 5.4% (10). There was one participant from a racial group not indicated above (0.5 % of the sample). In the current study it was hypothesized that white correctional officials would have more negative attitudes towards rehabilitation and humane treatment of offenders than black correctional officials. Due to the vast difference in the number of participants from the various ethnic groups, comparisons of these racial groups to determine if any differences in their attitudes towards rehabilitation and humane treatment existed based on their ethnicity was not done. The researcher selected participants through stratified random sampling to ensure that a proportional number of participants from different racial groups would be included.

In Leeuwkop Correctional Institution there are 652 male correctional officials and 106 female correctional officials (DCS, 2007). From the total of 652 males, 530 are blacks, 93 white, 20 coloured and 9 indian. Although stratified random sampling was used to try to counteract the challenge of racial inequalities in the number of correctional officials, it could not sufficiently curb the inequalities. Out of the total number of white, coloured and indian male correctional officials, some are in managerial positions, and some do not work directly with the offenders but render supportive services (clerical or human resource duties) and this made them ineligible for participation in the study. Furthermore, the researcher could not include more correctional officials from other racial groups (not black) in the study because they were either working night duty or were on leave. The

pool from which the researcher could select participants from was also reduced due to the fact that some correctional officials refused to participate in the study. These challenges were also applicable to female correctional officials, bearing in mind that female correctional officials are generally fewer than male correctional officials. The distribution of participants according to race is shown in Table 5.2.

Table 5.2: Distribution of participants according to race

Race	Frequency	%
Black	162	87.5
White	12	6.5
Coloured	10	5.4
Other	1	0.5
Total	185	100

5.2.4 Educational background

The participants were further categorized according to their educational background. The participants were divided into two groups, correctional officials with no tertiary education qualifications and correctional officials who have tertiary education qualifications. Participants with no tertiary education qualifications had grade 12 (Std 10) or lower as their highest education qualification, while those who had a tertiary education qualification had a post school diploma, a degree or post graduate qualification. The

educational background of participants varied from no tertiary education qualification to post graduate qualification. Correctional officials with a tertiary educational qualification constituted 38.9% of the sample and 61.1% did not have a tertiary educational qualification. For the distribution of participants according to their educational background see Table 5.3.

Table 5.3: Distribution of participants according to educational background

Educational Qualification	Frequency	%
No formal qualification	1	0.5
Grade 11 (Std 9) or lower	9	4.9
Grade 12 (Std 10)	102	55.1
Post school diploma / certificate	41	22.2
Undergraduate degrees(s)	14	7.6
Post graduate degree(s)	16	8.6
Missing	2	1.1
No tertiary educational qualification	112	60.5
Tertiary educational qualification	71	38.4
Total	185	100

5.2.5 Work experience

The work experience of the participants ranged from 1 year to 36 years. The participants were divided into two groups. One group consisted of correctional officials with work experience of between 0 and 10 years. These are the correctional officials who were employed after the legislation on rehabilitation and humane treatment of offenders was promulgated. The other group consisted of correctional officials with work experience of 11 years or more, meaning that these correctional officials were employed in the DCS before the legislation on rehabilitation and humane treatment of offenders was adopted. More than 50% of the participants had work experience of 10 years or less. The mean was 8.53. The median was 6.00 while the mode was 3. The distribution of participants according to work experience is shown in Table 5.4

Table 5.4: Distribution of participants according to work experience

	Total
Participants	185
Valid	169
Missing	16
Mean	8.53
Median	6.00
Mode	3
Minimum	1
Maximum	36

Work experience of 0-10 years	119
Work experience of 11 years or more	50

5.2.6 Type of offenders

Leeuwkop Correctional Institution incarcerates juvenile, medium and maximum offenders. For the purpose of the current study correctional officials were grouped into three categories according to the type of offenders under their care. From a total of 185 participants, 93 (50.3%) participants had medium offenders, 53 (28.6%) had maximum offenders and 39 (21.1%) had juvenile offenders under their care.

5.3 The overall attitude of correctional officials towards rehabilitation and humane treatment of offenders

To determine the overall attitude of the participants towards rehabilitation, participants were required to indicate on a rated scale the extent to which they believed offenders can be rehabilitated, and the extent to which offenders should be rehabilitated. Similarly, to determine the general attitude of correctional officials towards humane treatment of offenders, participants were asked to indicate on a rated scale the extent to which they believed offenders should be treated with respect and dignity. From a total of 185 participants, 184 participants indicated their responses, and 1 participant did not indicate

a response. The responses of the participants ranged from to a small, moderate, and large extent. More than 90% of the participants indicated that to some extent they believed that offenders deserve to be rehabilitated, and be treated humanely. An overwhelming 88.6% of the participants indicated that to a large extent offenders should be rehabilitated, while 71.3% of correctional officials believed to a large extent that offenders can be rehabilitated. Table 5.5 shows the frequencies of the responses of correctional officials concerning their overall attitude towards rehabilitation and humane treatment of offenders.

5.5: Frequency distribution of the overall attitudes of correctional officials

	To no extent	To a small-moderate extent	To a large extent	Total
...do you believe that offenders should be treated with respect?	7 (3.8%)	38 (20.6%)	139 (75.5%)	184 (100%)
...do you believe offenders should be treated with dignity?	7 (3.8%)	41 (22.3%)	136 (73.9%)	184 (100%)
...do you believe offenders can be rehabilitated?	9 (4.9%)	44 (23.8%)	132 (71.3%)	185 (100%)
...do you believe offenders should be rehabilitated?	3 (1.6%)	18 (9.8%)	124 (88.6%)	185 (100%)

Based on the frequencies of the responses of the correctional officials with regard to their overall attitude towards rehabilitation and humane treatment of offenders, an independent

samples t-test was conducted to determine if there was a significant difference in the overall attitude of the categories of correctional officials towards rehabilitation and humane treatment of offenders. The mean scores of the overall attitude of the categories of correctional officials were compared to determine whether there were any significant differences in the mean scores of these selected categories. The categories of correctional officials were selected according to gender, age, educational qualifications and work experience. These categories of correctional officials were explained in the previous chapters. The mean scores of the overall attitude of the categories of correctional officials are shown in Table 5.6.

Table 5.6: Mean scores of the overall attitude of categories of correctional officials

		N	Mean	SD	F	P
Gender	Male	121	4.0826	0.75693	0.898	0.345
	Female	61	3.8825	0.87736		
Age (in complete years)	35 years and younger	88	4.0303	0.78032	0.002	0.967
	36 years and older	70	4.0900	0.78020		
Highest Qualification	No tertiary qualification	112	4.0116	0.82714	0.480	0.489
	Tertiary Qualification	71	4.0427	0.75849		
Work Experience	0-10 years	119	3.9899	0.79176	0.000	0.998
	11 years or more	50	4.0500	0.82427		

Furthermore a one way ANOVA test was conducted to determine the differences in the overall attitudes of the group of correctional officials categorized according to the type of offenders under the correctional officials' care. The mean scores of the correctional officials who either had juvenile, medium or maximum offenders under their care were also compared. Correctional officials with medium offenders had a mean score of 4.09, correctional officials with maximum offenders had a mean score of 4.04, while correctional officials with juvenile offenders under their care had a mean score of 3.82.

No significant results were noted when comparing the categories of correctional officials because p was above 0.05 for all the categories of correctional officials. One possible reason for this could be that the items were not measuring the same phenomena. As a result the variables were then separated through exploratory factor analysis. Two factors were identified. Factor 1 indicated the knowledge of correctional officials about the legislation relating to rehabilitation and humane treatment of offenders, and factor 2 indicated the overall attitude of the correctional officials towards rehabilitation and humane treatment of offenders. Correctional officials who have an overall positive attitude towards rehabilitation and humane treatment of offenders believe that offenders should be treated with respect and dignity, and that offenders should be and can be rehabilitated. Correctional officials who had the knowledge of the legislation relating to how the offenders should be treated were more familiar with the content of both the Correctional Services Act 111 of 1998 and the White Paper on Corrections.

The knowledge factor grouped two items, and had a lower mean score of 3.74, while the overall attitude factor grouped four factors, and had a higher mean score of 4.16. This indicated that having knowledge about how offenders should be treated does not cause an individual to have an overall positive attitude towards rehabilitation and humane treatment of offenders, and vice versa, individuals who have an overall positive attitude towards rehabilitation and humane treatment of offenders do not necessarily have a better knowledge base about the legislation relating to the treatment of offenders. The results of the factor analysis for the overall attitude of correctional officials are presented in table 5.7.

Table 5.7: Factor analysis for the overall attitude of correctional officials

	Knowledge factor (Factor 1)	Overall attitude factor (factor 2)
Are you familiar with the contents of the Correctional Services Act 111 of 1998?	0.808	0.156
Are you familiar with the content of the White Paper on Corrections of 2005?	0.836	0.166
Do you believe offenders should be treated with respect?	0.379	0.773
Do you believe offenders should be treated with dignity?	0.425	0.715
Do you believe offenders can be rehabilitated?	0.022	0.731
Do you believe offenders should be rehabilitated?	0.123	0.798
Mean	3.74	4.16

Linear regression was done to determine the relationship between the level of awareness factor (factor one) and the different categories of correctional officials, as well as the relationship between the overall attitude factor (factor two) and the different categories of correctional officials. The categories of correctional officials again included gender, age, educational background, work experience and type of offenders under the correctional officials' care. The linear regression results for the level of awareness factor (factor one) and the different categories of the correctional officials revealed no significant results about the overall attitudes of correctional officials. These results were applicable when categories of correctional officials were regressed individually for factor one, and when the categories were regressed together.

Likewise, linear regression was conducted to determine the overall attitude of correctional officials towards rehabilitation and humane treatment of offenders for the attitude factor (factor two) and the different categories of correctional officials. None of the individual categories tested for factor two were significant. Most importantly, gender and type of offenders both showed no significant results. However, when these two categories of correctional officials were regressed together they showed significant results. This means that when looking at the overall attitude of women or men separately no significant results will be determined. Similarly, when testing for the overall attitude of correctional officials based on the type of offenders under the correctional officials' care no significant results will be found.

However, when the researcher made the type of offenders under the correctional officials' care the control group, significant results were noted in the overall attitude of women and men. In addition when the researcher made gender the control group, significant results were noted in the overall attitude of correctional officials based on the type of offenders under their care. Male correctional officials and correctional officials with medium offenders under their care had more positive overall attitudes towards the rehabilitation and humane treatment of offenders than female correctional officials and correctional officials with juvenile and maximum offenders under their care. The results are shown in Table 5.8.

Table 5.8: Regression analysis for the overall attitude of correctional officials

Category		Mean	B	Std Error	Beta	Sig
Gender	Male	4.0826	-0.275	0.245	-2.018	0.045
	Female	3.8825				
Type of offenders	Juvenile offenders	3.8205	-0.176	0.082	-0.158	0.032
	Medium offenders	4.0946				
	Maximum offenders	4.0384				

5.4 Factors that could potentially influence the attitudes of correctional officials towards rehabilitation and humane treatment of offenders

In this section the results concerning the possible impact of the individual factors on the attitudes of correctional officials towards rehabilitation and humane treatment of offenders at Leeuwkop Correctional Institution will be presented. Once more the individual factors included gender, age, educational background, work experience and type of offenders under the correctional officials' care. The possible impact of the individual factors on the attitudes of correctional officials was explored separately for attitude towards rehabilitation as well as attitude towards the humane treatment of offenders.

5.4.1 Gender

A total of 182 participants took part in this survey 121 (66.5%) were males 61 (33.5%) were females. An independent samples t-test was conducted to determine whether gender had an impact on the attitudes of correctional officials, and whether there were significant differences between the attitudes of male and female correctional officials. It was hypothesized that female correctional officials would have more positive attitudes towards rehabilitation and humane treatment of offenders than male correctional officials. The test scores revealed differences in the mean scores of correctional officials. However the t-test results indicated that the differences between the male and female scores were not significant, because the p levels were above 0.05. The p level for males and females

was 0.505 and 0.491 respectively for attitudes towards rehabilitation and attitudes towards humane treatment of offenders. Therefore no significant differences were noted in attitudes of correctional officials based on gender. The results are shown in Table 5.9.

Table 5.9: Differences in the attitudes of correctional officials according to gender

	Gender	N	Mean	SD	F	P
Attitudes towards rehabilitation	Male	120	4.2262	0.50828	0.46	0.505
	Female	60	4.2792	0.59971		
Attitudes towards humane treatment	Male	119	3.9343	0.56318	0.477	0.491
	Female	59	3.9276	0.54708		

5.4.2 Age

Age is the second factor that was hypothesized to influence the attitudes of correctional officials, it was predicted that older correctional officials have more negative attitudes towards the rehabilitation and humane treatment of offenders when compared to younger correctional officials. Participants were divided into two groups, namely that of younger and older correctional officials. In total 88 participants were 35 years old and younger (younger correctional officials), and 70 participants were 36 years old and older (older correctional officials). An independent samples t-test was conducted to determine if any

differences exist in the attitudes of these two groups towards treatment of offenders, and whether age had an impact on the attitude of these participants. The results revealed slight differences in the mean scores, however no significant differences were noted in the t-test scores of younger and older correctional officials. The scores were above the p level of 0.05.

These results were also confirmed by using a Mann-Whitney-U test to determine whether any significant difference existed in the attitudes of these groups. The choice of this statistical procedure was based on the fact that the data was on an ordinal level of measurement, and the data scores were not normally distributed. However, the results indicated that the differences in the attitudes of younger and older correctional officials towards rehabilitation and humane treatment of offenders were not significant, because the p value was above 0.05 (0.360 for attitudes towards rehabilitation and 0.053 for attitudes towards humane treatment). Table 5.10 presents the results of the independent samples t-test on the attitudes of correctional officials according to age. The results of the Mann-Whitney-U test are presented in appendix D.

Table 5.10: Independent samples t-test of correctional officials according to age

	Age (in complete yrs)	N	Mean	SD	F	p
Attitudes towards rehabilitation	35 years and younger	87	4.2460	0.53398	0.875	0.351
	36 years and older	69	4.3008	0.54351		
Attitudes towards humane treatment	35 years and younger	86	3.9289	0.51918	2.120	0.147
	36 years and older	69	4.0527	0.54561		

5.4.3 Educational background

In this study it was also hypothesized that correctional officials with a tertiary education qualification would have more positive attitudes towards rehabilitation and treatment of offenders than correctional officials with no tertiary education qualification. The sample was divided into two groups of correctional officials, one group consisted of correctional officials with a tertiary education qualification and the other group consisted of correctional officials with no tertiary education qualification. Participants with a tertiary education qualification had a post school diploma, a degree or post graduate qualification, while those who had no tertiary education qualification had Grade 12 (Std 10) or lower as their highest educational qualification. An independent samples t-test ($p < 0.05$) was conducted. A sample of correctional officials with a tertiary education qualification was compared to a sample of correctional officials with no tertiary education qualification.

Slight differences were noted in the means of both groups. However, there were no significant differences in the scores of the two groups of correctional officials. The p value for all the sections was above 0.05, indicating that there was no difference in the attitudes of correctional officials based on their educational background. The results are presented in table 5.11.

Table 5.11: Independent samples t-test of correctional officials according to educational qualification

	Highest Qualification	N	Mean	SD	F	p
Attitudes towards rehabilitation	No tertiary qualification	111	4.2521	0.54595	0.001	0.975
	Tertiary Qualification	70	4.2406	0.53251		
Attitudes towards humane treatment	No tertiary qualification	110	3.9560	0.56437	0.099	0.754
	Tertiary Qualification	69	3.9161	0.55190		

5.4.4 Work experience

Correctional officials employed before the change in correctional services legislation were hypothesized to have more negative attitudes towards rehabilitation and humane treatment of offenders than correctional officials employed after the change in legislation. A sample of 119 correctional officials with work experience of 0-10 years was compared

to a group of 50 correctional officials with work experience of 11 years or more in the DCS. The comparison was undertaken to determine if any differences in the attitudes existed between the two groups due to the difference in their working experiences.

To test this hypothesis an independent samples t-test was performed. Similarly to other factors only a small difference was noted between the mean scores of correctional officials with 0-10 years work experience and the mean scores of correctional officials with work experience of 11 years or more, as shown in Table 5.12. No significant differences were noted in the p values of both groups on attitudes towards rehabilitation, and attitudes towards humane treatment of offenders, the p values for all the sections were > 0.05. Thus no significant differences were noted in the attitudes of correctional officials towards rehabilitation and humane treatment of offenders based on their work experience.

Table 5.12: Independent samples t-test of correctional officials according to work experience.

	No of yrs worked in DCS	N	Mean	SD	F	P
Attitude towards rehabilitation	0-10 years	117	4.2780	0.51938	2.245	0.136
	11 years or more	50	4.1530	0.57866		
Attitude towards humane	0-10 years	115	3.9461	.50621	6.520	.012

treatment						
	11 years or more	50	3.9174	.64889		

5.4.5 Type of offenders

Correctional officials working with maximum security offenders were hypothesized to have more negative attitudes towards rehabilitation and humane treatment of offenders than correctional officials working with juvenile or medium security offenders. To determine if any differences exist in the attitudes of correctional officials based on the type of offenders under their care, a one way ANOVA test was done. Correctional officials were classified into three groups according to the type of offenders under their care, which are juvenile, medium and maximum offenders.

The mean scores of the correctional officials who had juvenile, medium or maximum offenders under their care were compared. There was a slight difference in the mean scores of these categories of correctional officials. The mean scores ranged from 3.9399 to 4.0946 for all the sections. However, the results of an ANOVA revealed that no significant differences existed between the groups of correctional officials based on the type of offenders under their care. The ANOVA scores of the attitudes of correctional officials for attitudes towards rehabilitation, and attitudes towards humane treatment were 0.313 and 0.134 respectively, at an alpha level of 0.05 as indicated in Table 5.13.

Therefore, the type of offenders under their care had no influence on the attitudes of correctional officials towards the rehabilitation and humane treatment of offenders.

Table 5.13: Differences in the attitudes of correctional officials according to the type of offenders

ANOVA						
		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Attitude towards rehabilitation of offenders	Between Groups	0.676	2	0.338	1.168	0.313
	Within Groups	52.063	180	0.289		
	Total	52.739	182			
Attitude towards humane treatment of offenders	Between Groups	1.238	2	0.619	2.030	0.134
	Within Groups	54.274	178	0.305		
	Total	55.511	180			

5.5 The differences between the attitudes of correctional officials towards rehabilitation and the attitudes of correctional officials towards humane treatment of offenders

The attitude of correctional officials towards rehabilitation, as well as the attitude towards humane treatment of offenders was measured on a five point Likert scale ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree. The paired samples t-test was conducted to determine if differences exist in attitudes of correctional officials towards rehabilitation and humane treatment of offenders. The mean score of the attitudes of correctional officials towards rehabilitation of offenders was of 4.2618 (SD= 0.5181), while the mean score of the attitude of correctional officials towards humane treatment of offenders was 3.9399 (SD= 0.5553). The mean score for the attitudes towards rehabilitation was higher than the mean score for the humane treatment of offenders, indicating that correctional officials prefer that offenders be rehabilitated rather than that they be treated humanely.

The results of the paired samples t-test revealed a significant difference in the attitudes of correctional officials towards rehabilitation and the attitudes of correctional officials towards humane treatment of offenders ($p=0.000$). This analysis provides evidence that the correctional officials had more positive attitudes towards rehabilitation of offenders than towards humane treatment of offenders. The results of the paired samples t-test are presented in Table 5.14.

Table 5.14: Paired samples t-test of the differences between the attitude of correctional officials towards rehabilitation and the attitude towards humane treatment of offenders.

Type of attitudes	N	Mean	SD	Sig. (2-tailed)
Attitudes of correctional officials towards rehabilitation	181	4.2618	0.51811	.000
Attitudes of correctional officials towards humane treatment	181	3.9399	0.5533	

5.6 Conclusion

The data analysis performed in this study revealed both significant and non-significant results. The results revealed that correctional officials have an overall positive attitude towards the rehabilitation and humane treatment of offenders. However, when the attitudes of correctional officials towards rehabilitation and towards humane treatment were examined separately different results were noted. The results revealed that although correctional officials believe in the rehabilitation of offenders they do not necessarily believe in the humane treatment of offenders. Results have also revealed that there are factors that influence the attitudes of correctional officials but they are only significant when examined together. The main findings and the discussion of the findings are presented in the next chapter.

CHAPTER 6

DISCUSSION OF THE RESULTS, RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSION

6.1 Introduction

The aim of this study was to explore correctional officials' attitudes towards their role of rehabilitating offenders and treating offenders with respect and dignity. Furthermore, the study aimed to determine if certain factors have a potential bearing on the attitude of correctional officials. It was envisaged that factors like gender, age, educational qualification, work experience, and the type of offender under the correctional officials' care could have an impact on the attitude of correctional officials. With this objective in mind, exploratory survey research was conducted at Leeuwkop Correctional Institution. In this last chapter, the results obtained from the study will be discussed. Limitations of the study and the recommendations for future research will be made.

6.2 Discussion of the results

In respect to the overall attitude of correctional officials at Leeuwkop Correctional Institution, the results of the study indicate that correctional officials had an overall positive attitude towards rehabilitation and humane treatment of offenders. Although this finding is supported by previous research findings (Farkas, 1999; Robinson, Porporino & Simourd, 1997; Van Voorhis et al., 1991) it is perplexing in the context of the high levels

of offender assaults by correctional officials, and high levels of re-offending behaviour by offenders (Erasmus, 2007; Gaum, Hoffman & Venter, 2006).

Based on the finding that correctional officials at Leeuwkop Correctional Institution had an overall positive attitude towards rehabilitation and humane treatment it can be concluded that high incidences of inhumane treatment of offenders and the high levels of recidivism are not necessarily due to the attitudes of correctional officials. The prevalence of these incidences of inhumane treatment and recidivism could possibly be attributed to other factors, such as organizational climate and job satisfaction, within the correctional system (Griffin, 2001). High levels of job satisfaction and a positive organizational climate are linked to positive employee behaviour, whereas low levels of job satisfaction and negative organizational climate are linked to negative employee behaviour (Lambert, 2003). The South African correctional system is characterized by low job satisfaction and a negative organizational climate that is attributed to the heavy work demands placed on the correctional officials.

Correctional officials are often faced with demands of having to do extra work, or work outside the normal boundaries of their job description with insufficient manpower to produce quality work (Botha & Pienaar, 2006). The ill treatment of offenders and high recidivism could be an outcome of the low job satisfaction and negative organizational climate that exists in South African correctional institutions. The findings of the study suggest that correctional officials do not dislike the idea of rehabilitation and humane treatment of offenders; however, factors like organizational climate and job satisfaction

may be influencing the behaviour of correctional officials thus resulting in assault or ill treatment of offenders. It is therefore recommended that the role played by job satisfaction and organizational climate in the ill treatment of offenders by correctional officials be explored.

The current study also compared the attitude of correctional officials towards rehabilitation, with the attitude of correctional officials towards humane treatment of offenders. The results show that correctional officials were more positive towards the rehabilitation of offenders than towards treating offenders with respect and dignity. A consequence of these results is that although correctional officials believe in the rehabilitation of offenders they do not necessarily believe in the humane treatment of offenders, thus providing some explanation for the high rate of ill treatment of offenders.

A possible explanation for these results is that studies, both locally and internationally, have revealed that people regard correctional institutions as schools of crime where offenders learn new ways to commit crime (Roberts & Hough, 2005). It is for this reason that people support the rehabilitation of offenders. The public support for rehabilitation of offenders in the correctional institutions is manifested by the desire of the public to see offenders improve their behaviour, and to stop the tendency to resort to criminal behaviour to maintain a living (Roberts & Hough, 2005). This desire is believed to be stronger for correctional officials as they often witness offenders being readmitted to correctional institutions (Gaum, Hoffman & Venter, 2006).

With respect to factors that could potentially influence the attitude of correctional officials towards rehabilitation and humane treatment of offenders, the results revealed that there were no differences in the attitudes of male and female correctional officials at Leeuwkop Correctional Institution. Both male and female correctional officials had positive attitudes towards the treatment of offenders. The results of the current study were consistent with those of Van Voorhis (1991), which revealed that gender did not have an impact on the attitude of correctional officials. However, these findings were in contradiction with the results of the study conducted by Farkas (1999). The latter study established that gender has an effect on the attitudes of correctional officials, female correctional officials were found to have more positive attitudes towards treatment of offenders than male correctional officials did.

The results did not support the hypothesis that older correctional officials have more negative attitudes towards the rehabilitation and humane treatment of offenders when compared to younger correctional officials. Correctional officials at Leeuwkop Correctional Institution, regardless of their age, had positive attitudes towards rehabilitation and humane treatment of offenders. These findings contradict the findings of previous studies which have demonstrated that older correctional officials have more positive attitudes towards rehabilitation and humane treatment of offenders (Farkas, 1999; Jackson & Ammen, 1996; Robinson, Porporino & Simourd, 1997).

There was no evidence to support the hypothesis that the educational background of correctional officials has an influence on their attitudes towards rehabilitation and

humane treatment of offenders. Both correctional officials with no tertiary education and those with a tertiary education had positive attitudes towards rehabilitation and humane treatment of offenders. These findings did not support the findings reported by Robinson, Porporino and Simourd (1997) and Leiber et al. (2002). These studies found that correctional officials who possessed a tertiary educational qualification had more positive attitudes towards rehabilitation and humane treatment of offenders.

In respect of work experience, correctional officials with more than 10 years of work experience as well as those with less than 10 years experience demonstrated positive attitudes towards rehabilitation and humane treatment of offenders. It was predicted that correctional officials employed before the change in legislation (more than 10 years work experience) would have more negative attitudes towards rehabilitation and humane treatment of offenders. The findings of the study suggest that work experience did not have an impact on the attitude of correctional officials at Leeuwkop Correctional Institution. These results could not be compared with the results of the previous studies as no study was found that examined the impact of work experience on the attitudes of correctional officials either locally or internationally.

However the results of the studies both locally and internationally, that explored the impact of work experience on organizational change reveal that work experience has an influence on the attitude of employees towards organizational change (Alas & Vadi, 2006, Msweli-Mbanga & Potwana, 2006). Employees with more work experience tend to have more negative attitude towards change than people with less or no work experience.

The negative attitude is attributed to perceived increase in work load, of employees in the change process (Msweli-Mbanga & Potwana, 2006) as well as a threat to acquired skills and knowledge and confidence they have acquired as a result of their previous work experience (Alas & Vadi, 2006).

Lastly, it was also hypothesized that correctional officials working with maximum security offenders would have more negative attitudes towards the rehabilitation and humane treatment of offenders than correctional officials working with juvenile and medium offenders. The type of offenders under the correctional officials' care did not have an impact on the attitudes of correctional officials at Leeuwkop Correctional Institution. Correctional officials, regardless of the type of offenders under their care, had positive attitudes towards rehabilitation and humane treatment of offenders. These results could also not be compared with the results of previous studies as no studies were found that examined this factor in relation to the correctional officials' attitudes. However studies have shown that the type of offender under correctional officials' care has an impact on the behaviour of correctional officials. For example, it has been shown that correctional officials with maximum offenders under their care have high levels of stress that cause them to behave negatively towards these offenders (Rossouw, 1997; Botha & Pienaar, 2006).

The results of this study revealed that gender, age, educational background, work experience and the type of an offender under the correctional official's care did not have any significant effect on the overall attitude of correctional officials towards

rehabilitation and humane treatment of offenders. These non-significant findings were noted when these factors were examined individually. However, when certain factors were correlated significant results were noted. A correlation between gender and the type of offenders cared for was noted. Gender and the type of offenders under the correctional officials' care each had a non-significant impact when these factors were examined individually. Yet, when controlling for gender or the type of offenders, the impact of these factors on the overall attitude of correctional officials became significant.

The overall attitude towards rehabilitation and humane treatment of offenders of male correctional officials was found to be more positive than the overall attitude of female correctional officials. In addition the correctional officials with medium offenders under their care were noted to have a more positive overall attitude towards rehabilitation and humane treatment of offenders than correctional officials with juvenile or maximum offenders under their care. The implication of these results is that the attitude of correctional officials may not be influenced by individual factors, but by the combination of these factors. These results were consistent with those of Van Voorhis et al. (1991), thus confirming the view that attitudes of correctional officials may be influenced by the linkage of numerous factors.

The study by Van Voorhis et al. (1991) investigated the impact of race and gender on the work experience of correctional officials, after controlling for peer and supervisory support, significant results were noted in the relationship between gender and work experiences. A study that will investigate the effects of the combination of the various

factors on the attitudes of correctional officials towards rehabilitation and humane treatment of offenders is therefore proposed, as significant results were noted in this study when these factors were examined together as opposed to examining these factors individually.

The findings of this study have shown that gender, age, educational background, work experience and the type of an offender under the correctional official's care do not have an impact on the attitude of correctional officials towards rehabilitation and humane treatment of offenders. These results have implications on the theory of how attitudes influence behaviour. Theoretically attitudes are known to predict behaviour and the findings have falsified this premise by suggesting that the attitude-behaviour link is a complex relationship in that attitudes do not always result in the expected behaviour (Armitage & Christian, 2003). The attitude behaviour link is determined and strengthened by the aspects of the attitude such as attitude strength and attitude accessibility (Armitage & Christian, 2003). These aspects also known as moderator variables, determine the extent of when and how an attitude will affect behaviour.

The term attitude strength refers to the extent of emotional reaction provoked by the attitude, the extent to which the attitude is stable, and guides behaviour, while attitude accessibility refers to an extent the attitude easily comes to mind (Baron & Byrne; Miller & Peterson, 2004). Stronger attitudes are likely to be more predictive of the people's behaviour than weak attitudes and are also easily accessed from memory (Armitage & Christian, 2003). Furthermore stronger attitudes are consistent because an individual does

not need to construct an attitude on the spot when in similar situations (Holland, Verplanken & Van Knippenberg, 2002).

The results of this study suggest that attitude strength has an impact on the behaviour of the correctional officials because even though correctional official have a general positive attitude towards rehabilitation, they do not necessarily perceive the need to treat offenders humanely. Despite the fact that correctional officials are more positive towards rehabilitation of offenders, the rate of recidivism and ill treatment of offenders remains high (Erasmus, 2007). Based on these findings it can be postulated that the strength of the attitude of correctional official towards humane treatment of offenders is more than strengths of the attitude towards rehabilitation at Leeuwkop Correctional Institution, thus resulting in the negative behaviour displayed in the treatment of offenders by the correctional officials. Therefore the incidences of the inhumane treatment of offenders are the result of the strength of the belief of the correctional officials that offenders do not need to be treated humanely while in custody.

6.3 Recommendations

There were several limitations to the study. The research methodology used in the study could have had an impact on the findings of the study. The data was gathered using a research questionnaire. The nature of the questionnaire was such that participants were required to choose a response from pre determined responses. This limits participants because even if they have different opinions they are unable to express them. Also, the

fact that a combination of demographic factors had an impact on the attitude of correctional officials points to the need for a research design that would be able to take into account complex and contextual issues that may inform the correctional official's attitude towards the rehabilitation and humane treatment of offenders. It is therefore recommended that a study similar to this one, that will combine both qualitative and quantitative research methods, be conducted. A study of this nature will also provide participants with an opportunity to express their own views in their own words, thus explaining the findings of the current study.

Due to practical and budgetary constraints, the survey was only conducted at the Leeuwkop Correctional Institution, and therefore the findings of this study are applicable to this correctional institution only, and cannot be generalized to the larger population of all correctional officials in South Africa. A study of this nature that includes a number of South African correctional institutions or all of the correctional institutions might yield different results. Conducting a study of this nature on a larger scale might be beneficial as it could provide an understanding of the general attitudes of South African correctional officials towards rehabilitation and humane treatment of offenders.

The research methodology employed in this study measured the explicit attitudes of correctional officials. Explicit attitude measures, as opposed to implicit attitude measures, directly ask respondents to indicate their attitude. A consequence of the explicit attitude measure is that the results may be subjected to the influence of social desirability with the participants wanting to appear to have the 'politically correct' attitude in the light of the

human rights culture which is being promoted by the South African societal institutions. Thus it would appear that the nature of the attitude object that this study sought to investigate, that is the attitude of correctional officials towards rehabilitation and humane treatment of offenders, may require the use of an implicit attitude measure so as to minimize the influence of social desirability, and further explain the results of this study.

6.4 Conclusion

When examining the results of the current study, it can be seen that the results did not support the predicted hypotheses. Overall correctional officials at Leeuwkop Correctional Institution had positive attitudes towards the rehabilitation and humane treatment of offenders. Demographic characteristic of correctional officials such as gender, age, educational qualification, race, work experience and the type of offenders under their care when examined individually did not have an impact on the attitudes of these correctional officials. No significant differences were noted in the attitude of correctional officials based on their demographic characteristics.

Determining the attitudes of correctional officials towards rehabilitation and humane treatment of offenders is an initial and crucial step that may assist in the successful implementation of the legislation pertaining to the rehabilitation and humane treatment of offenders. This study has been envisaged as forming a foundation for similar studies about the treatment and rehabilitation of offenders. This subject still needs to be pursued and investigated so as to gain greater insight into the factors that lead to high incidences

of violence against and ill treatment of offenders in South African correctional institutions. In particular the study has made a contribution by alluding to the importance of future studies exploring the impact of a combination of demographic factors on attitudes of correctional officials towards rehabilitation and humane treatment of offenders. The findings from the study also indicate the need for future studies that will explore how different aspects may play a role in the way correctional service officials treat offenders and their willingness to contribute to the rehabilitation of offenders.

Organizational climate and job satisfaction was specifically highlighted as possible contributing factors to a lack of offender rehabilitation and the ill treatment of offenders by correctional service officials. This study also highlighted the need for programmes that will equip correctional service officials with skills to rehabilitate offenders as well as skills that will promote the humane treatment of offenders.

References

Ajzen, I. (2001). Nature and operation of attitude. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 52(1), 27-58.

Alas, R. & Sharifi, S. (2002). Organizational learning and resistance to change in Estonian companies. *Human Resource Development International*, 5(3), 313-331.

Alas, R. & Vadi, M. (2006). The impact of organisational culture on organisational learning and attitudes concerning change from an institutional perspective. [*International Journal of Strategic Change Management*, 1\(1/2\), 155 - 170.](#)

Albarracin, D., Johnson, B.T. & Zanna, M. P. (2005). *The handbook of attitudes*. New York: Routledge

Anonymous. (2002). Doing time from punishment to rehabilitation and restoration. *Centre for Conflict Resolution*, 11(2), 60-64.

Applegate, B. K., Cullen, F. T. & Fisher, B. S. (2002). Public views toward crime and correctional policies: Is there a gender gap? *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 30 (2), 89–100.

Armitage, C.J & Christian, J. (2003). From attitudes to behaviour: Basic and applied research on the theory of planned behaviour. *Current Psychology*, 22 (3), 187-195.

Babbie, E. & Mouton, J. (2001). *The practice of social research*. Cape Town: Oxford University Press.

Baron, A. R. & Byrne, D. (1997). *Social psychology*. (8th ed.). Boston: Ally & Bacon.

Bohner, A. R. & Wanke, M. (2002). *Attitude and attitude change*. New York: Taylor & Francis Inc.

Botha, C. & Piennar, J. (2006). South African correctional official stress: The role of psychological strengths. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 34(1), 73-84.

Bruyns, H. J. & Nieuwehuizen, C. (2003). The role of education in the rehabilitation of offenders. *South African Journal of Higher Education*, 17 (2), 13-20.

Cardinal, B.J. (2001). Role modeling attitudes and physical activity and fitness promoting behaviours of HEPDR professionals and preprofessionals. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, 74 (1), 84-90.

Cilliers, C. & Smit, J. 2007. Offender rehabilitation in the South African correctional system: Myth or reality? *Acta Criminologica*, 20 (2), 83-101.

Cresswell, C. J. (1994). *Research design: Qualitative and quantitative approaches*. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage.

Dent, E. B. & Goldberg, S. G. (1999). Challenging resistance to change. *The Journal of Applied Behavioural Science*, 35(1), 25-41.

Department of Correctional Services. (1998). *Correctional Services Act 111 of 1998*. *Government Gazette*. (No. 19522).

Department of Correctional Services. (2005). *White Paper on Corrections*. *Government Gazette*. Retrieved May 10, 2006 from <http://www.dcs.gov.za/Policies/White%20Paper/WHITE%20PAPER%208.doc>

Department of Correctional Services. (2007) [Leeuwkop: Gauteng region, 3rd quarter 2007]. Unpublished raw data.

Dissel, A. & Ellis, S. (2002). *Reform and stasis: Transformation in prisons*. Retrieved May 19, 2006 from <http://www.csvr.org.za/papers/papadese.htm>

Erasmus, N. C. (2007). *Annual Report for the period 1 April 2006 to 31 March 2007*. Retrieved May 25, 2008 from <http://judicialinsp.pwv.gov.za/Annualreports/ANNUAL%20REPORT%202007.pdf>

Fagan, J. J (2006) *Annual Report for the period 1 April 2005 to 31 March 2006*.

Retrieved October 10, 2006 from

<http://judicialinsp.pwv.gov.za/Annualreports/ANNUAL%20REPORT%202006.pdf>

Farkas, M. A. (1999). Correctional officer attitudes toward inmates and working with inmates in a get tough era. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 27(6), 495-506.

Fazio, R. H., Powell, M. C. & Williams, C. J. (1989). The role of attitude accessibility in the attitude-to –behaviour process. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 16(3), 280-288.

Fink, A. (1995). *How to conduct surveys: a step by step guide*. (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publication.

Fowler, F. (2002). *Survey research methods*. (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications.

Franchi, V. (2003). Across or beyond the racialized divide: Current perspectives on ‘race’, racism and ‘intercultural’ relations in ‘post-apartheid’ South Africa. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 27 (2), 125–133.

Gaum, G., Hoffman, S. & Venter, J. H. (2006). Factors that influence adult recidivism: An exploratory study in Pollsmoor prison. *South African Journal of Psychology*, 36(2), 407–424.

Geer, J. H. & Robertson, G. G. (2005). Implicit attitudes in sexuality: Gender differences. *Archives of Sexual Behaviour*, 34(6), 671-677.

George, J. M. & Jones, G. R. (1997). Experiencing work: Values, attitudes, and moods. *Human relations*, 50 (4), 393-416.

Giffard, C. & Muntingh, L. (2007, June). The numbering of days: Sentencing and prison population growth. *SA Crime Quarterly*, 20, 21-20.

Gillespie, K. (2003). *Correction: A vision for securing democracy in the new South Africa*. Retrieved September 29, 2006 from <http://www.ssrc.org/programs/gcs/publications/quarterly10/gillescorrect.pdf>

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

Griffin, M. L. (2001). Job satisfaction among detention officers: Assessing the relative contribution of organizational climate variables. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 29(3), 219-232.

Haddock, G. (2003). On using questionnaires to measure attitudes. In G. Breakwell (Ed.), *Doing social psychology* (pp. 154-174). London: Blackwell.

Harrison, D. (1999). Assess and remove barriers to change. *HR Focus*, 76 (7), 9-11.

Hesselink-Louw, A., Joubert, S. & Maree, A. (2003). Criminological assessment of offenders: An analysis with the aim of promoting rehabilitation. *Acta Criminologica*, 16 (5), 91-98.

Holland, R.W., Verplanken, B., & Van Knippenberg, A. (2002). On the nature of attitude- behaviour relations: The strong guide, the weak follow. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 32(6), 869-876.

Horsten, D. (2006). The role played by the South African Human Rights Commissions' economic and social rights reports in good governance in South Africa. *Potchefstroom Electronic Law Journal*, 2(1), 1-21.

Human Rights Commission. (1999). *Building a culture of human rights-Workshop manual*. Johannesburg: Human Rights Commission.

Huskinson, T. L. H. & Haddock, G. (2006). Individual differences in attitude structure and the accessibility of the affective and cognitive components of attitude.

Social cognition, 24(4), 453-468.

Jackson, J. E. & Ammen, S. (1996). Race and correctional officers' punitive attitudes toward treatment programs for inmates. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 24(2), 153-166.

Jenkins, T. & McLean, G. R. (2004). The Steve Biko affair. *The Lancet*, 364, 36-37.

Jurik, N. (1985). Individual and organizational determinants of correctional officers' attitudes towards inmates. *Criminology* 23(3), 523-540.

Kagee, A. (2005). Construction and initial validation of the South African former detainees' distress scale: An exploratory factor analysis. *South African Journal of Psychology*, 35(4), 623-636.

Lambert, E. (2003). The impact of organizational justice on correctional staff. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 31(2), 155-168.

Lambert, E. G., Barton, S. M. & Hogan, N.L. (1999). The missing link between job satisfaction and correctional staff behaviour: The issue of organisational commitment. *American Journal of Criminal Justice*, 24(1), 95-116.

Leiber, M. J., Schwarze, K., Mack, K. Y. & Farnworth, M. (2002). The effects of occupation and education on punitive orientations among juvenile justice personnel. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 30(4), 303– 316.

Luyt, W.F.M. (2001). The transformation of corrections in the New South Africa. *Acta Criminologica*, 14(3), 26-33.

Malherbe, R. (2003). Advancing social change: Recent human rights developments in South Africa. *Tydskrif vir die Suid-Afrikaanse Reg*, 3, 432-464.

Merrett, C. (1990). Detention without trial in South Africa: The abuse of human rights as state tragedy in the late 1980s. *Africa Today*, 37(2), 53-66.

Miller, S.B. & Schacter, M. (2000). From restorative justice to restorative governance. *Canadian Journal of Criminology*, 42(3), 405-420.

Mitchell, O., MacKenzie, D. L., Gover, A. R. & Styve, G.J. (2001). The influences of personal background on perceptions of juvenile correctional environments. *Journal of Criminal Justice* 29(1), 67- 76.

Morodi, L. R. (2001). The constitutional rights of prisoners within the South African criminal justice system. *Crime Research in South Africa*, 4(4), 1-14.

Mouton, J. (2001). *How to succeed in your masters and doctoral studies: A South African guide and resource book*. Pretoria: Van Schaik.

Msweli-Mbanga, P. & Potwana, N. (2006). Modelling participation, resistance to change, and organizational citizenship behaviour: A South African case. *South African Journal of Business Management*, 37(1), 21-29.

Mubangizi, J. C. (2001). Prisons and prisoners rights: Some jurisprudential and historical perspectives. *Acta Criminologica*. 14(3), 120-129.

Mubangizi, J. C. (2002). Some reflections on the promotion of the rights of prisoners in South Africa. *Acta Criminologica*, 15(2), 26-34.

Mubangizi, J. C. (2004). Protection of human rights in South Africa: Public awareness and perceptions. *Journal of Judiciary Science*, 29(1), 62-87.

Nardi, P. M. (2006). *Doing survey research: A guide to quantitative methods*. (2nd ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Naude, B. (2006). An international perspective of restorative justice practices and research outcomes. *Journal for Juridical Science* 31(1), 101-120.

Naude, B., Prinsloo, J. & Ladikos, A. (2003). Restorative justice: A global overview of its functioning and effectiveness. *Acta Criminologica*, 16(5), 1-9.

Neser, J. (2001). Restorative justice – A new dimension of sentencing in South African courts. *Acta Criminologica*, 14(3), 46-51.

Neuman, L.W. (2003). *Social research methods: Qualitative and quantitative approaches*. (5th ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Oppler, S. (1998). *Assessing the state of South African prisons*. Retrieved September 29, 2006, from <http://www.iss.co.za/Pubs/Monographs/No29/Prison.html>

Payne, B. K., Gainey, R. R., Triplett, R. A. & Danner, M. J. E. (2004). What drives punitive beliefs?: Demographic characteristics and justifications for sentencing. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 32(3), 195– 206.

Perugini, M. (2005). Predictive models of implicit and explicit attitudes. [*British Journal of Social Psychology*, 44\(1\), 29-46.](#)

Pete, S. (1997). Prisoners' rights. *South African Human Rights Yearbook*, 8(9), 206-244.

Petty, R. E., Wegner, D.T. & Fabrigar, L. R. (1997). Attitude and attitude change. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 48(1), 609-647.

Pinsonneault, A. & Kraemer, K. L. (1993). Survey research methodology in management information systems: An assessment. *Journal of Management Information Systems Archive*, 10(2), 75-105.

Plasket, C. (2006). Human rights in South Africa: An assessment. *Obiter*, 27(1), 1-19.

Pollak, C. & Sigler, R. (1998). Low levels of stress among Canadian correctional officers in the Northern Region of Ontario. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 26(2), 117-128.

Roach, K. (2000). Changing punishment at the turn of the century: Restorative justice in the rise. *Canadian Journal of Criminology*, 42(2), 249-280.

Roberts, J.V. & Hough, M. (2005). The state of the prisons: Exploring public knowledge and opinion. *The Howard Journal*, 44(3), 286-306.

Robinson, D., Porporino, F. J. & Simourd, L. (1997). The influence of educational attainment on the attitudes and job performance of correctional officers. *Crime Delinquency*, 43 (1), 60-77.

Roman, M. (2003). Towards facilitating a human rights culture at a distance. *Progressio*, 25(1), 32-47.

Rossi, P.H., Berk, R. A. & Campbell, A. (1997). Just punishments: Guideline sentences and normative consensus. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, 13(3), 267-290.

Rossum, R.A. & Rossum, C. (2003). Rehabilitating rehabilitation. *The World & I*, 18(12), 24-29.

Rydell, R. J. & McConnell, A. R. (2006). Understanding Implicit and Explicit Attitude Change: A Systems of Reasoning Analysis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 91(6), 995–1008.

Schweigert, W. A. (1998). *Research methods in psychology: A handbook*. Pacific Grove, California: Brookes/Cole Publication.

Sekhonyane, M. (2002). *Emergency measures: Early release to alleviate prison overcrowding*. Retrieved March 16, 2009 from <http://www.iss.org.za/pubs/CrimeQ/No.1/4Sekhonyane.html>

Sekhonyane, M. (2004, March). First things first: Rehabilitation starts with alternatives to prison. *SA Crime Quarterly*, 7, 33-36.

Singh, A. & Maseko, T.W. (2006). The protection of prisoners' rights to health care services in South African law: Is it adequate? *Journal for Juridical Science*, 31(1), 80-100.

Smith, J. R. & Terry, D. J. (2003). Attitude- behaviour consistency: The role of group norms, attitude accessibility, and mode of behavioral decision making. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 33(5), 591-608.

Sotirovic, M. (2001). Effects of media use on complexity and extremity of attitudes toward the death penalty and prisoners' rehabilitation. *Media Psychology*, 3(1), 1-24.

Sprott, J. B. (1999). Are members of the public tough on crime?: The dimensions of public "punitiveness". *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 27(5), 467– 474.

Stohr, M. K., Lovrich, N. P. & Wood, M. J. (1996). Service versus security concerns in contemporary jails: Testing general differences in training topic assessments. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 24(5), 437-448.

Thompson, C. (2006). Working on the inside: Women in corrections. *New Mexico Woman*, 19(1), 12.

Thotse, M.L. & Grobler, J. E. H. (2003). Standpoints on 'Black-on-Black' v.s 'third force' violence during South Africa's transitional negotiations (1990-1994). *Historia*, 48(2), 143-160.

Van Harreveld, F., Van Der Pligt, J., De Vries, N. K. & Andreas, S. (2000). The structure of attitudes: Attribute importance, accessibility and judgement. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 39(3), 363-380.

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

Van Zyl Smit, D. (1992). *South African prison law and practice*. Durban: Butterworth.

Ward, T. & Langlands, R. L. (2008). Restorative justice and the human rights of offenders: Convergences and divergences. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 13(5) , 355-372.

Zinger, I. (2006). Human rights compliance and the role of external prison oversight. *Canadian Journal of Criminology and Criminal Justice*, 48(2), 127-155.

Appendix A: Letter of Approval to conduct the study from the DCS



correctional services

Department:
Correctional Services
REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA

Private Bag X136, PRETORIA, 0001 Poyntons Building, C/O Church and Schubart Street, PRETORIA
Tel (012) 307 2000, Fax (012) 328-5111

August 2007

Dear Ms AN Rozani

Re: Feedback on the Application to Conduct Research in the Department of Correctional Services on "Attitudes of Correctional officials towards rehabilitation and humane treatment of prisoners"

It is with pleasure to inform you that your request to conduct research in the Department of Correctional Services on the above topic has been approved. Your research title should, however, reflect the Leeuwkop Correctional centre to avoid the generalization of results.

Regional Head: Corrections: Gauteng- Ms. Madisa has been appointed as your internal guide. You are requested to contact her at telephone number **(012) 420 0100** before the commencement of your research project.

Your attention is drawn to the following:

- The relevant Area and Regional Commissioners where the research will be conducted will be informed of your proposed research project.
- It is your responsibility to make arrangements for your visiting times.
- Your identity document and this approval letter should be in your possession when visiting the centers.
- You are required to use the terminology utilized in the White Paper on Corrections in South Africa (February 2007).
- You are not allowed to use any audio, digital, photographic, or video equipment during your visits to the Correctional Centres.
- You are required to submit your final report to the Department for approval by the Commissioner of Correctional Services before publication of the report.
- Should you have any enquiries regarding this process, please contact the Directorate Research for assistance at telephone number 012-305 8619/8686/8627 or 307-2359.

Thank you for your application and interest to conduct research in the Department of Correctional Services.

Yours faithfully


DC: POLICY CO-ORDINATION & RESEARCH
Ms. T. M. Magoro

2007.08.14

Appendix B: Consent form for the participants

Attitudes of Correctional Service Officials towards the Rehabilitation and Humane Treatment of Prisoners at LEEUWKOP CORRECTIONAL CENTRE.

Miss A. N. Rozani
Department of Psychology
University of Johannesburg.

Dear Participant

The role of the Department of Correctional Services (DCS) has changed from that of punishing offenders to provision of rehabilitation to offenders and treatment of offenders with respect and dignity. Rehabilitation and humane treatment of offenders are fairly new concepts in the Department of Correctional Services (DCS), and are believed to be the key concepts that will help to decrease crime and to prevent repeat offending behaviour patterns. The purpose of this study is to determine how and why correctional officials feel about this new role of rehabilitating and treating offenders with respect and dignity.

I am a Masters student in Psychology at the Department of Psychology of the University of Johannesburg. I kindly request you to volunteer to participate in my research project on attitudes of correctional officials towards rehabilitation and humane treatment of offenders at Leeuwkop Correctional Centre.

I kindly request you to complete the following questionnaire, and the completion may take about 20 minutes. I will collect the questionnaire immediately after completion. Please do not write your name or contact details on the questionnaire, it remains anonymous. The information gathered from the questionnaire will be used for academic purpose only and not for any other reason and all the information used in this study is strictly confidential.

Permission to conduct this study has been granted by the Research Directorate of the DCS in Pretoria. Your participation is voluntary and you have the right to refuse to participate or stop at any time without stating any reason. You should not agree to take part in the study unless you are completely happy about what is expected of you.

Prior to participating in the study you are requested to sign an informed consent form. Feedback about the findings will be given to the participants as well as to the DCS management in writing.

If you have any questions during this study do not hesitate to consult me or my research supervisor Mrs. F.H. Kaldine at the University Johannesburg at (011) 559 3126.

Your assistance is highly appreciated.

Yours sincerely
Miss A. N. Rozani
(011) 933 7162 OR 082 398 0527.

INFORMED CONSENT FORM

I the undersigned..... (full names in print) have read the details of the study , or have listened to the oral explanation thereof, and declare to understand it. I have had the opportunity to discuss relevant aspects with the researcher and declare that I voluntarily participate in the study. I hereby give consent to participate in the study

Signature of the Participant:

Date:

Signed

at.....on.....

Appendix C: Questionnaire

PLEASE ANSWER THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS BY CROSSING (x) THE RELEVANT BLOCK OR WRITING DOWN YOUR ANSWER IN THE SPACE PROVIDED.

EXAMPLES of how to complete this questionnaire:

1. Which hand do you write with?

If you are right handed:

Right	1 X
Left	<u>2</u>

SECTION A: DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

1. Gender

Male	<u>1</u>
Female	<u>2</u>

2. Age (in complete years)

<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
----------------------	----------------------

3. Ethnicity

Black	<u>1</u>
White	<u>2</u>
Coloured	<u>3</u>
Indian	<u>4</u>
Other	<u>5</u>

4. Your highest education qualification

No formal qualification	<u>1</u>
Grade 11 or lower(std 9 or lower)	<u>2</u>
Grade 12 (Std 10)	<u>3</u>
Post school diploma / certificate	<u>4</u>
Undergraduate degree(s)	<u>5</u>
Post graduate degree(s)	<u>6</u>

5. Number of complete years that you have worked in the Dept of Correctional Services?

<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
----------------------	----------------------

6 Type of offenders under your care (Mark all applicable)

Medium offenders	<input type="checkbox"/>
Maximum offenders	<input type="checkbox"/>
Juvenile offenders	<input type="checkbox"/>

SECTION B

7.1. Have you ever been accused of ill-treating a prisoner?

Yes	1
No	2

7.2. Have you ever been found guilty of ill-treating a prisoner?

Yes	1
No	2

8. Please indicate the extent to which or each of the following statements apply to you by using the 5-point response scale provided.	1=To no extent	2=To a small extent	3= To a moderate extent	4=To a large extent	5=To a very large extent
To what extent:					
are you familiar with the content of the correctional services Act 111 of 1998?					
are you familiar with the content of the white paper on corrections of 2005?					
do you believe offenders should be treated with respect?					
do you believe offenders should be treated with dignity?					
do you believe offenders can be rehabilitated?					
do you believe offenders should be rehabilitated?					

SECTION C:

To what extent do you agree with each of the following statements regarding the rehabilitation of offenders? Please indicate your answer using the 5-point response scale provided.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
Imprisonment is about rehabilitation of Offenders.	1	2	3	4	5
Offenders deserve a second chance.	1	2	3	4	5
Offenders can change to be responsible individuals through rehabilitation.	1	2	3	4	5
Correctional officials play an important role in the rehabilitation of offenders.	1	2	3	4	5
It is important that offenders be rehabilitated before they are released from correctional institutions.	1	2	3	4	5
Correctional officials are equally responsible for rehabilitation of offenders as social workers and psychologists are.	1	2	3	4	5
The successful implementation of rehabilitation programmes of offenders in my section is my responsibility as well.	1	2	3	4	5
Rehabilitation empowers offenders to stop offending behaviour.	1	2	3	4	5
Imprisonment is about punishment of offenders.	1	2	3	4	5
Rehabilitation of offenders is a waste of time because they always come back to prison.	1	2	3	4	5
The successful rehabilitation of offenders depends on active participation of correctional officials.	1	2	3	4	5
I enjoy the role of rehabilitating offenders.	1	2	3	4	5
I encourage offenders to participate in rehabilitation programmes.	1	2	3	4	5
I empower myself by attending workshops on how to rehabilitate offenders.	1	2	3	4	5

SECTION D

To what extent do you agree with each of the following statements regarding the humane treatment of offenders? Please indicate your answer using the 5-point response scale.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
Offenders have the right to be treated humanely.	1	2	3	4	5
Correctional officials should protect offenders against ill treatment.	1	2	3	4	5
Offenders must be treated with respect.	1	2	3	4	5
Treating offenders with respect will lead to the rehabilitation of offenders.	1	2	3	4	5
Correctional officials must ensure that offenders are treated with dignity.	1	2	3	4	5
Treating offenders with dignity will lead to rehabilitation of offenders.	1	2	3	4	5
Offenders are human beings therefore should be treated as such.	1	2	3	4	5
Humane treatment of offenders has a positive effect on offenders' behaviour.	1	2	3	4	5
Corporal punishment is an effective punishment for offenders.	1	2	3	4	5
Punishing offenders is a violation of human rights.	1	2	3	4	5
Because offenders are violent the only way of communicating with them is through violence.	1	2	3	4	5
Punishing offenders is the only way of maintaining order in prison.	1	2	3	4	5
Denying offenders their right is inhumane.	1	2	3	4	5
Limitation of offenders' rights, for example suspension of visitation rights, is an effective punishment compared to corporal punishment.	1	2	3	4	5

Thank you very much for your co-operation in completing this questionnaire.

Appendix D: The Mann-Whitney-U test according to age

Ranks				
	Age (in complete years)	N	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks
Attitude towards rehabilitation	35 years and younger	87	75.56	6573.50
	36 years and older	69	82.21	5672.50
	Total	156		
Attitude towards humane treatment	35 years and younger	86	71.77	6172.00
	36 years and older	69	85.77	5918.00
	Total	155		

Test Statistics (a)

	Attitude towards rehabilitation	Attitude towards humane treatment
Mann-Whitney U	2745.500	2431.000
Wilcoxon W	6573.500	6172.000
Z	-0.915	-1.932
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	0.360	0.053

a Grouping Variable: Age (in complete years)