

6-2018

Social Work Students' Views and Attitudes Towards Working with Previously Incarcerated Individuals

Tiffany Comptois

CSUSB, comptoit@coyote.csusb.edu

Brianda Villa

CSUSB, villb303@coyote.csusb.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <http://scholarworks.lib.csusb.edu/etd>

 Part of the [Social Work Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Comptois, Tiffany and Villa, Brianda, "Social Work Students' Views and Attitudes Towards Working with Previously Incarcerated Individuals" (2018). *Electronic Theses, Projects, and Dissertations*. 688.

<http://scholarworks.lib.csusb.edu/etd/688>

This Project is brought to you for free and open access by the Office of Graduate Studies at CSUSB ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Electronic Theses, Projects, and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of CSUSB ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact scholarworks@csusb.edu.

SOCIAL WORK STUDENTS' VIEWS AND ATTITUDES TOWARDS WORKING
WITH PREVIOUSLY INCARCERATED INDIVIDUALS

A Project
Presented to the
Faculty of
California State University,
San Bernardino

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Social Work

by
Brianda Anahi Villa
Tiffany Marina Comptois

June 2018

SOCIAL WORK STUDENTS' VIEWS AND ATTITUDES TOWARDS WORKING
WITH PREVIOUSLY INCARCERATED INDIVIDUALS

A Project
Presented to the
Faculty of
California State University,
San Bernardino

by
Brianda Anahi Villa
Tiffany Marina Comptois

June 2018

Approved by:

Erica L. Lizano, PhD., Faculty Supervisor
Janet Chang, Ph.D., Research Coordinator

© 2018 Brianda Anahi Villa and Tiffany Marina Comptois

ABSTRACT

Due to the lack of literature on social worker involvement with the rehabilitation of previously incarcerated individuals, this study was designed to explore social work student's views and attitudes towards working with this population in the future. This study used a web-based quantitative survey design containing one open-ended question to survey 77 social work students. Findings reveal that most social work students recognize previously incarcerated individuals as a vulnerable and marginalized population that is deserving of services and expect to work with this population in the future. Additionally, this study identified that having children may impact social work student's views and attitudes towards working with previously incarcerated individuals. Common themes that emerged were dignity and worth of persons, intersectionality of this population with social work, and concerns regarding skills, training, and experience which reflected social work students' adherence to professional social work values and ethics as set forth by the NASW. This study highlights the need of social work students to be provided with the tools necessary in making them feel equipped to work with the rehabilitation of previously incarcerated individuals. Future research identifying barriers that prevent social worker involvement with this population can generate information that can be used to develop trainings to provide further education and knowledge to promote social work student's competency with this population.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	iii
LIST OF TABLES	viii
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION	
Problem Statement	1
Purpose of Study	4
Significance of the Project for Social Practice.....	5
CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW	
Introduction	7
The Marginalization of Previously Incarcerated Individuals	7
Successful Programs on Reentry	9
Mental Health and Previously Incarcerated Individuals	12
Social Work Involvement	14
Theories Guiding Conceptualization	16
Summary	18
CHAPTER THREE: METHODS	
Introduction	19
Study Design	19
Sampling.....	21
Data Collection and Instruments.....	22
Procedures	23
Protections of Human Subjects.....	24
Data Analysis.....	25

Summary	26
CHAPTER FOUR: RESULTS	
Introduction	27
Presentation of Findings	27
Descriptive Statistics.....	27
Inferential Analysis.....	28
Qualitative Analysis	33
Dignity and Worth of Persons	34
Intersectionality in Social Work	36
Competence.....	36
CHAPTER FIVE: DISCUSSION	
Introduction	38
Discussion	38
Quantitative Findings	39
Qualitative Findings	42
Dignity and Worth of Persons	42
Intersectionality in Social Work	43
Competence.....	44
Study Limitations	44
Recommendations for Social Work Practice.....	45
Conclusions	46
APPENDIX A: INFORMED CONSENT FORM.....	47
APPENDIX B: DEBRIEFING STATEMENT.....	49

APPENDIX C: AGENCY APPROVAL LETTER.....	51
APPENDIX D: INSTRUMENT	53
REFERENCES	57

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Demographic Characteristics of Study Sample	28
Table 2. Comparison of Parent Status and the Belief that “Less Emphasis Should be Placed on Protecting the Public from Incarcerated Individuals.”	31
Table 3. Comparison of Parent Status and the Belief that “Virtually Anyone Can Become Incarcerated.”	32
Table 4. Comparison of Parent Status and the Belief that “I Would Feel a Little Nervous if I was Asked to Facilitate a Group Consisting of Previously Incarcerated Individuals.”	32
Table 5. Comparison of Parent Status and the Belief that “I Would Feel Comfortable Working with a Client Who Has Been Convicted of Manslaughter.”	33
Table 6. Participant Responses to “Do You See Yourself Working with this Population in the Future?”	34

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

Problem Statement

The primary mission of social workers involves a focus on human well-being, primarily focusing on helping everyone to succeed in achieving basic human needs, specifically those populations who are vulnerable and oppressed (NASW, 2017). Social workers do not only focus on the well-being of individuals, but also the well-being of society at large through empowerment on a micro as well as a macro level (NASW, 2008). A population who is particularly vulnerable includes individuals who have been, or who currently are incarcerated, subsequently marginalized, discriminated against, oppressed, disenfranchised, and ultimately stripped of all human rights to be regarded as second-class citizens. Current post-incarceration policies and the resulting stigma that it creates among society robs this population of the opportunity to rehabilitate successfully. Although research exists regarding this population, there is not much that involves social workers willingness or involvement in helping previously incarcerated individuals' successful rehabilitation and reentry into society. Due to the current lack of research, this study attempts to capture social work students' views and attitudes on their willingness to work with previously incarcerated individuals to explore the reasons why social workers do not seem to be more actively involved in the rehabilitation of this population in the literature.

Ellem and Wilson (2010) identified and discussed barriers involved in assisting previously incarcerated individuals including their low social status maintained by current incarceration and post-incarceration policies, ultimately leading to the barriers of social stigma, discrimination, and the belief that this population is unworthy of reentry assistance. For these reasons, social workers and other social service agencies face many challenges in accessing the prison population to begin with. In addition to these barriers, reaching out to incarcerated individuals includes its own set of obstacles, which can include the consequences of physical confinement of an individual and their integration of prison culture which sets them even further back when seeking rehabilitative assistance (Ellem & Wilson, 2010). It seems that previously incarcerated individuals with mental health diagnoses are more readily assisted with rehabilitative services, however this leads to a further investigation of whether a difference exists in which these individuals are viewed as acceptable to help, whereas others are not. Ellem and Wilson (2010) implemented a life story intervention to help previously incarcerated individuals with intellectual disabilities leading participants to reclaim their voice and develop an understanding of themselves and their relationships with others. It should be noted that these researchers were unable to gain access to their intended population of currently incarcerated individuals which led to the subsequent use of the study's population. Therefore, the opportunity for currently incarcerated individuals to participate in the study in addition to the potential benefits that could've been

received through the life story intervention were revoked from this population. Through Ellem and Wilson's (2010) struggle in gaining access to their intended population comes the assumption that even research attempting to help the rehabilitation and reentry of the general population of incarcerated individuals is not as easily granted, or accepted, as it would be for those of the population who have an intellectual disability.

Research surfaced regarding the successful integration of faith-based programs and interventions in supporting the rehabilitation and reentry of previously incarcerated individuals into society (Armstrong, 2014; Homeboy Industries, n.d.; Sumter, 2006). These studies concluded that relationships involving genuine trust, unconditional acceptance, and the absence of judgement or condemnation with this population can be the most successful component in assisting this population (Armstrong, 2014; Delancey Street Foundation, 2007; Homeboy Industries, n.d.; Sumter, 2006). This success can be based on faith's ability to overlook an individual's past and focus on bettering the individual towards becoming interdependent, which also helps the well-being of the overall society. The importance of the lack of research on social workers involvement with this population can be related back to their Code of Ethics regarding their mission to empower the vulnerable and oppressed populations of society (Ellem & Wilson, 2010; Haski-Leventhal, Gelles, & Cnaan, 2010; Magen, Emerman, & Weaver, 2000; Scott & Zeiger, 2000). In essence, helping previously incarcerated individuals resonates with the profession of social work's commitment to social

justice through providing advocacy and services for the people who have been continuously silenced by society (Ellem & Wilson, 2010), ultimately leading to the development of this research study.

Purpose of Study

The purpose of this study is to examine social work students' views and attitudes on their willingness to work with previously incarcerated individuals and to begin to explore the reasons why social workers do not seem to be more actively involved in the rehabilitation of previously incarcerated individuals in the literature. Little research currently exists that involves the role of social workers in assisting this population in their reentry into society. Research that surfaced regarding social workers' involvement with this population mostly consisted of the debate as to whether or not to accept this population into social work education programs, mostly resulting in the rejection of these individuals based on their past convictions (Haski-Leventhal, Gelles, & Cnaan, 2010; Magen, Emerman, & Weaver, 2000; Scott & Zeiger, 2000). These articles lead to the inference that social workers views and attitudes might not differ from the stigma that exists in society's current perception of this population, resulting in the gatekeeping that occurs barring their admission into social work education programs (Haski-Leventhal, Gelles, & Cnaan, 2010; Magen, Emerman, & Weaver, 2000; Scott & Zeiger, 2000). For these reasons, this study was designed to explore social work students' views and attitudes in working with previously incarcerated individuals.

A quantitative survey design was utilized to allow us to begin to explore this topic. In addition, this study gathered quantitative data consisting of participants' basic demographic information as well as their agreeability ratings to statements targeting their personal and professional views and attitudes towards this population via Likert Scale. Lastly, this study also gathered qualitative data through the use of a follow-up open-ended question which asked participants, "Do you see yourself working with this population in the future? Why or why not?" This quantitative survey research design was chosen to attain solid quantitative and quantifiable data in this area, but also to begin to explore the possible reasons or barriers that social work students may have in being involved with this population. Additionally, the nature of our web-based survey design allowed researchers to gather and store data from a large group of people at one point in time.

Significance of the Project for Social Work Practice

The lack of literature in this area created a need for this research study to provide further insight on social work students' willingness to work with this population and to begin to explore the possible barriers that may prevent them from becoming involved. These findings can assist in education and trainings for social workers, or even social work students, in working with the previously incarcerated population as well as the education required in understanding previously incarcerated individuals as a vulnerable and oppressed population

deserving of services. This research can lead to social workers who are better equipped in fighting the policies that continue to create the social stigma, discrimination, and marginalization that currently exists towards this population. Providing rehabilitative services for previously incarcerated individuals will assist them in becoming interdependent which will benefit the individual themselves, their families, their communities, as well as society at large. This study examines social work students' views and attitudes on their willingness to work with previously incarcerated individuals to explore the reasons why social workers do not seem to be more actively involved in the rehabilitation of previously incarcerated individuals in the literature.

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

Chapter two consists of a discussion regarding literature that is relevant in this study. This chapter is divided into the following sections: the marginalization of previously incarcerated individuals, successful programs on re-entry, mental health and previously incarcerated individuals, social worker involvement, and a section on theories that help guide the conceptualization of this research study.

The Marginalization of Previously Incarcerated Individuals

The Federal Bureau of Prisons reported a total of 188,294 federal inmates in the United States as of June 2017 (BOP, 2017). About 45 percent of inmates are serving a sentence due to drug charges, while about 12 percent are serving a sentence for homicide or sex offenses (BOP, 2017). Around 25 percent of inmates serve a 5-10-year term and about 20 percent serve a 10-15-year term (BOP, 2017). In addition, inmates are typically serving at least a five-year term for their offenses and are often not provided sufficient rehabilitation programs or opportunities to make a successful transition towards becoming an interdependent member of society (BOP, 2017; Hall, Wooten, & Lundgren, 2016). Hall, Wooten, and Lundgren (2016) argue that current post-incarceration policies place previously incarcerated individuals in an even greater disadvantage when it comes to successful reentry which negatively impacts these individuals and society at large, as well other social policies and programs.

Previously incarcerated individuals face many barriers in life after prison. It is difficult for these individuals to secure housing, to find an employer who is willing to accept their criminal past, and to find people who are supportive and accepting of them without passing judgement. Upon exiting the prison system, previously incarcerated individuals can have strained family, friend, or other social relationships due to their troubled behavior history and/or their long, or intermittent, prison sentences. Hall, Wooten, and Lundgren (2016) analyzed how current post-incarceration policies disenfranchise and ultimately marginalize this population, regarding these policies as 'unfairly punitive', 'ineffective', and 'discriminatory'. They also discussed how these policies result in intended and unintended barriers on the individual and community levels that increase the risk for unsuccessful reentry and recidivism in previously incarcerated individuals (Hall, Wooten, & Lundgren, 2016). These barriers include the reduced ability to access government assistance programs, such as cash and food stamp aid; the revocation of their driver's license upon incarceration and the expensive and lengthy process that's required to reapply for it post-incarceration; the revocation of their right to vote; the reduced employment and education opportunities; the added barriers of the supervision offered by parole and probation; and also the reduced access to housing which increases the risk of homelessness for these individuals (Hall, Wooten, & Lundgren, 2016).

Hall, Wooten, and Lundgren (2016) also discussed the need to reduce the public stigma associated with incarceration, especially when previously

incarcerated individuals demonstrate a desire and motivation for change and self-improvement. Incarceration typically leads to the social stigma and labeling of this population as permanently deviant and maladaptive which is exacerbated by these marginalizing policies. By abolishing or significantly modifying current post-incarceration policies, public stigma can be reduced which can expand the opportunities and resources available to these individuals, increasing their chances for successful rehabilitation and reentry into society (Hall, Wooten, & Lundgren, 2016). Although some reform has occurred, such as the use of behavioral health risk assessments to screen for issues of substance abuse, physical health, or mental health as well as community service and other pre-release services, there is still necessary progress that has yet to be made (Hall, Wooten, & Lundgren, 2016). Through current post-incarceration policies, previously incarcerated individuals are marginalized, oppressed, and thoroughly disadvantaged, left to face public stigma and discrimination with very little social support or assistance extended to them. The punitive consequences that accompany being previously incarcerated puts them among the most oppressed and discriminated populations in need of assistance.

Successful Programs on Re-Entry

Although research is limited when it comes to social workers views, attitudes, and beliefs on previously incarcerated individuals, there is research that supports the use of faith-based methods with this population pre- and post-release leading to their successful rehabilitation and reentry (Armstrong, 2014;

Sumter, 2006). Armstrong (2014) conducted an ethnographic study with 48 incarcerated males who had completed an 18-month faith-based program pre-release while simultaneously in a faith-based partnership with a Christian volunteer mentor; participants were interviewed pre-release, within two weeks post-release, and again at an average of 7.5 months post-release (Armstrong, 2014). Through these interviews, Armstrong (2014) found that participants emphasized the power of trust and honesty in their relationships with their faith-based volunteer mentors during their reentry, supporting the idea that society's negative perceptions leads to a dehumanization and criminalization of these individuals based on their past behaviors and offenses which can negatively impact their rehabilitation and reentry. Through interviews that were conducted in selecting the Christian volunteer mentors, volunteers reported that in order to work with this population, they had to first be trained by the state, specifically by a prison officer and two chaplains, who explicitly counseled them not to trust the prisoners, how to be safe and attentive, how not to disclose any personal information, and to keep their relational distance with the population (Armstrong, 2014). However, it was found that the volunteers' grace, or 'the bestowal of gratuitous trust and acceptance', as well as their ability to relate and identify with the participants (i.e., regarding them as equals) resulted in a more trusting relationship as opposed to the content that volunteers received initially through the trainings offered by the state (Armstrong, 2014). This study indirectly shows that even the way in which people are trained to work with this population can be

dehumanizing, which can negatively impact this population's successful rehabilitation and reentry, ultimately crippling society in the fight to reduce recidivism by preserving and maintaining a stigmatizing perception towards this population.

Another example of faith-based intervention comes from an organization that was started in Los Angeles, California is Homeboy Industries. This program was developed to help former gang-members and previously incarcerated men and women redirect their lives and become interdependent members of society, focusing on transforming the pain that they have carried with them rather than transferring it in a negative way (Homeboy Industries, n.d.). Father Gregory Boyle saw the need for opportunity in his community when the gang population and violence began to increase, believing that investing in finding jobs and education for this population would lead to better outcomes as opposed to the route of suppression and incarceration (Homeboy Industries, n.d.). Homeboy Industries noticed that individuals leading gang-affiliated lives were missing hope and feeling trapped in a cycle of violence which resulted in the Homeboy focus on jobs and education (Homeboy Industries, n.d.). The model used by Homeboy Industries continues to have great success in assisting previously incarcerated individuals on reentry and has been adopted by 46 programs nationally and internationally (n.d.). Father Greg was an ordained Catholic priest who did not let the current stigma and perceptions of society deter him from finding a way to help these individuals achieve successful reentry (Homeboy Industries, n.d.).

Delancey Street Foundation (2007) is another form of rehabilitation founded by a self-identified ex-felon, John Maher, to provide a residential self-help organization for former substance users, ex-convicts, homeless individuals, and others in need. Delancey Street Foundation (2007) provides their residents with an academic education, training in three marketable skills, accountability and responsibility, dignity, decency, and integrity aiming at providing this population with the sufficient tools in becoming a successfully interdependent member of society. It is well-known that individuals with a criminal history have a difficult time in seeking vocational programs to assist them in their reentry, however research has been shown that employment improves previously incarcerated individuals' mental health, quality of life, and reduces recidivism by 50 percent (Hamilton, Schneider, Kane, & Jordan, 2015). Unlike the few organizations developed to help vulnerable populations like previously incarcerated individuals, Delancey Street Foundation (2007) decided to follow an extended family model for funding rather than the typical nonprofit route, investing their own finances, time, and energy to helping previously incarcerated individuals to rehabilitate.

Mental Health and Previously Incarcerated Individuals

Currently, very little research or literature exists on the involvement of social workers in assisting previously incarcerated individuals in their rehabilitation and reentry into society. However, it seems that previously incarcerated individuals with mental health diagnoses are more readily assisted

with rehabilitative services (Ellem & Wilson, 2010), which leads to the speculation as to whether or not there is a difference in the degree of acceptability that exists when aiding previously incarcerated individuals with an intellectual disability as opposed to the incarcerated population, in general. Ellem and Wilson (2010) identified and discussed barriers involved in assisting previously incarcerated individuals including their low social status which is maintained by current incarceration and post-incarceration policies and ultimately leads to the barriers of discrimination, social stigma, and the belief that this population is unworthy of reentry assistance. In addition to these barriers, reaching out to incarcerated individuals includes its own set of obstacles, such as the consequences of physical confinement and their integration of prison culture which sets them even further back when seeking rehabilitative assistance (Ellem & Wilson, 2010). Additionally, the researchers claimed that obtaining participants to implement the life story intervention with was a difficult and a lengthy process due to reluctance by the agencies to approach their clients with the “sensitive nature” that the research entails (Ellem & Wilson, 2010).

Ellem and Wilson (2010) implemented the life story intervention with 10 previously incarcerated individuals who demonstrated intellectual impairment obtained through disability agencies, mental health facilities, and boarding houses in Queensland, Australia. The life story intervention was designed to allow participants to take the lead in telling their life story and aiding them in separating their life events into chronological order aimed towards participants

ability to define themselves, their hopes, and their experiences during each event (Ellem & Wilson, 2010). The life story intervention was found to help participants reclaim their voice, develop an understanding of themselves and their relationships with others, make sense of important events in their lives, and ultimately identify where change is needed (Ellem & Wilson, 2010). As mentioned previously, these researchers were unable to gain access to their intended population of currently incarcerated individuals which led to the subsequent use of previously incarcerated individuals with intellectual disabilities. Therefore, the opportunity for currently incarcerated individuals to participate in the study in addition to the potential benefits that could've been received through the life story intervention were revoked from this intended population. Through Ellem and Wilson's (2010) struggle in gaining access to their intended population comes the assumption that even research attempting to help the rehabilitation and reentry of the general population of incarcerated individuals is not as easily granted, or accepted, as it would be for those of the population who have an intellectual disability.

Social Worker Involvement

Upon review of the existing literature, there was no research to be found on social workers views and attitudes regarding their willingness to work with the rehabilitation and reentry of previously incarcerated individuals back into society. In fact, very little research existed that studied social workers engagement with this population at all. However, research did surface that discussed the

admission of previously convicted felons into School of Social Work education programs. These studies discussed the ethical responsibilities that social work educators have in gatekeeping against those with felonies as well as the risk management that we must take into consideration to protect fellow social work students and their clients (Haski-Leventhal, Gelles, & Cnaan, 2010; Magen, Emerman, & Weaver, 2000).

Haski-Leventhal, Gelles, and Cnaan (2010) highlighted that in addition to standardized testing, grades, and recommendations, social work students are also required to put to the test their values, moral standards, and previous commitments to social justice during the admissions process, arguing that the School of Social Work should deny admissions to convicted felons. Although there are no universal standardized admissions processes, some universities don't ask applicants for information on past convictions or criminal backgrounds at all which can be regarded as negligent (Haski-Leventhal, Gelles, & Cnaan, 2010). Magen, Emerman, and Weaver (2000) agreed with these findings who referred back to the Code of Ethics which stated that recidivism research has shown a high risk for reoffending and that the School of Social Work's first priority should be the safety of the clients. However, Scott and Zeiger (2000) countered this argument, stating that by denying convicted felon applicants, social work educators would be contradicting their own values when they should believe in second chances and in people's ability to recover and change, arguing that admission should be on a case-by-case basis. The lack of research regarding

social workers views and attitudes on working with the previously incarcerated population is concerning considering that the only research found was related to how social work educators should bar the entry of this population into social work programs.

Theories Guiding Conceptualization

Bronfenbrenner's Ecological Systems Theory is driving this research project. This theory encapsulates the interaction of an individual and all their surrounding systems, providing a framework in studying the relationship between an individual's behavior within the contexts of their communities and the general society (Bronfenbrenner, 1979). Social work students are trained to identify and understand the interaction of all an individual's contexts. When it comes to previously incarcerated individuals, their interactions with the various systems within their lives affect not only themselves but others around them, such as their immediate family, extended family, their friends, their communities, society, and ultimately the world. Therefore, the training that social work students receive regarding how a variety of factors can contribute to an individual's behavior as well as the belief that all behavior is considered 'normal' in context, gives them the skills and abilities to recognize and understand previously incarcerated individuals, within their own contexts.

Another theory that drives this research includes Carl Rogers' Humanistic and Person-Centered Approach to understanding and connecting with clients.

This theory consists of the idea of unconditional positive regard, which is the basic acceptance and support of a person regardless of what the person says or does (Rogers & Koch, 1959). This closely resembles the genuine trust that contributes to the success of faith-based programs in working with previously incarcerated individuals. Carl Rogers' theory also emphasizes the client-therapist relationship and in using this relationship to foster genuine interactions, which is therapeutic in itself (Rogers & Koch, 1959).

In addition to these approaches, the strengths-based perspective also contributed to the development of this study since many social workers utilize this theory when working with their clients (Cohen, 1999). Focusing on the strengths of an individual rather than their limitations has been shown to be effective in empowering clients, which is ultimately what social workers aim to do. Equality and fairness are questioned regarding why previously incarcerated individuals would be ineligible to receive services and interactions that would empower them. Instead, post-incarceration policies and the stigma of society creates multiple levels of disadvantage, discrimination, marginalization, oppression, and the dehumanization that disenfranchises this population, fundamentally stripping this population of their basic human rights and degrading them to be considered as second-class citizens. Bronfenbrenner's Ecological Systems theory, Carl Rogers' unconditional positive regard, and person-centered approach, along with strengths-based interventions are designed to be all-inclusive among all populations, including previously incarcerated individuals. These theories are

also widely utilized in the social work field, begging the question as to why there is a lack of research on the use of these interventions and approaches by social workers with this population.

Summary

The lack of research on this topic leads us to look more closely at social work students' views on working with this vulnerable and marginalized population. Faith-based programs have found that having a non judgemental relationship containing elements of unconditional positive regard and acceptance of a previously incarcerated individual's past can be an effective intervention in transforming this population into becoming interdependent members of society (Armstrong, 2014; Sumter, 2006). Additionally, the NASW's Code of Ethics strongly suggest that previously incarcerated individuals fit the criteria of vulnerable and oppressed populations that require social work involvement and services (NASW, 2017). However, the discussion that currently exists in the literature regarding whether or not the School of Social Work's gatekeeping practices against previously incarcerated individuals contradicts their Code of Ethics is concerning (Haski-Leventhal, Gelles, & Cnaan, 2010; Magen, Emerman, & Weaver, 2000). This research study begins to explore where the social work field stands when it comes to working with this population, rather than resulting in assumptions based on their absence in the literature.

CHAPTER THREE

METHODS

Introduction

This section includes a detailed description of the research methods and procedures that will be employed in carrying out this study. Specifically, this section addresses the design of the study, sampling methods used, data collection and instruments, procedures, protection of human subjects, and methods for data analysis.

Study Design

In response to the lack of research on social workers' views, attitudes, or involvement in working with previously incarcerated individuals, this research study is a starting point in the exploration of whether a bias exists in social workers' willingness to work with this population. This research study surveyed social work students who are currently working towards a profession in social work. This study employed a quantitative survey design to analyze social work students' responses to identify any patterns in potential bias located among the sample of students. Data was collected through the use of a web-based survey created on Qualtrics which was provided to students in select classrooms.

The rationale for choosing a quantitative web-based survey design was due to the study's limited time frame, the low cost of data collection, and the ability to collect data from a large sample at once. Additionally, this design was

chosen to be able collect data that will aid as a starting point leading to further exploration on this topic, but also to allow for descriptive statistics on this topic. Through quantitative methods, this research study gathered quantifiable data and the ability of statistical analyses while also yielding the benefit of a larger potential sample size with the web-based survey approach. By collecting qualitative data through the use of open-ended follow-up questions, this study explored students' reasoning behind their ratings, allowing us to identify whether there was a pattern in potential bias located among students' responses.

Ultimately, it is the lack of research on social worker involvement in working with previously incarcerated individuals that led to the development of this research study, however a limitation of this study includes the fact that our participants are social work students and not necessarily practicing social workers. This study was designed to sample social work students due to the ease of availability and convenience sampling that this population offered. However, this research is not meant to be representative of, or generalized to, the population of social workers at large, but rather to sample from social work students who are currently working towards a profession in social work. A methodological limitation of this study includes the low response rate of web-based surveys. Another methodological limitation is the potential for student responses to be dishonest or biased, as social work students are held to the same ethical standards as professional social workers and students may have felt the need to respond according to these standards.

The lack of research on this topic led researchers to study social work students' views on working with this vulnerable and marginalized population. Additionally, the NASW's Code of Ethics strongly suggest that previously incarcerated individuals fit the criteria of vulnerable and oppressed populations that require social work involvement and services (NASW, 2017). However, the discussion that currently exists in the literature regarding whether or not the School of Social Work's gatekeeping practices against previously incarcerated individuals contradicts their Code of Ethics is concerning (Haski-Leventhal, Gelles, & Cnaan, 2010; Magen, Emerman, & Weaver, 2000). This research study acts as a starting point in the exploration of social work students' views and attitudes on their willingness to work with previously incarcerated individuals through surveying social work students' responses to identify any patterns in potential bias located among the sample of students.

Sampling

Participants for this study were recruited from select classrooms of social work students. This research study utilized convenience sampling to survey select classrooms of Master of Social Work (MSW) students and Bachelor of Social Work (BASW) students. Since both sets of students are learning social work curricula, including the National Association of Social Workers' (NASW) Code of Ethics, MSW and BASW students are developing a social work framework and lens which may influence their responses when surveying their

views and attitudes on working with previously incarcerated individuals. The sampling criterion for this study included age, ethnicity, gender, and student status.

The sample consisted of male and female MSW and BASW students of varying age and ethnicity. There is a total of 265 MSW and 105 BASW students who met the criteria for participation in this study, totaling up to a possible sample size of 370 participants. The survey link was provided to all MSW and BASW students via mass email through Andrew Copeland. Ultimately, the sample size consisted of 77 participants yielding a response rate of 20.8%.

Data Collection and Instruments

As previously mentioned, the survey link was provided to all MSW and BASW students via mass email through the School of Social Work. The data for this study will be collected using an anonymous web-based survey created through Qualtrics. The questionnaire was made up of several questions pertaining to the views of social work students on working with previously incarcerated individuals. Since no existing instruments surveying views and attitudes of the previously incarcerated population could be located, the questions used in this research study were modified from existing instruments measuring views and attitudes: The Index of Homophobia (IHP) and the Community Attitudes Toward Mentally Ill (CAMI) scale (Hudson & Ricketts, 1980; Taylor & Dear, 1981). For example, a question from the CAMI scale, "The

mentally ill don't deserve our sympathy" (Taylor & Dear, 1981), was modified to, "Previously incarcerated individuals don't deserve our sympathy". The survey contained four parts: Part I gathered demographic information including participant's age, gender, ethnicity, marital status, student status, number of children, and whether they are close to a person who has been previously incarcerated; Part II contained questions that have been modified from the Community Attitudes Towards Mentally Ill (CAMI) scale; Part III contained questions that have been modified from the Index of Homophobia (IHP); Part IV contained one open-ended question: "Do you see yourself working with this population in the future? Why or why not?" During Part II and Part III, participants were asked to record their responses on a Likert Scale ranging from Disagree, Somewhat Disagree, Neither Agree nor Disagree, Somewhat Agree, or Agree.

Procedures

To gain clearance in being able to conduct this research study, the student researchers obtained approval via email from the Director of Social Work for consent to use social work students as participants. Second, the student researchers drafted a research proposal that was submitted to the Institutional Review Board in December 2017 that asked for approval to conduct this research starting January 2018. This IRB Proposal described the nature of the study. Potential participants for this study include all MSW and BASW students, totaling 370. The informed consent, survey questionnaire, and debriefing

statement was presented to participants via survey link from January 2018 to April 2018.

Student researchers requested that a mass email be sent to all MSW and BSW students via the School of Social Work with the survey link provided and requested student participation. Consent to participate was obtained through the use of an informed consent page in which potential participants were instructed to mark an “X” inside a box to grant their willingness and voluntary participation in this study.

Protection of Human Subjects

The protection of rights and welfare of all participants was safeguarded by the research design chosen for this study and by the process and procedures in carrying out the study. First, the surveys were web-based and anonymous, the questionnaires were not numbered therefore participants were not identified. An informed consent was provided to participants explaining the research project and confidentiality measures. The informed consent also stressed voluntary participation, the right to withdraw participation at any time without penalty, the right to leave questions blank if participants felt they may reveal their identity, and that consent should be granted by signing with an “X” mark and not their name. Lastly, a debriefing statement was included on the last page after completion of the survey outlining a contact number to reach the faculty advisor that supervised the project, a statement of where and when the findings of the study will be

available, and a mental health referral in case participation in the study causes distress. The findings of the study were presented anonymously in aggregated data only and the surveys were destroyed at the conclusion of the research study around July 15, 2018. Data was collected through Qualtrics, a free online survey platform, and stored on a password-protected USB drive to be analyzed using SPSS. Upon completion of the study, the raw data was erased, and the USB drive was reformatted.

Data Analysis

The data gathered from this study utilized a quantitative data analysis to assess the social work students' views and attitudes in working with previously incarcerated individuals. Descriptive statistics were used to summarize participants' demographic information and ratings using measures of central tendency (e.g., mean) and measures of variability (e.g., standard deviation). Inferential statistics were used to determine if there was a significant relationship between demographic variables (gender, ethnicity, student status, marital status, or having a close relationship with someone who has been or is currently incarcerated), their views and attitudes, and in their level of comfortability to work with individuals based on their past convictions (e.g., t-test and chi-square). Inferential statistics were used to determine if there was significant relationship between student's age, number of children, their views and attitudes, and their

level of comfortability to work with individuals based on their past convictions (e.g., Pearson's r). All analysis was conducted using IBM SPSS 24.

Summary

The research method employed in this research study is a quantitative survey design through the use of a web-based survey created on Qualtrics. Participants for this study were recruited from one university and consisted of a total of 77 students of varying age and ethnicity as well as student status. The survey questionnaire was made up of three sections: a section that asked for demographic information, a section that asked for rating responses on a Likert scale, and a section with an open-ended question that pertained to the students views and attitudes towards working with previously incarcerated individuals. Both descriptive and inferential statistics was used to analyze the data to be collected. The open-ended question was analyzed using qualitative method of thematical analysis.

CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS

Introduction

Chapter four summarizes the demographic characteristics of the study sample, how that data was analyzed, and significant findings of the analysis. This chapter consists of quantitative and qualitative results and analyses.

Presentation of the Findings

Descriptive Statistics

Table 1 presents the demographic characteristics of the study sample. Participant ages ranged from 21 to 56 with an average age of 27. A large proportion of study participants were women (80.51%). The sample was approximately 7.79% African American, 48.05% Hispanic/Latino/a, 1.29% Asian/Pacific Islander, 23.37% Caucasian, 1.29% Native American, and 10.38% Other. Of the sample, 50.64% were Never Married, 25.96% were Married, 7.79% were Divorced/Widowed, and 7.79% were Cohabiting. The sample consisted of 79.22% MSW students and 12.89% BASW students. Of this sample, 31.16% were parents and 61.03% were non-parents.

Table 1. Demographic Characteristics of Study Sample

	N	%	M
Age			27
Gender			
Male	9	11.66%	
Female	22	80.51%	
Missing	6	7.79%	
Ethnicity			
African American	6	7.79%	
Hispanic/Latino/a	37	48.05%	
Asian/ Pacific Islander	1	1.29%	
Caucasian	18	23.37%	
Native American	1	1.29%	
Other	8	10.38%	
Missing	6	7.79%	
Marital Status			
Never Married	39	50.64%	
Married	20	25.97%	
Divorced/Widowed	6	7.79%	
Cohabiting	6	7.79%	
Missing	6	7.79%	
Student Status			
MSW	61	79.22%	
BASW	10	12.89%	
Missing	6	7.79%	
Parent Status			
Parent	24	31.16%	
Non-parent	47	61.03%	
Missing	6	7.79%	

Inferential Analysis

A series of 38 independent sample t-tests for differences in means were conducted to examine the relationship between social work students' views and attitudes towards previously incarcerated individuals and having a close

relationship with an individual of this population. Findings indicated that participants who reported having a close relationship with someone who was or is currently incarcerated did not differ in their responses assessing views and attitudes towards this population when compared to participants who reported that they did not have a close relationship with a previously incarcerated individual. Therefore, the impact of knowing someone who was or is previously incarcerated did not yield a p value of $< .05$, however, the following findings approached significance and are worth noting.

Although these findings did not yield a p value of $< .05$, participants who reported having a close relationship with a previously incarcerated individual differed slightly from participants who did not have a close relationship on the belief that, "I would feel comfortable working with a client who had been convicted of murder" ($p=0.09$). Inspection of the two group means indicates that the average for participants who reported not having a close relationship ($M=2.71$) is slightly greater than those who reported having a close relationship with a previously incarcerated individual ($M=2.24$). Therefore, participants who reported having a close relationship with a previously incarcerated individual were more likely to agree with the statement of feeling comfortable working with clients who have been convicted of murder more so than participants who reported not having a close relationship.

The second finding that approached significance was that participants who reported having a close relationship differed slightly from participants who did not

have a close relationship on the belief that, “Someone would be foolish to marry an individual who has been previously incarcerated, even if they seem fully rehabilitated” ($p=0.09$). Inspection of the two group means indicates that the average for participants who reported not having a close relationship ($M=4.45$) is less than participants who reported having a close relationship with a previously incarcerated individual ($M=4.76$). Therefore, participants who reported having a close relationship with a previously incarcerated individual were more likely to disagree with the statement that someone would be foolish to marry a previously incarcerated individual more so than participants who reported not having a close relationship.

The last finding that approached significance was that participants who reported having a close relationship differed slightly from participants who did not have a close relationship on the belief that, “I would not want to live next door to someone who has been previously incarcerated” ($p=0.08$). Inspection of the two group means indicates that the average for participants who reported not having a close relationship ($M=3.79$) is less than participants who reported having a close relationship with a previously incarcerated individual ($M=4.26$). Therefore, participants who reported having a close relationship with a previously incarcerated individual were more likely to disagree with the statement that they would not want to live next door to an individual of this population more so than participants who reported not having a close relationship.

Table 2 shows that parents were different from non-parents on the belief that “Less emphasis should be placed on protecting the public from incarcerated individuals” ($p=.022$), which was statistically significant. Inspection of the two group means indicates that the average for parents ($M=3.30$) is greater than non-parents ($M=2.61$). Therefore, parent participants were more likely to disagree with the statement that less emphasis should be placed on protecting the public from incarcerated individuals than non-parent participants.

Table 2. Comparison of Parent Status and the Belief that “Less Emphasis Should be Placed on Protecting the Public from Incarcerated Individuals”

Variable	M	SD	t	df	p
Parent Status			-2.35	67	.02
Parent	3.30	1.26			
Non-Parent	2.61	1.11			

Table 3 shows that parents were different from non-parents on the belief that virtually anyone can become incarcerated ($p=.048$), which was statistically significant. Inspection of the two group means indicates that the average for parents ($M=2.35$) is greater than non-parents ($M=1.76$). Therefore, parent participants were more likely to disagree with the statement that virtually anyone can become incarcerated more so than non-parent participants.

Table 3. Comparison of Parent Status and the Belief that “Virtually Anyone Can Become Incarcerated”

Variable	M	SD	t	df	p
Parent Status			-2.01	67	.048
Parent	2.35	1.58			
Non-Parent	1.76	.85			

Table 4 shows that parents were different from non-parents on the belief that “I would feel a little nervous if I was asked to facilitate a group consisting of previously incarcerated individuals” ($p=.048$), which was statistically significant. Inspection of the two group means indicates that the average for parents ($M=4.26$) is greater than non-parents ($M=3.40$). Therefore, parent participants were more likely to disagree with the statement that they would feel nervous when facilitating a group consisting of previously incarcerated individuals more so than non-parent participants.

Table 4. Comparison of Parent Status and the Belief that “I Would Feel a Little Nervous if I was Asked to Facilitate a Group Consisting of Previously Incarcerated Individuals”

Variable	M	SD	t	df	p
Parent Status			-2.61	63	.01
Parent	4.26	1.18			
Non-Parent	3.40	1.31			

Table 5 shows that parents were different from non-parents on the belief that “I would feel a little nervous if I was asked to facilitate a group consisting of previously incarcerated individuals” ($p=.03$), which was statistically significant. Inspection of the two group means indicates that the average for parents ($M=1.52$) is lesser than non-parents ($M=2.24$). Therefore, parent participants were more likely to agree with the statement that they would feel comfortable working with a client who has been convicted of manslaughter more so than non-parent participants.

Table 5. Comparison of Parent Status and the Belief that “I Would Feel Comfortable Working with a Client Who Has Been Convicted of Manslaughter (i.e., Involuntary Killing by Car Accident or Moments of Insanity)”

Variable	M	SD	t	df	p
Parent Status			2.17	63	.03
Parent	1.52	1.12			
Non-Parent	2.24	1.34			

Qualitative Analysis

One open-ended item was collected from 77 respondents where participants were asked, “Do you see yourself working with this population in the future? Why or why not?” Table 6 displays participant’s responses on the first part of this question. The second part of this question was analyzed thematically. The main themes that emerged were dignity and worth of previously incarcerated individuals, the intersectionality of this population with social work, and

competence. Table 6 shows that, of this sample, 53.25% of participants responded that they are interested in working with this population in the future, 16.88% responded that they might be interested, and only 9.09% of participants responded that they were not interested in working with this population in the future.

Table 6. Participant’s Responses to “Do You See Yourself Working with this Population in the Future?”

Participant Response	N	%
Yes	41	53.25%
No	7	9.09%
Maybe	13	16.88%
Did not Answer	1	1.30%
Missing	15	19.48%

Dignity and Worth of Persons. The most common theme to emerge among participant’s responses is the value of dignity and worth of persons. The National Association of Social Work enforces that, “Social workers respect the inherent dignity and worth of the person” as important ethical values (NASW, 2017). This ethical value is reflected in the data collected in which social work students mention that previously incarcerated individuals deserve to be treated with dignity and respect regardless of their past crimes or convictions. Study participants further elaborated on the various forms of adopting this ethical value regardless of their incarceration history. This theme is embodied in the following quotes

which illustrates that social work student participants align themselves with this ethical value as set forth by the NASW:

Yes, because I believe in the rehabilitation theory. Everyone ones a second, third, fourth and more opportunities.

I would like to work with this population because once labeled a criminal, these individual's get denied many of their rights. I believe it is possible to rehabilitate these individuals. They are still human by the end of the day and depending on the crime, it should not restrict them from living a normal life. The system is unfair to these individuals and does not help in their recovery. I want to be able to provide support to these individual's and help change the system or offer them resources that will help better their chances to reintegrate into society.

Yes. I believe we should all be treated with an unconditional positive regard. Everyone deserves treatment, whether it be mental, medical or any other form. Not everyone has the capacity to be resilient, but everyone deserves help to become the best person they can be.

Intersectionality in Social Work. A second common theme that emerged was the intersectionality of this population that will inevitably occur when working within the field of social work. The NASW endorses a second ethical value which

states that a social worker's goal should be to help individuals in need and address social problems (NASW, 2017). Participant responses aligned with this service value as illustrated in their discussions regarding the field of social work as one that involves a variety of intersecting populations that are in need of services. This theme is embodied in the following quotes supporting social work student participants as being accepting of providing services to this population at some point in their careers:

Yes. Every area of social work eventually intersects. This population is also vulnerable and in need of services.

I do. My intention is not to purposely seek employment working with previously incarcerated people however I understand that in the field of social work I will come across many individuals who have been previously incarcerated.

Yes because of the kind of field we are in.

Competence. The third and final theme that emerged was participants' desires to enhance their skills through training and experience in order to prepare them to work with previously incarcerated individuals in the future. The NASW emphasizes the importance of social workers practicing within their area and scope of competence and striving to further develop their professional expertise

(NASW, 2017). Participant's responses exemplified this ethical value of competence in discussing their desire to expand their skills in order to be prepared to work with previously incarcerated individuals in the future. This theme is embodied in the following quotes demonstrating that social work student participants align with this NASW ethical value in practicing within their scope and striving to develop their professional expertise:

If given the opportunity to work with this population in the future, I would take the opportunity. The skill set developed by working with this population can only be learned and polished by continuing to work with them in the corresponding setting.

I do once I am more experienced in the field and have practiced skills.

My current lack of experience does not make me feel confident to work with this population right now. Once I gain professional experience I don't think that I would mind working with nonviolent offenders.

CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION

Introduction

Chapter five discusses this study's findings regarding views and attitudes of social work students towards working with previously incarcerated individuals in addition to the limitations of this research study. This chapter will conclude with recommendations and implications for future research, as well as final thoughts and recommendations regarding ways to increase social workers' involvement with previously incarcerated individuals.

Discussion

Due to the lack of literature on social worker involvement with the rehabilitation of previously incarcerated individuals, this study was designed to explore social work student's views and attitudes towards working with this population in the future. It was determined through qualitative analysis that 70% of participants reported that they are either interested and plan to work with this population in the future (53.25%) or are open to the possibility of doing so (16.88%). These findings indicate that social work students do demonstrate a willingness to work with this population, however this finding does not aid in identifying the barriers that may prevent social worker involvement in the rehabilitation of these individuals. Although these findings were not significant,

participants who reported having a close relationship to a previously incarcerated individual approached significance on certain views and attitudes when compared to participants who reported not having a close relationship with an individual of this population. However, significant results were found when comparing responses of parent participants to non-parent participants on four particular views and attitudes. Through qualitative analysis, it was indicated that having children can impact a social work student's views and attitudes towards previously incarcerated individuals.

Quantitative Findings

Kuczynski, Pitman, Ta-Young, and Harach (2016) discuss the transactional model of human development which suggests that parents and their children engage in a bidirectional relationship of growth and development in which they influence each other towards change over time. It is argued that even the presence of children has a pervasive impact on the lives of parents in which children influence parents' decisions regarding employment, finances, daily activities, and life plans (Ambert, 2001). As parents are faced with parent-specific challenges, they are provided with opportunities for self-reflection and growth that non-parents do not experience. Therefore, the fact that this study found significant differences between these two demographics on certain views and attitudes towards previously incarcerated individuals is no surprise.

First, parent participants were more likely to disagree with the statement that less emphasis should be placed on protecting the public from incarcerated

individuals than non-parent participants which demonstrates a more negative view towards this population. As discussed by parents have their children to consider, it makes sense that parents would demonstrate a heightened awareness when making decisions that protect their children when compared with non-parents who do not have children to consider when making such decisions. Therefore, in disagreeing with the statement that less emphasis should be placed on protecting the public, parent participants' responses on this item may reflect their desire to provide a safe environment for their children as taking precedent over the rehabilitative needs of previously incarcerated individuals. This finding is supported by the assumptions of the transactional model of parent-child development as parents are taking their children into consideration, perhaps at a subconscious level, while answering questions regarding previously incarcerated individuals (Ambert, 2001; Dillon, 2002; Kuczynski, Pitman, Ta-Young, & Harach, 2016).

Parent participants were also more likely to disagree with the statement that 'virtually anyone can become incarcerated' than non-parent participants which demonstrates a more negative view towards this population. This finding indicates that parent participants are less likely to believe that virtually anyone can become incarcerated. Perhaps parents are more cautious than non-parents to agree with this statement due to the consideration that their children are included in 'virtually anyone' leading them to disagree with this notion. This finding supports existing research that demonstrates that parents experience

shifts in perspective of themselves, their child, and others as well as in the way that they perceive situations even remotely involving their child (Ambert, 2001; Luvmour, 2011).

Parent participants were more likely to disagree with the statement that they would feel nervous when facilitating a group consisting of previously incarcerated individuals more so than non-parent participants which demonstrates a more positive view towards this population. This indicates that parents are more likely to feel comfortable facilitating a group consisting of previously incarcerated individuals than non-parents. Similarly, parent participants were more likely to agree with the statement that they would feel comfortable working with a client who has been convicted of manslaughter more so than non-parent participants which demonstrates a more positive view towards this population. Perhaps parent participants are more forgiving than non-parent participants in working with individuals who have been convicted of manslaughter (e.g., unintentional killing). These findings are consistent with existing research that supports the transactional model of parent-child development in which children promote their parent's growth and well-being including, but not limited to, their open-mindedness, empathy, and acceptance as well as their ability to have a greater connection with themselves and others (Kuczynski, Pitman, Ta-Young, & Harach, 2016; Luvmour, 2011). Further research can explore the transactional model specifically looking at the influence

that children have on the development of their parents regarding their involvement in the rehabilitation of these individuals.

Qualitative Findings

The ethical values of a social worker include: service, social justice, dignity of worth and person, importance of human relationships, integrity, and competence (NASW, 2017). When providing responses to the open-ended question, participants responded in an overwhelmingly positive manner towards this population which contributed to the following themes: dignity and worth of previously incarcerated individuals, intersectionality of this population with social work, and competence. These themes directly relate to the NASW Code of Ethics and values that social work students are taught during their social work education to be implemented in their professional social work practice.

Dignity and Worth of Persons. The NASW's (2017) code of ethics states that social workers should treat individuals in a caring and respectful manner, while being mindful of their individual differences. The majority of participant responses demonstrated support in the belief that previously incarcerated individuals deserve to be treated with the same dignity and respect afforded to other members of society. Many participants mentioned that previously incarcerated individuals are often seen as not worthy of rehabilitative services due to their criminal history, supporting the belief that society creates unnecessary barriers aimed at preventing this population from receiving services. The NASW (2017) also states that social workers resolve conflicts between

client's interests and society's interests in a responsible manner. Participants mentioned that society's focus is on protecting other members and punishing previously incarcerated individuals rather than providing effective services that can prevent recidivism and benefit society at large. Therefore, social workers have an obligation to mediate this conflict in order to meet the rehabilitative needs of this population as well as the needs of society. Ultimately, participant's responses reflected the NASW ethical value of treating all persons with dignity and worth, regardless of their past convictions.

Intersectionality in Social Work. The NASW Code of Ethics states that a social worker's primary goal should be to help people in need in addressing social problems (NASW, 2017). In addressing social problems, social workers agree to elevate the needs of others through service provided to diverse populations in a variety of settings. Participants supported their adherence to this ethical value as they mentioned that they expect to come across previously incarcerated individuals regardless of the agency or population that they work with in the future (e.g., children and families, mental health, substance use, criminal justice, etc.). In their responses, participants demonstrate their recognition of incarceration as a pervasive social problem occurring with the most vulnerable populations in need of services. Most participants mentioned that they are sure that they will encounter this population at some point in their careers as social workers.

Competence. The NASW Code of Ethics also states that social workers should practice in their areas of competence and continually strive to increase their professional knowledge (NASW, 2017). The last common theme to emerge was the need and desire of participants to develop their skills through training, exposure, and experience, stressing competence as an important area to take into consideration when working with previously incarcerated individuals. Many participants expressed their concerns in the skills and preparation necessary to work with this population, stating that they would prefer a couple years of experience before feeling comfortable enough to provide services to this population. Participants demonstrated self-reflection and awareness in their responses when discussing their capabilities and scope of practice which suggests that they adhere to the NASW ethical value of competence. Working within one's scope of competence provides individuals or clients with the best services and does not put them at risk for additional harm.

Study Limitations

One of the main limitations of this research study was that it was only able to access social work students to survey within one university which is not representative of all social work students. Therefore, this study is unable to make valid generalizations of the views and attitudes that may be held by the broader population of professional social workers. Additionally, as social work students are training to become professional social workers and have knowledge of the

values and ethics that social workers should act in accordance with, this could have hindered participants from giving their honest responses, leading them to answer how they think a social worker should answer. Lastly, if the sample size was larger than perhaps there would have been more power and more significant findings to report, especially regarding whether or not the views and attitudes of participants who have a close relationship with a previously incarcerated individual differed from those who do not have a close relationship as these findings neared significance.

Recommendations for Social Work Practice, Policy, and Research

As the majority of participants reported their willingness to work with previously incarcerated individuals, future research should continue to explore barriers that may prevent social workers from actually becoming involved in the rehabilitation of this population. Furthermore, this research has identified that social work students who have children differed from those who do not. Future research should explore the ways in which becoming a parent can influence their ability to provide services to the most vulnerable populations as a social worker. Further research can generate information that can be incorporated in developing trainings to provide further knowledge and education to social work parents (and non-parents) to promote more positive views towards this population. Social work students also indicated that training, exposure, and experience is necessary in making them feel comfortable in development the skill set necessary to work with

previously incarcerated individuals. Ultimately, this research study illustrates the importance of providing education and training to social work students who are interested in becoming involved with this population.

Conclusion

In conclusion, this study reveals that most social work students recognize previously incarcerated individuals as a vulnerable and marginalized population that is deserving of services and expect to work with this population in the future. Additionally, this study identified that having children may impact social work student's views and attitudes towards working with previously incarcerated individuals. Moreover, the common themes identified in this study reflected social work students' adherence to professional social work values and ethics as set forth by the NASW. Although this study only included surveyed social work students and it is not a representation of all social workers, this project contributed to an understudied area of research and can assist in guiding future research. Conclusively, this study highlights the need of social work students to be provided with the tools necessary in making them feel equipped to work with the rehabilitation of previously incarcerated individuals.

APPENDIX A
INFORMED CONSENT FORM

INFORMED CONSENT

The study in which you are asked to participate is designed to survey social work students' views and attitudes towards working with previously incarcerated individuals. The study is being conducted by Brianda Villa and Tiffany Comptois, two MSW students under the supervision of Dr. Erica Lizano, assistant professor in the School of Social Work, California State University, San Bernardino. The study has been approved by the Institutional Review Board Social Work Sub-Committee, California State University, San Bernardino.

PURPOSE: The purpose of the study is to survey social work students' views and attitudes on working with previously incarcerated individuals.

DESCRIPTION: Participants will be asked to rate their agreeableness to a variety of statements assessing their views and attitudes towards previously incarcerated individuals, their willingness to work with this population, and some demographic questions.

PARTICIPATION: Your participation in the study is totally voluntary. You can refuse to participate in the study or discontinue your participation at any time without any consequences.

CONFIDENTIALITY OR ANONYMITY: Your responses will remain anonymous and data will be reported in group form only.

DURATION: It will take 10 to 15 minutes to complete the survey.

RISKS: There are no foreseeable risks to the participants.

BENEFITS: There are not any direct benefits to the participants, other than candy to be received upon completion of the survey during student researcher's classroom visits.

CONTACT: If you have any questions about this study, please feel free to contact Dr. Erica Lizano at 909-537- 5584 (email: elizano@csusb.edu).

RESULTS: Results of the study can be obtained from the Pfau Library ScholarWorks (<http://scholarworks.lib.csusb.edu>) at California State University, San Bernardino after December 2018.

This is to certify that I read the above and I am 18 years or older.

Place an X mark here

Date

APPENDIX B
DEBRIEFING STATEMENT

Debriefing Statement for study of Social Work Students' Views and Attitudes
Towards Working with Previously Incarcerated Individuals

The study that you have just completed was designed to investigate social work students' views and attitudes on working with previously incarcerated individuals. We are interested in surveying student's personal views and attitudes towards previously incarcerated individuals as well as how willing social work students are in working with this population in the future, in order to determine if there is a pattern of bias that exists among participant's responses.

This is to inform you that no deception is involved in this study.

Thank you for your participation. If you have any questions about the study, please feel free to contact Dr. Erica Lizano at 909-537-5584. If you would like to obtain a copy of the group results of this study, please contact the Pfau Library ScholarWorks database (<http://scholarworks.lib.csusb.edu/>) at California State University, San Bernardino after December 2018.

APPENDIX C
APPROVAL LETTER

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, SAN BERNARDINO
SCHOOL OF SOCIAL WORK
Institutional Review Board Sub-Committee

Researcher(s) Brianda Villa & Tiffany Comptois
Proposal Title Social Work Students' Views and Attitudes
on Working with Previously Incarcerated Individuals
SW1808

Your proposal has been reviewed by the School of Social Work Sub-Committee of the Institutional Review Board. The decisions and advice of those faculty are given below.

Proposal is:

- approved
 to be resubmitted with revisions listed below
 to be forwarded to the campus IRB for review

Revisions that must be made before proposal can be approved:

- faculty signature missing
 missing informed consent debriefing statement
 revisions needed in informed consent debriefing
 data collection instruments missing
 agency approval letter missing
 CITI missing
 revisions in design needed (specified below)

James Ch...
Committee Chair Signature

1/17/2018
Date

Distribution: White-Coordinator; Yellow-Supervisor; Pink-Student

APPENDIX D
INSTRUMENT

Social Work Students' Views and Attitudes on Working with Previously Incarcerated Individuals

Part 1:

Please answer the following demographic questions.

1. What is your age? _____
2. What is your gender? - male, female, other
3. What is your ethnicity? - African American, Hispanic/Latino, Asian/Pacific Islander, Caucasian, Native American, Other
4. What is your marital status - Never Married, Married, Divorced/Widowed, Cohabiting
5. What is your student status? - BASW or MSW
6. How many children do you have? (put 0 if none)
7. Are you close to someone who was previously or currently incarcerated?

Part 2:

Please read the following and select whether you Agree, Somewhat Agree, Neither Agree nor Disagree, Somewhat Disagree, or Disagree with each statement.

1. One of the main causes of incarceration is lack of self-discipline and willpower.
2. The best way to handle incarcerated individuals is to keep them behind locked doors.
3. As soon as a person shows signs of criminal behavior, they should be incarcerated.
4. Incarcerated individuals need the same kind of control and discipline as a young child.
5. Previously incarcerated individuals should not be treated as outcasts of society.
6. Less emphasis should be placed on protecting the public from incarcerated individuals.
7. The prison system is an outdated means of dealing with criminals.
8. Virtually anyone can become incarcerated.
9. Previously incarcerated individuals have for too long been the subject of ridicule.
10. More tax money should be spent on the re-entry of incarcerated individuals into society.

Part 2.2

11. We need to adopt a far more tolerant attitude toward previously incarcerated individuals in our society.
12. We have the responsibility to provide the best possible rehabilitative care for previously incarcerated individuals.

13. Previously incarcerated people don't deserve our sympathy.
14. Previously incarcerated people are a burden on society.
15. Increased spending on rehabilitative services are a waste of tax dollars.
16. There are sufficient existing services for the rehabilitation of previously incarcerated individuals.
17. The previously incarcerated should not be given any responsibility.
18. The previously incarcerated should be isolated from the rest of the community.
19. Someone would be foolish to marry an individual who has been previously incarcerated, even if he seems fully rehabilitated.
20. I would not want to live next door to someone who has been previously incarcerated.

Part 2.3

21. Previously incarcerated individuals should not be denied their individual rights.
22. Previously incarcerated individuals should be encouraged to assume the responsibilities of normal life.
23. Some previously incarcerated individuals are less of a danger than most people think.
24. Someone who was once previously incarcerated can be trusted as a babysitter.
25. The best rehabilitation for many previously incarcerated individuals is to be part of a normal community.
26. Rehabilitation services should be provided to all previously incarcerated individuals.
27. Residents have nothing to fear from people coming into their neighborhood to obtain rehabilitative services.
28. Rehabilitative facilities should be kept out of residential neighborhoods.
29. Having previously incarcerated individuals living within residential neighborhoods might be good therapy but the risks to residents are too great.
30. It is frightening to think of previously incarcerated individuals living in residential neighborhoods.

Part 3:

Please think about your role as a social worker when answering the following questions and select whether you Agree, Somewhat Agree, Neither Agree nor Disagree, Somewhat Disagree, or Disagree with each statement.

1. I would feel comfortable working with a client who has been previously incarcerated.
2. I would feel unsafe if I learned that my client had been incarcerated previously.

3. I would feel a little nervous if I was asked to facilitate a group consisting of previously incarcerated people.
4. I would feel comfortable working with a client who had been convicted of murder (i.e., premeditated killing with intent and plan).
5. I would feel comfortable working with a client who had been convicted of rape.
6. I would feel comfortable working with a client who had been convicted of pedophilia.
7. I would feel comfortable working with a client who had been convicted of drug-related offenses.
8. I would feel comfortable working with a client who had been convicted of manslaughter (i.e., involuntary killing by car accident or moments of insanity.)

Part 4:

Do you see yourself working with this population in the future? Why or why not?

(Instrument created by Brianda Anahi Villa and Tiffany Marina Comptois.)

REFERENCES

- Ambert, A. M. (2001). *The effect of children on parents*. New York: The Haworth Press.
- Armstrong, R. (2014). Trusting the untrustworthy: The theology, practice and implications of faith-based volunteers' work with ex-prisoners. *Studies in Christian Ethics*, 27(3) 299–317. doi:10.1177/0953946814530227
- Bronfenbrenner, U. (1979). *Ecology of human development: Experiments by nature and design*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Cohen, B. (1999). Intervention and supervision in strengths-based social work practice. *Families in Society*, 80(5), 460-466.
- Delancey Street Foundation. (2007). Our Story. Retrieved from <http://www.delanceystreetfoundation.org/ourstory.php>
- Dillon, J. J. (2002). The role of the child in adult development. *Journal of Adult Development*, 9, 267–275.
- Ellem, K. A., & Wilson, J. (2010). Life story work and social work practice: A case study with ex-prisoners labelled as having an intellectual disability. *Australian Social Work*, 63(1), 67-82. doi:10.1080/03124070903464285
- Federal Bureau of Prisons. (2017). Retrieved from <https://www.bop.gov/about/statistics/>
- Hall, T., Wooten, N., & Lundgren, L. (2016). Postincarceration policies and prisoner reentry: Implications for policies and programs aimed at reducing

recidivism and poverty. *Journal of Poverty*, 20(1), 56-72.

doi:10.1080/10875549.2015.1094761

Hamilton, I. S., Schneider, J., Kane, E., & Jordan, M. (2015). Employment of ex-prisoners with mental health problems, a realistic evaluation protocol.

BMC Psychiatry, 15(1), 1-8. doi:10.1186/s12888-015-0553-3

Haski-Leventhal, D., Gelles, R., Cnaan, R. (2010). Admitting convicted felons to social work programs: Conceptual dilemmas and practices. *International*

Social Work 53(1), 87–100. doi: 10.1177/0020872809348949

Homeboy Industries. (n.d.). *Why we do it*. Retrieved from

<http://www.homeboyindustries.org/why-we-do-it/>

Hudson W. & Ricketts W. A strategy for the measurement of homophobia.

Journal Of Homosexuality [serial online]. Sum 1980 1980;5(4):357-372.

Available from: PsycINFO, Ipswich, MA. Accessed November 19, 2017

Kuczynski, L., Pitman, R., Ta-Young, L., & Harach, L. (2016). Children's influence on their parent's adult development: Mothers' and fathers' receptivity to children's requests for change. *Journal Of Adult*

Development, 23(4), 193-203. doi:10.1007/s10804-016-9235-8

Luvmour, J. (2011). Developing together: Parents meeting children's developmental imperatives. *Journal of Adult Development*, 18, 164–171.

Magen, R. H., Emerman, J., & Weaver, H. N. (2000). Should convicted felons be denied admission to a social work education program? Yes!. *Journal Of*

Social Work Education, 36(3), 401-408.

National Association of Social Workers. (2017). *Code of Ethics*. Retrieved June 6, 2017 from <http://www.naswdc.org/pubs/code/code.asp>

Rogers, C. R., & Koch, S. (1959). *A theory of therapy, personality, and interpersonal relationships, as developed in the client-centered framework*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Scott, N. & S. Zeiger. (2000). Should convicted felons be denied admission to a social work education program? No!. *Journal of Social Work Education* 36(3), 409–413.

Sumter, M. (2006). Faith-based prison programs. *Criminology & Public Policy*, 53, 523–528. doi:10.1111/j.1745-9133.2006.00399.x

Taylor, S. M., & Dear, M. J. (1981). Scaling community attitudes toward the mentally ill. *Schizophrenia Bulletin*, 7(2), 225-240.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/schbul/7.2.225>

ASSIGNED RESPONSIBILITIES

This was a two-person project where authors collaborated throughout. However, for each phase of the project, certain authors took primary responsibility. These responsibilities were assigned in the manner listed below.

1. Data Collection

Assigned Leader: Brianda Anahi Villa

Assisted by: Tiffany Marina Comptois

2. Data Entry and Analysis

Assigned Leader: Tiffany Marina Comptois

Assisted by: Brianda Anahi Villa

3. Writing Report and Presentation Findings

a. Introduction and Literature

Assigned Leader: Brianda Anahi Villa

Assisted by: Tiffany Marina Comptois

b. Methods

Joint Effort: Tiffany Marina Comptois and Brianda
Anahi Villa

c. Results

Assigned Leader: Tiffany Marina Comptois

Assisted by: Brianda Anahi Villa

d. Discussion

Joint Effort: Tiffany Marina Comptois and Brianda
Anahi Villa