

Training correctional staff in the management of sexual offenders:
Increasing knowledge and positive attitudes

Jayson Ware
Jennifer Galouzis
Rachel Hart
&
Ruth Allen

Corrective Services New South Wales, Australia

Correspondence to:

Jayson Ware

Executive Director

Offender Services & Programmes

Corrective Services NSW

Level 7, 20 Lee Street, Sydney, NSW 2000, Australia.

E-mail: jayson.ware@dcs.nsw.gov.au

ABSTRACT

Treatment will always rely, to some extent, on the *positive support* of non-therapy staff. Attitudes towards sex offenders, however, are usually negative. The aim of this study was to examine different correctional staff attitudes towards sex offenders and evaluate the impact of a two-day training program delivered to correctional staff in Corrective Services New South Wales. This study found that correctional staff attitudes towards sex offenders were significantly improved after training. This is in direct contrast to the similar studies published in the area of staff training that did not find any impact on attitudes towards sex offenders. Participants were more likely to believe that a sex offender could be rehabilitated after this staff training. Training also appeared to decrease the endorsement of myths about sex offenders held by correctional staff. Further research is planned that will involve the re-testing of these staff some time later to see whether the changes in attitudes were maintained over an extended period of time.

INTRODUCTION

Recent years have seen a significant increase in our knowledge of sexual dynamics, treatment, and risk assessment of sexual offending. This has coincided with increased public awareness of the prevalence of sexual offending and its impact on victims (Koss, 1993). Not surprisingly this has led to an increased use of prison sentences and longer terms in prison for sexual offenders. Notwithstanding this, we now know that contrary to public opinion, sexual offenders appear to re-offend at comparatively low rates particularly when compared to violent or theft offenders (Losel & Schmucker, 2005). There is also a general consensus as to how to assess offenders' risk of sexual recidivism with at least moderate accuracy (see Hanson & Morton-Bourgon, 2004).

A lot more is also now known about the effective management of sexual offenders. Large scale meta-analyses have reliably demonstrated a moderate positive effect of psychological treatment – that is, it appears to reduce sexual recidivism (e.g., Hanson et al., 2002; Losel & Schmucker, 2005). There is also a general consensus as to what should be addressed within sexual offender treatment programs and how to target these factors most effectively (see Marshall, Marshall, Serran, & O'Brien, 2011).

Ware (2011) has argued, however, that more research attention needs to be focused on contextual issues that might have a significant impact on sexual offender treatment effectiveness. As an example of this, research has started to establish the importance of staff involvement in treatment, particularly therapists and their interactions with offenders. Whereas previous research tended to focus solely on the evaluation of the content of treatment programs, evidence now exists that demonstrates that particular characteristics of therapists and the quality of the therapeutic relationship contribute significantly to the effectiveness of sex offender treatment (Marshall, et al., 2003).

What has not received significant research attention is the importance of non-therapy correctional staff and their role in the effective treatment of sexual offenders. Treatment will always rely, to some extent, on the *positive support* of non-therapy staff irrespective of whether or not the treatment takes place in a prison or residential facility or in the community. Non-therapy staff can encourage, motivate, support, and provide opportunities for offenders to practice and rehearse the skills learnt within treatment.

Taking a prison context as an example, where the role of the prison officer is most normally one of security, there are a number of ways in which the prison officer can assist in the treatment of a sexual offender. They may have a direct role with sex offenders when treatment takes place within a specialised unit using therapeutic community principles (Ware, Frost, & Hoy, 2010) or they may be involved as a co-facilitator of therapy groups (Mann & Thornton, 1998). Blanchard (1998) also suggested that the stereotypes held by prison officers are likely to negatively impact on how a sexual offender will respond to prison environments. Or, more indirectly, prison officers can offer support and encouragement to assist a sex offender to volunteer for, or persist within, a treatment program (Sanghara & Wilson, 2006). This is particularly important when sex offenders may have heard negative things about the treatment (such as “it does not work” or “they make you confess to things you didn’t do”) or do not want to be identified as a sexual offender for fear of the negative consequences within a prison environment.

Sexual offenders are often viewed negatively and this may make it difficult for staff to interact positively with them (Akerstrom, 1986; Lea, Auburn, & Kibblewhite, 1999). These negative views may be in part due to the often observed (yet understandable) behaviour of sex offenders within prison or whilst under supervision

or parole, such as their defensiveness, manipulation, hostility, or distorted beliefs (see Ware & Mann, 2012). The negative views towards sex offenders may also, however, be due to the attitudes of staff towards these people and their sexual offences.

Correctional staff (and the community more generally) are likely to have more negative attitudes towards sex offenders than other offenders (Craig, 2005; Hogue, 1993, 1995; Weekes, Pelletier, and Beaudette, 1995). Within their review of attitudes towards sex offenders, Willis, Levenson, and Ward (2010) noted that researchers typically find that, in assessing the views of correctional staff who deal with sex offenders, prison officers not involved in treatment have the most negative views. In contrast probation officers and psychologists hold the most positive views towards sex offenders. Similarly, greater contact with sex offenders appears to result in more positive views, irrespective of respondent age, gender or socio economic status, or whether or not the correctional staff are prison or community based.

Weekes et al (1995) found that only 20.7% of prison officers from their sample viewed sex offenders as treatable, rating them as more unchangeable, dangerous, irrational, mysterious, than non-sexual offenders. Of particular note, 68% of this sample of custodial officers indicated that they wanted more training in how to deal with sexual offenders and only 12.3% reported that their training had prepared them adequately enough.

A number of training programs specifically aiming to increase the knowledge of correctional staff have been evaluated. The results have to a large degree been discouraging to the extent that Willis, Levenson, and Ward (2010) noted that “the available evidence indicates that short educational programs are ineffective, or at worst, harmful in effecting attitude change among professionals working with sex offenders” (p. 553). Hogue (1995), using the Attitudes Towards Sex Offenders Scale (ATS: Hogue, 1993) found more positive attitudes towards sexual offenders after training 81 correctional staff. This training was, however, of three weeks duration and given the high pre-training scores may have reflected an already positive group of correctional staff. Taylor, Keddie, and Lee (2003) provided a two and a half day training course for 66 nurses and social workers who were to work with sex offenders with learning disabilities. They developed their own measure of knowledge and attitudes and also found a significant improvement in knowledge and attitudes after training.

Other training has not proved effective in changing correctional staff attitudes.

Kjelsberg and Loos (2008) evaluated a 2-day educational training program regarding sex offenders to 153 prison employees of whom 90 completed the ATS pre-training and again 12 months after the initial training. Consistent with other research (Craig, 2005; Hogue, 1993; Hogue & Pebbles, 1997; Weekes et al., 1995), they found that prison officers hold more negative views than other correctional staff. Interestingly they also found that there was no significant difference in attitudes towards sex offenders 12 months after the training between the trained and untrained group. Hence, the researchers questioned whether there may have been short term positive effects of training that did not last.

Craig (2005) also used the ATS to evaluate a two-day training program delivered to 63 residential hostel workers and 9 probation officers. Of note, the residential workers did not necessarily have any formal qualifications although it appears that a number had a lot of experience in working with sex offenders. These participants expressed significantly more negative views about sexual offenders than non-sexual offenders before training commenced. Craig (2005) found that the training did not change the attitudes participants held towards sexual offenders but it did change their levels of confidence and knowledge regarding the management of sexual offenders. The researcher cautioned that training attempting to change attitudes is best delivered over weeks and that those delivering training should be very careful not to convey messages that might worsen attitudes towards sexual offenders.

Whether training correctional staff in the management of sex offenders improves their attitudes towards these offenders remains unclear. The aim of this study is to: (1) compare correctional staff attitudes towards sex offenders and non-sex offenders, (2) evaluate the impact of a two-day training program delivered to correctional staff in Corrective Services New South Wales in relation to sex offenders, and (3) to specifically measure knowledge of sexual offending and beliefs in sex offenders' ability to change their offending behaviour using subscales of a recently developed Sex Offender Questionnaire (SOQ; Thakker, 2006).

METHOD

Participants

Participants in this study included 117 Corrective Services NSW employees and volunteers who completed a two day training program on the principles of

working with sex offenders. Of the 117 participants included in the analysis (it should be noted that the sample sizes included in the analysis vary due to missing or incomplete data), 51 (43.6%) were male and 59 (50.4%) were female (there was missing gender data for 7 (6.0%) participants). The average age of participants was 43.3 years (SD 11.4, range 22 - 68 years) and almost two-thirds (63.6%) were over 35 years of age.

The training was available to any CSNSW staff or volunteers involved in the delivery of services to sex offenders. The occupational breakdowns for training participants are displayed in Table 1. Psychologists and Probation and Parole Officers were combined in the data analysis as these occupational groups are directly involved in the rehabilitation of offenders. Custodial officers and community compliance and monitoring officers (CCMG) were combined into one occupation group as both have a focus on compliance rather than rehabilitation. As can be seen in Table 1, there were significant differences among the occupational groups with respect to years of experience with CSNSW ($\chi^2(6)=28.45, p<.001$). The custodial officer and CCMG officer group had significantly more participants with more than 5 years experience with CSNSW. No participants had completed the training previously.

The range of experience in working with Corrective Services NSW ranged from no experience to 34 years, with an average of 8.3 years (SD=7.7 years). Support Workers were the most inexperienced occupational group, with only a fifth (21.7%) of the group working with CSNSW for more than 5 years. Custodial / CCMG Officers were significantly more experienced than the other occupational groups, with the majority of the group (73.8%) reporting more than 5 years experience with CSNSW.

Table 1: *Occupational breakdown for training participants and years of CSNSW experience*

	<i>CSNSW Experience</i>			
	<i>5 years or less</i>		<i>More than 5 years</i>	
	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
<i>Psychologists / Probation and Parole Officers</i>	24	55.8	19	44.2
<i>Custodial Officers / Community Compliance and Monitoring Officers (CCMG)</i>	11	26.2	31	73.8
<i>Support Workers*</i>	18	78.3	5	21.7
<i>Total**</i>	53	49.1	55	50.9

*includes volunteers, accommodation support workers, service and program officers and chaplains

** Missing occupational type for 9 participants

Training

Corrective Services New South Wales recognises the importance of training and educating staff in the management of sexual offenders. A senior training officer or psychologist with specialist knowledge delivers the 2-day training workshop to correctional staff. This workshop called “Principles of Sex Offender Management” was developed for delivery to all corrective services staff that will have face to face contact with sexual offenders. The course is facilitated at the NSW Corrective Services Academy and a number of Correctional Centres and Community Offender Service offices around the State. The specific topics covered include the following.

- Understanding the nature of sexual offending (dispelling myths)
- Understanding sexual offenders and the dynamics of their offending
- Positive strategies for working with (and case managing) sexual offenders
- Understanding risk assessment and risk management
- Knowledge on available treatment for sexual offenders and its effectiveness
- Reviewing worker issues and self care.

The training includes didactic teaching, group work exercises, role plays, exercises using fictional case studies, and demonstrations of positive management interactions (such as motivational interactions). An assessment task is completed post training and evaluated by those who delivered the training.

Measures

Participants of the principles of sex offender management workshop that were delivered over a 12-month period were invited to participate in this research. Those who volunteered completed an initial background questionnaire that asked for their age, gender, years of experience working for CSNSW, highest educational level completed, and prior training in working with sexual offenders. Each participant was given a unique identifier to maintain anonymity for the research study. Participants then completed the following three questionnaires immediately prior to, and immediately following completion of, the 2-day workshop.

Attitudes to Prisoners (ATP; Melvin, Gramling & Gardner, 1985)

The ATP was developed in order to measure attitudes towards prisoners with high scores reflecting more positive attitudes towards prisoners. The ATP consists of 36 statements in which the participant has to rate how strongly they agree or disagree with each statement. Nineteen of the 36 statements are worded negatively and reversed scored. A constant of 36 is removed from the total score, which ranges from 0 to 144. The ATP has been researched with multiple samples (i.e., community, students, and correctional staff) and in several countries. The ATP scale possesses moderate to high split-half ($r = .84$ to $.92$) and test-retest ($r = .82$) reliability. In the current study, the internal consistency was found to be strong with a Cronbach alpha coefficient of $.91$.

Attitudes to Sex Offenders (ATS; Hogue, 1993)

The ATS is a replication of the ATP in which the word “prisoner” has been replaced with “sex offender”. The ATS therefore also consists of 36 statements in which the participants are asked to rate on a 5-point Likert scale how strongly they agree or disagree with the statements (e.g., “Only a few *sex offenders* are really dangerous”). Like the ATP, a number of items are worded as negative and reverse scored. The higher the total score, the more positive the attitudes towards sexual offenders. Hogue (1993; 1995) has validated the ATS with multiple occupations as a reliable method of measuring attitudes towards sexual offenders. Nelson, Herlilhey, and Jeffrey (2002) found the ATS to be reliable (Cronbach alpha coefficient of $.92$) with a test-retest

$r=.82$. In the current study the internal consistency was found to be strong with a Cronbach alpha coefficient of .93.

Sex Offender Questionnaire (SOQ; Thakker, 2006)

The SOQ consists of 44 statements regarding sex offenders where the participants is asked to rate how strongly they agree or disagree with each statement (on a 7-point Likert scale (e.g., 1 = strongly disagree, 4 = undecided, and 7 = strongly agree). A number of items are reverse scored. This scale was developed to measure attitudes and beliefs about sexual offenders. A high total score will indicate the presence of overly negative, unrealistic and stereotypical views of sexual offenders. There are five subscales that measure unchangeability, myth endorsement, extreme beliefs, understanding and compassion, and general crime (as opposed to specific beliefs about sex offenders). The psychometric properties of the SOQ have so far been limited to non-published research with online samples reporting internal reliability as high (Cronbach's alpha for the whole scale is 0.914). In the current study, the internal consistency was found to be strong with a Cronbach alpha coefficient of .92.

RESULTS

Attitudes towards prisoners and sex offenders

Attitudes towards prisoners and sex offenders were measured using the ATP and ATS, parallel instruments that make reference to either prisoners or sex offender and provide directly comparable attitudinal measurements. At baseline measurement, prior to completion of the training program, participants had significantly more positive attitudes towards prisoners ($X=85.6$) compared to sex offenders ($X=72.5$), $t(87) = 9.94, p<.001$ ($n=88$, missing ATS or ATP data for 29 participants for paired sample t-test).

As expected, there were significant differences in both attitudes towards prisoners ($F(2,102) = 12.23, p<.001$) and sex offenders ($F(2,95) = 15.24, p<.001$) among the different occupational groups. As can be seen in Table 2, at baseline the rehabilitative-focused Psychologists and Probation and Parole Officer group reported significantly more positive attitudes towards both prisoners and sex offenders compared to the other occupational groups. Correctional officers and Community Compliance and Monitoring Officers reported the most negative attitudes towards both offender groups.

Table 2: Means and standard deviations of the ATP and ATS pre training by occupational group

	ATP*			ATS**		
	<i>n</i>	<i>X</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>X</i>	<i>SD</i>
<i>Psychologist / PPO</i>	42	92.74	13.65	39	82.41	15.75
<i>Custodial / CCMG</i>	41	77.00	15.38	35	62.60	14.77
<i>Support Worker</i>	20	85.40	14.36	22	67.86	17.78
<i>Total</i>	103	85.05	16.02	96	71.85	18.12

* missing data for 14 participants

** missing data for 21 participants

Impact of training on attitudes towards prisoners and sex offenders

Attitudes towards prisoners, as measured by the ATP, did not change significantly ($t(100)=0.71$, $p=.48$) from pre-training ($M=84.8$, $SD=16.1$) to post-training ($M=84.2$, $SD=16.5$). However, as predicted, attitudes towards sex offenders improved significantly ($t(92)=6.54$, $p<.001$) from pre ($M=71.63$, $SD=18.3$) to post ($M=78.48$, $SD=16.3$) training.

To further examine the impact of training on attitudes towards sex offenders, a mixed repeated measures Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was conducted. Occupational group and years of experience with CSNSW were included in the ANOVA ($2 \times 3 \times 2$ design) to examine the relationship between these factors and training effectiveness. A significant main effect for the within subjects factor of training was found, ($F(1,80) = 33.65$, $p<.001$, partial eta squared = .296), with scores on the Attitudes Towards Sex Offenders (ATS) scale increasing significantly from pre to post training. There was no significant interaction between Training and Occupational Group or between Training and CSNSW experience. As can be seen in Table 3, the training increased positive attitudes towards sex offenders across all occupational groups and all levels of CSNSW experience.

Table 3: Means and standard deviations of the ATS across occupational groups

	n*	Pre		Post		F
		X	SD	X	SD	
<i>Within Subjects</i>						<i>Main Effect</i>
Training	86	71.47	18.65	78.58	16.46	33.65**
<i>Between Subjects</i>						<i>Interaction</i>
Occupational Group						1.71
Psychologist / PPO	34	82.18	16.35	86.68	15.59	
Custodial / CCMG	31	62.29	15.62	70.10	13.72	
Support	21	67.67	18.19	78.00	15.66	
<i>CSNSW Experience</i>						<i>Interaction</i>
						0.70
5 years or less	46	71.48	20.08	79.50	16.42	
More than 5 years	40	71.45	17.11	77.53	16.66	

* missing data for 31 participants

**p<.01

Impact of training on knowledge of sexual offending and belief in treatment efficacy

Knowledge of sexual offending and beliefs in the capacity of a sex offender to change their offending behaviour were measured using subscales of the Sex Offender Questionnaire (SOQ). The *myth endorsement* (14 items) subscale was used as a measure of knowledge of sexual offending as the items measure understanding of sexual offending and endorsement of stereotypes of sexual offending. The *unchangeability* (7 items) subscale was used as a measure of belief in the efficacy of treatment as it measures the endorsement that sex offenders can not change. The SOQ-44 includes three other subscales: *understanding and compassion* (9 items), *extreme views* (8 items) and *general crime* (6 items), that were excluded from the analysis as they were not relevant in this study.

Repeated measures Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was conducted to examine the impact of training (pre and post), occupational group, and years of CSNSW experience on participant endorsement of the *unchangeability* and *sexual offending myths*. To reduce the risk of Type 1 errors increased by the multiple ANOVAs, a Bonferroni adjusted alpha of .025 was applied.

Examination of participant knowledge of sexual offending (*myth endorsement*) found a significant main effect for training, with myth endorsement decreasing significantly following training ($F(1,89) = 27.50, p < .001$, partial eta squared = 0.236). There was also a significant interaction between *training* and *occupational group*, ($F(2,89) = 4.99, p = .009$, partial eta squared = .101). Planned pairwise comparisons (a Bonferroni adjusted alpha of .016 was applied) revealed that the significant difference was between the Psychologist / Probation and Parole Officers group and the Support Worker group ($t(59) = 3.05, p = .003$) indicating that the training was significantly more effective in reducing the endorsement of sexual offending myths among Support Workers compared to Psychologists / PPOs.

A similar pattern of results was found with belief in the efficacy of treatment. A significant main effect for training was found, with beliefs in the inability of sex offenders to change through treatment decreasing significantly following training ($F(1,89) = 57.01, p < .001$, partial eta squared = 0.390). A significant interaction was also found between training and occupational group, ($F(2,89) = 4.22, p < .018$, partial eta squared = .087). Planned pairwise comparisons (a Bonferroni adjusted alpha of .016 was applied) revealed the significant difference was again between the Psychologist / PPO group and the Support Worker group ($t(59) = 2.48, p = .016$), indicating that the training had a significantly larger impact on Support Workers' belief in treatment efficacy. There was no interaction between training and CSNSW experience ($F(1,89) = 3.87, p = .05$), indicating that the training was effective across all levels of CSNSW experience.

Table 4: Means and standard deviations of the myth endorsement and unchangeability subscales of SOQ pre and post training

	Myth Endorsement					<i>F</i>	Unchangeability				<i>F</i>
	n	Pre		Post			Pre		Post		
		X	SD	X	SD		X	SD	X	SD	
<i>Within Subjects</i>						<i>Main effect</i>					<i>Main effect</i>
<i>Training</i>	95	3.59	0.81	3.36	0.78	27.50*	3.44	1.17	2.73	0.85	57.01*
<i>Between Subjects</i>						<i>Interaction</i>					<i>Interaction</i>
<i>Occupational Group</i>						4.99*					4.22*
Psychologist / PPO	36	3.08	0.68	2.97	0.66		2.85	1.06	2.42	0.76	
Custodial Officer / CCMG	38	3.85	0.67	3.66	0.71		3.83	1.00	3.06	0.87	
Support Worker	21	4.01	0.79	3.48	0.84		3.72	1.24	2.65	0.76	
<i>CSNSW Experience</i>						1.72					3.87
5 years or less	49	3.49	0.84	3.26	0.81		3.32	1.30	2.74	0.82	
More than 5 years	46	3.71	0.76	3.47	0.74		3.56	1.00	2.72	0.89	

* $p < .025$ (.05/2 Bonferroni adjusted)

DISCUSSION

This study found that, similar to previous research (Craig, 2005; Hogue, 1993, 1995; Kjelsberg & Loos, 2008; Weekes et al., 1995), correctional staff hold more negative views towards sex offenders than they do prisoners in general. Again, as expected, this study also found that Psychologists and Parole Officers held more positive views towards sex offenders than other correctional staff. Correctional Officers and Community Compliance and Monitoring officers group reported the most negative attitudes towards both offender groups. In many ways, these results are not surprising. Arguably the main role of the correctional or Community Compliance and Monitoring Officer group within CSNSW is to supervise, monitor, and control offenders. Their role is primarily to be alert to negative behaviours (see Kjelsberg & Loos, 2008) and, as mentioned previously, they will invariably witness and experience some of the more difficult offender behaviours. In contrast, psychologists, support workers, and probation officers (to a lesser extent) may focus on the strengths

and resources of the offender. These staff may even be involved in treatment or maintenance (relapse prevention) programs.

This study also found that a 2-day training program actually had a positive impact on correctional staff attitudes towards sex offenders. This is in direct contrast to the results of Craig (2005) and Kjelsberg and Loos (2008). As could be expected, attitudes towards prisoners in general did not change as a result of training, however attitudes towards sex offenders improved significantly irrespective of years of experience or occupation type. In other words, the 2-day training appears to have had a significant across-the-board positive impact on attitudes towards sex offenders. This is a significant result when one considers that the average pre-training ATS score in this study ($ATS = 71.63$, $SD = 18.27$) is lower than that of the Kjelsberg and Loos ($ATS = 83$, $SD = 17.6$) and Craig studies ($ATS = 76.44$, $SD = 12.95$). This suggests that the attitudes of participants within this study might have been less positive to begin with.

More specifically, training also appeared to have a significant impact on the participants' belief in the effects of treatment (the changeability of the sex offender). Participants were more likely to believe that a sex offender could change after this training. Training also appeared to decrease the endorsement of myths about sex offenders held by correctional staff. This was most notable for support workers who perhaps may have had little knowledge or awareness of sexual offending prior to the training. This is an important finding given Willis, Levenson, and Ward's (2010) concerns that educational (training) programs may serve to increase the salience of inaccurate beliefs towards sex offenders.

So, in contrast to other 2-day workshops, the CSNSW Principles of Sex Offender Management training has had an immediate and significant impact on correctional staff's attitudes towards sex offenders. It is important to consider why this might have been the case particularly as these staff were not specifically involved in any sex offender treatment and were not pre-selected in any way. Craig (2005) reflected on the differences in training content, objectives, and length and how this might have an impact. Willis, Levenson, and Ward (2010) argued that careful consideration of training content is critical and they point to the rehabilitation content of Hogue's (1995) training as one of the reasons for its effectiveness (and the fact that it was two weeks in length). A significant focus within the CSNSW training was on positive strategies for interacting with sex offenders. A further goal was to impart

knowledge about risk assessment and rehabilitation – notably the low base rates of sexual re-offending and the effectiveness of treatment. These goals implicitly targeted participants' attitudes. A large component of the training is the use of role play particularly in discussing how to understand a sexual offender's behaviour and then how to interact positively with this. The two day training evaluated by Craig (2005), in comparison, explicitly targeted the increasing of participant knowledge rather than attitudes. The goals of the CSNSW training and the manner in which it was delivered may therefore, be the reasons why this training appeared to be effective. In contrast to Hogue's (1993) research, the participants within this study were not selected to run therapeutic programs and so these results could not be attributed to a pre-selection bias. Similarly these participants had not previously completed the training in this field.

The key limitation of this study is that it has focused on immediate attitudinal change. A more compelling result would involve the re-testing of these staff some time later to see whether the changes in attitudes were maintained over an extended time. Kjelsberg and Loos (2008) also examined the impact of a 2-day course on prison employee's attitudes towards sex offenders, however they re-tested participants 12 months later finding no lasting effect. Future research is planned by the current authors to address this issue. A further limitation is the lack of a control group.

In conclusion, this study has demonstrated that a 2-day training workshop that focused on the positive management of sex offenders could significantly change the attitudes of correctional staff towards sex offenders and belief in the efficacy of treatment. This is an important research finding given that, as Ware (2011) and Ware, Frost and Hoy (2009) have argued that effective offender treatment will always rely, to some extent, on the *positive support* of non-therapy staff.

REFERENCES

- Akerstrom, M. (1986). Outcasts in prison: The cases of informers and sex offenders, *Deviant Behaviour*, 7, 1-12.
- Blanchard, G. T. (1998). *The difficult connection: The therapeutic relationship in sex offender treatment*. Brandon, VT: Safer Society press.
- Craig, L. A. (2005). The impact of training on attitudes towards sex offenders. *Journal of Sexual Aggression*, 11, 197-207.

- Hanson, R.K., Gordon, A., Harris, A.J.R., Marques, J.K., Murphy, W.D., Quinsey, V.L., & Seto, M.C. (2002). First report of the Collaborative Outcome Data Project on the Effectiveness of Psychological Treatment of Sex Offenders. *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment, 14*, 169-195.
- Hanson, R.K., & Morton-Bourgon, K. (2004). *Predictors of sexual recidivism: An updated meta-analysis*. Ottawa: Public Works and Government Services Canada.
- Hogue, T. E. (1993). Attitudes toward Prisoners and Sexual Offenders. *Issues in Criminological and Legal Psychology, 19*, 23-32.
- Hogue, T. E. (1995). Training multi-disciplinary teams to work with sex offenders: Effects on staff attitudes. *Psychology, Crime & Law, 1*, 227-235.
- Hogue, T. E., Pebbles, J. (1997). The influence of remorse, intent and attitudes towards sex offenders on judgements of a rapist. *Psychology, Crime, and Law, 3*, 249-259.
- Koss, M. P. (1993). Rape: Scope, impact, interventions and public policy responses. *American Psychologist, 48*, 1062-1069.
- Kjelsberg, E., & Loos, L. H. (2008). Conciliation or condemnation? Prison employees and young peoples' attitudes towards sexual offenders. *The International Journal of Forensic Mental Health, 7*, 95-103.
- Lea, S., Auburn, T., & Kibblewhite, K. (1999). Working with sex offenders: The perceptions and experiences of professionals and paraprofessionals. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology, 43*, 103-119.
- Losel, F., & Schmucker, M. (2005). The effectiveness of treatment for sexual offenders: A comprehensive meta-analysis. *Journal of Experimental Criminology, 1*, 117-146.
- Mann, R. E., & Thornton, D. (1998). The evolution of a multisite sexual offender treatment program. In W.L. Marshall, Y.M. Fernandez, S.M. Hudson & T. Ward (Eds.), *Sourcebook of treatment programs for sexual offenders*. (pp. 47-58). New York: Plenum Press.
- : *An integrated approach*. New York: Taylor & Francis Group.
- Marshall, W. L., Fernandez, Y. M., Serran, G. A., Mulloy, R., Thornton, D., Mann, R.E., & Anderson, D. (2003). Process variables in the treatment of sexual

- offenders: A review of the relevant literature. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 8, 205-234.
- Marshall, W. L., Marshall, L. E., Serran, G. A., & O'Brien, M. D. (2011). *The rehabilitation of sexual offenders: Strengths-based approach*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Melvin, K. B., Gramling, L. K., & Gardner, W. M. (1985). A scale to measure attitudes towards prisoners. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 12, 241-253.
- Nelson, M., Herlihy, B., & Oescher, J (2002). A Survey of Counselor Attitudes Towards Sex Offenders. *Journal of Mental Health Counseling*, 24, 51-67.
- Sanghara, K. K., & Wilson, J. C. (2006). Stereotypes and attitudes about child sexual abusers: A comparison of experienced and inexperienced professionals in sex offender treatment. *Legal and Criminological Psychology*, 11, 229-244.
- Taylor, J. L., Keddie, T., & Lee, S. (2003). Working with sex offenders with intellectual disability: Evaluation of an introductory workshop for direct care staff. *Journal of Intellectual Disability Research*, 47, 203-209.
- Thakker, J. K. (2006). The sex offender questionnaire: Exploring attitudes and beliefs. *Preventing Sex Crime: From Evidence and explanation to policy and practice*. 4th Biennial Conference, Australia and New Zealand Association of the Treatment of Sexual Abusers, Brisbane, Australia.
- Ware, J. (2011). The importance of contextual issues within sexual offender treatment. In D. P. Boer, R. Eher, L. A. Craig, M. H. Miner, and F. Pfäfflin (Eds.), *International Perspectives on the Assessment and Treatment of Sexual Offenders. Theory, Practice and Research*, (pp. 299-312). West Sussex, UK: John Wiley & Sons Ltd.
- Ware, J., Frost, A., & Hoy, A. (2010). A review of the use of therapeutic communities when treating sex offenders. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*.54, 721-742.
- Ware, J., & Mann, R. E. (2012). How should acceptance of responsibility be approached in sex offender treatment. *Aggression & Violent Behavior*. 17, 279-288.
- Weekes, J. R., Pelletier, G., & Beaudette, D. (1995). Correctional officers: How do they perceive sex offenders? *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 39, 55-61.

Willis, G. M., Levenson, J. S., & Ward, T. (2010). Desistance and attitudes towards sex offenders: Facilitation or hindrance? *Journal of Family Violence*, 25, 545-556.