



BSc in Psychology
Department of Psychology

A Second Chance After Incarceration: The Public Attitudes Towards
Former Inmates Returning to Work.

May, 2020

Student: Sigurlaug Sara Gylfadóttir

ID number: 060495-3009

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the BSc Psychology degree, Reykjavik University, this thesis is presented in the style of an article for submission to a peer-reviewed journal. This thesis was completed in the spring of 2020 and may therefore have been significantly impacted by the COVID-19 pandemic. The thesis and its findings should be viewed in light of that.

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to examine attitude towards former inmates from the public in Iceland, not many studies that have examined this topic in Iceland. Participants in this study were 311 individuals from the general public, 200 females (64.3%) and 111 males (35.7%). The questioner that was used was a translated version of an Attitude towards crime scale (ACS). The questioner was divided into two sections, hereditary and individual causes and social and environmental causes. The results of the study showed that 96.5% (n=300) of the general public were positive in regards to inmates returning to the labor market after incarceration and be given a second chance. The results also showed that there is not a positive correlation between having a personal relationship with a former inmate and being in favor of them returning to work. Participants with a high education level are more positive when it comes to former inmates returning to work. And finally, there is not a significant statistical difference between genders when it comes to attitude towards former inmates. It would be of interest to do a more detailed study on this topic and gather data from former inmates themselves to see what kind of attitude they face when returning to work and if they do indeed get a second chance

Keywords: Attitude, former inmates, labor market

Útdráttur

Tilgangur rannsóknarinnar var að skoða viðhorf almennings gagnvart fyrrum afbrotamönnum á Íslandi, en ekki hafa verið gerðar margar rannsóknir hér á landi varðandi þetta viðfangsefni. Þátttakendur rannsóknarinnar voru 311 talsins, 200 konur (64.3%) og 111 karlar (35.7%). Notast var við þýddan spurningakvarða sem kannar viðhorf fólks til glæpa (ACS), spurningarnar skiptust upp í tvo hluta, arfgengar og einstakar ástæður og félagslegar og umhverfislegar ástæður. Niðurstöður rannsóknarinnar sýndu fram á að 96.5% (n=300) þátttakenda töldu að fyrrum afbrotamenn eigi skilið annað tækifæri á vinnumarkaði eftir afplánun. Niðurstöðurnar sýndu að það er ekki martækur munur á milli þess að þekkja fyrrum afbrotamann og vera jákvæðari gagnvart fyrri föngum að snúa aftur á vinnumarkaðinn. Ennfremur kom fram að það eru tensl á milli þess að vera með hátt menntunarstig og vera jákvæðari gagnvart fyrrum afbrotamönnum á vinnumarkaði. Að lokum var ekki marktækur munur á milli kynja þegar kemur að viðhorfi þeirra gagnvart fyrrum afbrotamönnum á vinnumarkaði. Áhugavert væri að gera nákvæmari rannsókn á þessu viðfansefni og safna gögnum frá fyrrum afbrotamönnum sem hafa snúið aftur á vinnumarkaðinn. Til að kanna það viðmót sem þeir standa frammi fyrir þegar þeir snúa aftur á vinnumarkaðinn eftir afplánun, fá þeir á annað borð tækifæri.

Keywords: Viðhorf, fyrrum afbrotamenn, vinnumarkaður.

The general public shows differences in opinion in relation to former criminals. Many former inmates face challenges when returning to society. They must adapt to their new freedom, resist temptations, and navigate their new responsibilities again after a period spent in incarceration (Skardhamar & Telle, 2012).

In Iceland, there is a general penal code no. 19/1940 (Almenn hegningarlög no. 19/1940) that covers all crimes of violence, sexual offenses, homicide, fraud, theft and property damage, it also covers forgery, violations against official authority and violations of privacy (Ríkislögreglustjóri, 2019). The annual report from the National Commissioner of the Icelandic Police shows that in 2018 a total of 96,378 offenses were reported (Ríkislögreglustjóri, 2019).

A longitudinal study from 2011 on former prisoners demonstrated the crucial importance of finding sustainable work after prison to help in the transition back to society. Employment is a significant factor in successful reintegration and forms important social controls that can help prevent further criminal activity. Former inmates report that successfully finding and maintaining a stable career is a major reason for their successful transition back into society after incarceration. Furthermore, former inmates report that employment plays a key role in regaining their sense of identity and dignity (Visher, Debus-Sherrill & Yahner, 2011).

Only half of former inmates are able to find employment within one year of being released from prison and their education level, work experience and skill set are below average. Former inmates often faced with some kind of discrimination when applying for employment and they also earn less than their colleges with comparable backgrounds that don't possess a criminal record (Lynch & Sabol, 2001; Justice Center Council on State Governments, 2013; Holzer, Raphael, & Stoll, 2006).

In their discussion on the theory of reasoned action, Ajzen and Fishbein (1980) state that attitudes are predictors of behavior. Perceived control is also relevant to this issue. Perceived control develops from perceived self-efficacy, and it is thought that both perceived control and intention are correlated. Action theory is another theory that can be an effective model for illustrating why attitudes can predict individuals' behaviors and can also be used to examine people's attitude towards crime and predict sentencing behavior (Sutton, 2001)

Social attitudes are also linked to beliefs about the origins of antisocial behavior and a person's opinion on how to prevent and handle criminal offences (Sutton, 2001.) A person's attitude toward criminals has also been shown to depend on their occupation. According to Carrol et al. (1987), individuals who work in the criminal justice system often have a more conservative attitude toward criminals and regard the predisposition to commit a crime as being fixed, arising from either a person's personality or for heredity reasons.

More conservative attitudes also hold that it is a criminal's choice to commit a crime and argue that society should respond with punishment and incarceration. On the other hand, individuals who work in other fields can have a more liberal view. Such individuals place the responsibility for crime mainly on the criminals' environment and the social factors affecting them. They emphasize rehabilitation, rather than solely focusing on the punishment itself (Homant and Kennedy 1986; Ollenburger 1986).

A study by Ortet-Fabrega and Pérez (1992) considered attitudes towards crime amidst professionals working in the criminal system. Their study sample consisted of a total of 382 students studying both medicine and psychology schools at the University of Barcelona. The participants were comprised of a total of 275 females

with a mean age of 20 (SD = 1.8) and 107 males with a mean age of 20 (SD = 1.7). The main purpose of the study was to construct a scale of attitudes toward crime. The scale utilized three independent scales: the first was an attitude scale toward the causes of crime, the second was an attitude scale towards the prevention of crime, and the final scale was an attitude scale towards the treatment of crime (Ortet-Fabrega & Pérez, 1992). Their study aimed to construct a Likert attitude scale. Likert scales are often used in survey studies to measure attitudes. In most cases, a five- or seven-grade Likert scale is used. In a five-grade scale, the options are strongly disagree, disagree, neutral (undecided), agree, strongly agree (Göb, McCollin & Ramalhoto, 2007)

Ortet-Fabrega and Pérez (1992) results showed that the Attitudes towards Crime Scale (ACS) adequate levels of reliability and validity. They also did another study where the aim was to compare and explain the attitudes of different professional groups working in the criminal justice system regarding prevention, cause and finally the treatment of crime. The results from their second study showed that attitudes were positive to environmental causes, but varied by professions (Ortet-Fabrega & Pérez, 1992).

Being in possession of a criminal record can reduce the employment opportunities or call backs by nearly 50% (R. Concepcion, 2012). Over 34 U.S. states have executed an initiative called "ban the box." This policy forbids managers from asking about an applicant's criminal background at the beginning of the process; instead, they are only able to ask personal background questions late in the recruitment process (Doleac and Hansen, 2016). The purpose of this initiative is to encourage managers to look first and foremost at the qualifications and skills of the applicant, rather than immediately rejecting an applicant based on the admission of a criminal background. In the context of a job application, the nature of the crime

committed is often not mentioned, whether several years have passed since the crime occurred is not mentioned, and it is often not stated that a former inmate has gained valuable experience since being released that could be important to the company (Doleac and Hansen, 2016).

The ban the box policy has a dual mission: the first is to expand job opportunities for former inmates and the second is to reduce racial discrimination in the employment process (Doleac and Hansen, 2016). The policy has both pros and cons. For example, eliminating the criminal background question from job applications may cause managers to speculate on whether the job applicant has a criminal record. This can have negative consequences for members of minority groups who do not have a criminal past (Doleac and Hansen, 2016; Bushway, 2004; Finlay, 2008).

Holzer et al. (2005) studied the effect of an applicant's criminal history on management hiring choices. Their results showed that only a fraction of managers were willing to consider hiring an applicant with a criminal background. The authors argued that when the crime occurred, the nature of the crime, and the numbers of prior convictions were relevant factors that should be considered. Managers were more likely to hire an applicant with a criminal background if the offence was drug- or property-related rather a violent crime (Holzer et al. 2005). Managers were also unlikely to hire applicants who had recently been released from jail and who had little to no prior work experience (Holzer et al. 2005).

Studies have shown that businesses that are less inclined to do a background check are smaller companies, wholesale trade industries and construction companies. Because of that former inmates are more likely to apply for jobs in these certain

industries, rather than deciding to work with minors or in jobs that entail face to face communication with citizens (Holzer et al. 2005; Smith & Woodbury, 1999).

A number of studies have shown that inmates who are poorly educated and without employment after being released from prison are more likely to be recidivist offenders. Secure employment has a beneficial effect on recidivism rates and can help former inmates be more successful when returning to society after serving their sentence (Skardhamar & Telle, 2012). Fulfilling work is essential in enabling former inmates to successfully integrate in society, and most former inmates are conscious of the importance of post-release work when it comes to recidivism reduction (Carter, 2008; Visher, Baer, & Naser, 2006).

According to the Correctional Statistics of Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway and Sweden for 2013–2017, in 2015, 205 individuals were released from prison in Iceland, and there were 48 reconvictions within two years, which represents a reconviction rate of 23% (Kriminalomsorgen, 2019).

Community service is sometimes undertaken as an alternative to prison time. Data from the Prison and Probation Administration showed that, in 2016 alone, a total of 1,465 people faced incarceration; of them, 254 engaged in community service (Fangelsismálastofnun, 2016). For each month of the conviction, the offenders worked 40 hours, and they also worked in paid employment or went to school in their remaining free time (Fangelsismálastofnun, 2016).

The purpose of this study was to investigate attitudes towards crime among the Icelandic general public, specifically regarding inmates' return to the labor market, community service, and second chances.

Hypothesis 1: There is a positive correlation between having a personal relationship with a former inmate and being unbiased toward them returning to the

labor market. Hypothesis 2: Participants with high levels of education have a more positive view of former inmates returning to the labor market compared with participants with lower levels of education. Hypothesis 3: There is a significant statistical difference between different genders' attitudes toward former inmates.

Method

Participants

The participants in this study comprised $N = 311$ members of the general public in Iceland. A self-selected sample was used to collect the data. Participants were not paid for their participation. The study was anonymous, and only the researcher and supervisor viewed the data. The complete response rate for the survey was 278 participants. The female participants comprised 64.3% ($n = 200$) of the total, and male participants comprised 35.7% ($n=111$). The participants' ages ranged from 18–65 years or older, and 31.1 % ($n = 97$) of the participants were in the 45–54 year age group. Table 1 shows the descriptive statistics for the participants' age and gender variables.

Table 1

Variables	N	%
Gender		
Females	200	35.6
Males	111	64.1
Age		
18–24 years old	33	10.6
25–34 years old	46	14.7
35–44 years old	28	9.0
45–54 years old	97	31.1
55–64 years old	76	24.4
65+ years	32	10.3

Measures

The study consisted of questions structured in four sections for a total of 127 items. Four basic background questions were asked first (Appendix A); following this, seven questions (Appendix B) from section two asked participants to state whether or not they supported a statement. An example question is, "How supportive are you of companies/managers asking for a person's criminal records when hiring?" The responses were measured on a 5-point scale, where very supportive = 1, supportive = 2, undecided = 3, unsupportive = 4, and very unsupportive = 5. The third section asked a total of five questions (Appendix C) on how important or unimportant the participants considered the following statements. An example of a question from this section is, "When it comes to former criminals, do you think it matters whether the person was under the influence of alcohol and/or drugs when the offense was committed? The responses were measured on a 5-point scale, where it matters a lot = 1, it matters = 2, undecided = 3, does not matter that much = 4, and does not matter at all = 5. The scale was added together to create one continuous variable ($M = 7.39$, $SD = 2.93$, $\alpha = .588$).

The final section of the study was a translated version of the ACS (Ortet-Fabregat & Pérez, 1992) and included 12 items (Appendix D). The finished questionnaire was sent to six people for a pilot review before being published.

Background questions. There were total of five background questions, which consisted of 22 items (Appendix A) The questions asked the participants' gender, age, highest level of education, occupation, and whether they had any personal relationship with a former inmate.

Attitude towards crime scale. The scale, which consisted of 69 items, was translated into Icelandic and was originally answered by university students.

However, in this study, the participants comprised members of the general public. The Icelandic translations were read by three different individuals who provided feedback that was included in the final version. The response format originally included three attitude toward crime scales, but only one of them was used in this study. The original version of the ACS consists of 22 items divided into two sections—heredity and individual causes and social and environmental causes. The first one has items associated with fate, mental illness, genetics as the main reasons behind criminal behavior while the second one has items associated with learning opportunities, the economy and educational factors as the reasons behind criminal behavior (Ortet-Fabregat & Pérez, 1992). This study asked only 13 questions over two sections. An example of question from the first sections is “Crime is caused by mental illness” and from the second sections “Crime is fundamentally due to a shortage of economic and labor resources”. Answers were measured on a four-point scale that ranged from one to five (agree strongly = 1, agree = 2, undecided = 3, disagree = 4, disagree strongly = 5; Ortet-Fabregat & Pérez, 1992).

The Icelandic society was taken into consideration in determining which questions to ask in the present study. Items that did not apply to modern Icelandic society were removed (e.g., “Many gypsies commit crimes because they carry it in the blood”). Three items centering on heredity factors were combined into one item to ensure that the number of questions was not excessive. The items “Crime is due only to hereditary factors, Crime is determined *mainly* by one's genetic make-up and a person becomes a criminal because it is carried in the blood” were combined into one item, as follows: “crime is determined by a person’s heredity factors.”

The scale was added together to create two continuous variables of attitudes toward former inmates; one item was left out, as it was not considered relevant. The

entire scale was categorized by subject, and a total of six questions were combined (Appendix E) to create a total sum variable by participants' opinions and attitudes regarding a former inmates' heredity and individual causes ($M = 18.09$, $SD = 3.49$, $\alpha = 0.741$).

Subsequently, a total of six questions were combined (Appendix E) to create a total sum variable by participants' opinions and attitudes regarding the social and environmental causes of crime ($M = 13.81$, $SD = 3.95$, $\alpha = 0.714$). In this study, a–b was considered a positive attitude, c–d was considered an impartial attitude, and e–f was considered a negative attitude.

The total score of both ACS, hereditary, and individual causes section and the social and environmental causes section ranged from 5–30.

The internal reliability or Cronbach's alpha for the heredity and individual scale in this study was $\alpha = .741$, while for the social and environmental scale, the Cronbach's alpha was $= .714$. Former studies with the ACS scale have shown that the internal reliability should be between 0.71–0.93 to be considered as having good reliability; in this study, all coefficients ranged from 0.6–0.7, which is considered acceptable (Ortet-Fabregat & Pérez, 1992).

Procedure

The study was constructed as an online survey via a Google Docs Form, and the survey link was posted on the researchers Facebook profile. A total of 10 people shared the survey link on to their personal Facebook profile, and this helped to reach other age groups, which provided greater variance. There were no inclusion criteria in the present study, but as the link was only posted on Facebook, anyone old enough to have a Facebook account could participate and, therefore, all participants automatically met the criteria. The study took place from April 19–April 24 2020.

When opening the link to begin the survey, the participants were greeted with a promotional letter and were informed that the study was collecting data for a BSc project in psychology by a student at Reykjavik University. The letter also stated that the study answers were anonymous, and the participants were assured that their answers would not be traced back to them. Participants were also informed that they could stop the survey and withdraw their participation at any time. Signed consent was not required for this study.

Data analysis

The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (IBM SPSS statistics 26) was used to perform the statistical testing and analyze the data. Microsoft Word and Excel were used for the chart design. After missing value analysis was conducted, it was decided that no participants would be removed from the data analysis because all participants answered the key questions in the survey. The analysis was conducted in numerous stages, and an independent sample t-test was used to test all three hypotheses. A one-way ANOVA was used to analyze whether attitudes changed according to the level of education.

Results

In this study, there are total of 311 participants, the results are as following. Table 2 provides a description of all the participants' background variables by education, current job and if they had any personal relationship to a former inmate. Total number of 311 participants, 200 females (64.3%) and 111 males (35.7%). Majority of the participants had finished some type of master's degree; a total of 34.6% (n= 108) and most of the participants had a current job at the labor market, total of 68.8% (n=214). Of all 311 participants a total of 87 females (27.8%) and 59

(18.8%) males, total of 46.6% ($M = 1.4$) ($SD = .492$) had some kind of a personal relationship with a former inmate.

Table 2

Descriptive statistics for background variables; gender, education, job and personal relationship with former inmate.

	Female (n = 200)	Male (n = 110)	F vs. M
Highest Education			n/s ($p = .325$)
Elementary School	13 (4.2%)	6 (1.9%)	
High school/ Vocational training	55(17.7%)	38(12.2%)	
Undergraduate (BSc/BA/diploma)	49 (15.7%)	33(10.6%)	
Postgraduate (MA/MSc/Ph.D.)	79 (25.3%)	29 (9.3%)	
Doctors degree	4 (1.3%)	4 (1.3%)	
Current job status			n/s ($p = .203$)
Self employed	15 (4.8%)	13 (4.2%)	
Labor market	144 (46.2%)	69(22.1%)	
Student	18 (5.8%)	12 (3.8%)	
Unemployed	7 (2.2%)	7 (2.2%)	
Retired	11 (3.5%)	7 (2.2%)	
Other	5 (1.6%)	2 (0.6%)	
Personal relationship to former inmate			n/s ($p = .321$)
Yes	87 (27.8%)	59(18.8%)	
No	113 (36.1%)	51(16.3%)	

Note. High school and Vocational training were combined for statistical analysis.

Table 3 shows descriptive statistics for the Valid Total Score of the Attitude Towards Crime scale, partitioned between questions regarding hereditary and individual causes (called ACS1 from here on) and social and environmental causes (called ACS2 from here on). It also shows descriptive statistics for the Valid Total

Score for statements regarding a former inmates offence specific. Total of 25 participants were missing for ACS1, and a total of 30 participants were missing for ACS2. The mean score for the ACS 1 was 18.09 (SD = 3.49, range 5-24), with Cronbach's $\alpha = .741$ and the mean score for the ACS2 was 13.81 (SD =3.95, range 2-24),with Cronabach's $\alpha = .714$. The mean score for the Total valid score for statements regarding a former inmates offence details was 7.39 (SD =2.93, range 2-16), with Cronbach's $\alpha = .588$.

Table 3

Descriptive Statistics for Valid Total Scores of the ACS and statements regarding former inmates offence specifics.

Total Score	<i>N</i>	Mean	Range	SD	Alpha
ACS1 – Hereditary and individual causes	286	18.09	5 - 24	3.49	.741
ACS2 - Social and environmental causes	281	13.81	3 - 24	3.95	.714
Offence Specific	311	7.39	2 - 16	2.93	.588

Table 4 shows descriptive statistics for statements regarding former inmates working in the labor market. Participant's got statements to answer, their attitude was labelled from positive, impartial and negative. Majority of the participants felt positive towards all of the five statements asked and a total of 300 participants (96.5%) thought former inmates should be given a second change when returning back to the labor market.

Table 4

Descriptive statistics for statements regarding former inmates

Variables	N	%
Managers asking for criminal record		
Positive	231	75
Impartial	66	21.2
Negative	14	4.8
Getting a second chance at labor market		
Positive	300	96.5
Impartial	10	3.2
Negative	1	0.3
Access to community service		
Positive	281	90.3
Impartial	19	6.1
Negative	11	3.5
Working with a former inmate		
Positive	109	34.9
Impartial	155	49.7
Negative	47	15.4
What field the former inmate works in (e.g., kindergarden, manufacturing)	232	75
Positive	50	16
Impartial	28	9
Negative		

Note: N = total participans, % = valid percentage, some columns do not add up to 100% due to missing data.

An Independent sample T-test was used associated with a statistically effect to examine the first hypothesis: There is a positive correlation between having a personal relationship with a former inmate and being unbiased towards them returning to the labor market. There was no significant difference between having a personal relationship with a former inmate and being more positive in regards of attitude towards former inmates, $t(276) = 2.516, p = .647$.

An Independent sample T-test was associated with a statistically effect was also used to examine the second hypothesis: Participants with high education level have are more positive when it comes to former inmates returning to the labor market. The two highest educational levels, being a postgraduate (MA/MSc/Ph.D.) and having finished a doctors degree were tested. The results showed that there was a significant difference between being highly educated and being more positive in regards of attitude towards former inmates $t(115) = 5.885, p = .000$

For the third hypothesis an Independent sample T-test was associated with a statistically effect was used to examine the third hypothesis. Therefor was no significant difference between genders and being more positive in regards of attitude towards former inmates, $t(276) = 5.885, p = .396$.

Assumptions were checked by one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) if there was a significant difference between the education levels and attitude towards crime, the result showed that there was a significant difference between the four education levels and attitude towards crime, $F(5,279) = 10.792, p < 0.05$. A Bonferroni Post hoc test was used to locate the difference between groups. The results of the Bonferroni Post hoc test indicated that there was a difference between the two highest education levels, those who had finished some kind of masters degree or doctors degree and the three lower educational groups. Elementary School (MD = -2.054, $p = 0.079$), High school and vocational training were combined in to one new variable (MD = -2.908, $p < .001$), Undergraduate (BSc/BA/diploma) (MD = -1.679, $p < .005$). Finally Eta squared was calculated to check whether the difference between groups mattered, the results showed a very strong effect, $\eta^2 = 0.162$.

Discussion

The purpose of this study was to investigate attitudes towards crime among the Icelandic general public, specifically regarding inmates' return to the labor market, community service, and second chances. The present study tested three hypotheses.

The first hypothesis tested whether there was a positive correlation between having a personal relationship with a former inmate and being unbiased toward them returning to the labor market. The results indicated that there was no positive correlation between having a personal relationship with a former inmate and being unbiased toward them returning to the labor market; therefore, the first hypothesis was not supported.

Hypothesis two tested whether participants with high levels of education had a more positive view of former inmates returning to the labor market compared with participants who had lower levels of education. The results indicated that participants with high levels of education have a more positive view of former inmates returning to the labor market compared with participants with lower levels of education; therefore, the second hypothesis was supported. Those results are similar to earlier findings from former studies examining attitudes towards crime; Ortet-Fabrega and Pérez (1992) indicated that attitudes varied by professions.

The third and final hypothesis tested whether there was a significant statistical difference between different genders' attitudes toward former inmates. The results indicated that there was not a significant statistical difference between different genders' attitudes toward former inmates; therefore, in conclusion, the third hypothesis was not supported.

The number of participants in this study was sufficiently large to obtain reliable results. The majority of the participants in this study had completed a master's degree or equivalent.

Prior studies have demonstrated the importance of employment after returning to society and the degree to which a criminal record affects employment opportunities. Skardhamar and Telle (2012) have shown that former inmates who are poorly educated and unemployed are more likely to be recidivist offenders. Furthermore, they discuss the importance and beneficial effect that finding secure employment has on recidivism rates. Employment can also have a major impact on former inmates in terms of their successful reintegration into society (Skardhamar & Telle, 2012).

Prior studies regarding the Attitudes towards Crime Scale (ACS), which was used as a guideline in this study, have shown that the scale has adequate validity and reliability. The internal reliability should be between 0.71–0.93 to be considered good, and in this study, all coefficients ranged from 0.6–0.7, which is considered acceptable.

When looking at the individual answers, it was noteworthy that the vast majority of participants (96.5% [n = 300]) believed that former inmates should be given a second chance in the labor market, though when it came to the question of whether they would be willing to work with a former inmate themselves, only 34.9% (n=109) answered positively. The results are reminiscent of the concept of “Not In My Backyard Syndrome” (NIMBYS), i.e. you agree to the following statement, but when it comes to your interest, you are against it.

While conducting this study, a news article appeared on one of the main news sources in Iceland regarding a former inmate who had returned to work after serving

his sentence. He was informed after only three days that he was not welcome at work. The reason provided was that other employees had said that they would not work with him. The chairman of the prisoners' association in Iceland said that the town he worked and lived in was prejudiced in driving him out.

This thesis was completed during the 2020 COVID-19 pandemic; because of this, some last-minute changes to this study were required. Originally, the study was designed to examine managers' perspectives on hiring former inmates and whether their companies had any specific policies on this matter. Understandably, no managers had time to spare to participate in this study during this time. It would be of interest to conduct that kind of study in the future.

There is always room for improvement when conducting research, and conducting a more detailed study to gather data from former inmates themselves to assess the attitudes they face from the community when returning back to work and whether they are indeed given a second chance would be of interest.

This study revealed that the general public in Iceland is somewhat positive when it comes to giving former inmates a second chance at the labor market.

Without job opportunities, life is difficult and maintaining employment empowers people to meet their primary needs and obtain the social status, self-respect, and self-confidence that comes from being a part of a community. Access to employment is important for all, and is encapsulated in the Icelandic saying *vinnan göfgar manninn* (“work makes the man better”).

References

- Ajzen, I & Fishbein, M. (1980). *Understanding attitudes and predicting social behavior*. Engelwood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall
- Almenn hegningarlög* no. 19/1949
- Bushway, Shawn D. (2004). "Labor Market Effects of Permitting Employer Access to Criminal History Records." *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice* 20(3), 276–91.
- Carroll, John & Perkowski, William & Lurigio, Arthur & Weaver, Frances. (1987). Sentencing Goals, Causal Attributions, Ideology, and Personality. *Journal of personality and social psychology*. 52. 107-18. doi:10.1037//0022-3514.52.1.107.
- Carter, F. (2008). Offender employment is the key. *Corrections Today*, 70, 108-109.
- Concepcion Jr., Roberto. (2012) "Need Not Apply: The Racial Disparate Impact of PreEmployment Criminal Background Checks." *Georgetown Journal on Poverty Law & Policy*, 19(2). May 2020, from http://racism.org/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=1366:preemployment&catid=51&Itemid=174.
- Doleac, Jennifer L., & Benjamin Hansen (2016). "Does 'Ban The Box' Help or Hurt Low Skilled Workers? Statistical Discrimination and Employment Outcomes When Criminal Histories Are Hidden." *National Bureau of Economic Research Working Paper 22469*. Retrieved May 2020, from <http://www.nber.org/papers/w22469>.
- Fangelsismálastofnun. (2019). *Community Service*. Retrieved April, 2020, from <https://www.fangelsi.is/samfelagsthjonusta>

- Finlay, Keith. (2008). *“Effect of Employer Access to Criminal History Data on the Labor Market Outcomes of Ex Offenders and Non-Offenders.”* Cambridge, MA: National Bureau of Economic Research
- Göb, R., McCollin, C. & Ramalhoto, M.F. Ordinal Methodology in the Analysis of Likert Scales. *Qual Quant* 41, 601–626 (2007). doi:10.1007/s11135-007-9089-z)
- Holzer, Harry J, Steven Raphael., & Michael A Stoll. (2006). “Perceived Criminality, Criminal Background Checks, and the Racial Hiring Practices of Employers”. *The Journal of Law and Economics* 49 (2): 451–480. doi.org/10.1086/501089
- Holzer, Harry., Raphael, Steven., Stoll, Michael., & Professor, Associate. (2005). *The effect of an applicant's criminal history on employer hiring decisions and screening practices: Evidence from Los Angeles*
- Homant, R. J., & Kennedy, D. B. (1986). Judgment of legal insanity as a function of attitude toward the insanity defense. *International Journal of Law and Psychiatry*, 8(1), 67–81. doi:10.1016/0160-2527(86)90084-1
- Justice Center Council on State Governments. (2013). *“The Second Chance Act: The First Five Years.* May 2020, from <http://csgjusticecenter.org/nrrc/posts/thesecond-chance-act-the-first-five-years/>.
- Kriminalomsorgen. (2019). *Correctional Statistics of Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway and Sweden 2013 – 2017.* Retrieved April, 2020, from https://www.fangelsi.is/media/almennt/Nordic-Statistics-2013_2017-final.pdf
- Lynch, J., & Sabol, W. (2001). *Prisoner reentry in perspective (Justice Policy Center).* Washington, DC: The Urban Institute.

Ollenburger, J.C. (1986). Panel Members' Attitudes Towards Justice: An Assessment, *The British Journal of Criminology*, 26, 372-284,

doi:10.1093/oxfordjournals.bjc.a047628

Ortet-Fabregat, G., & Pérez, J. (1992). An assessment of the attitudes towards crime among professionals in the criminal justice system. *The British Journal of Criminology*, 32(2), 193–207. doi:10.1093/oxfordjournals.bjc.a048191

Ríkisslögreglustjóri. (2019). *Annual report for 2018*. Retrieved May, 2020, from [https://www.logreglan.is/wp-content/uploads/2019/05/Afbrotat%
c3%b6lfr%
c3%a6%
c3%b0i-2018-29.5.2019.pdf](https://www.logreglan.is/wp-content/uploads/2019/05/Afbrotat%c3%b6lfr%c3%a6%c3%b0i-2018-29.5.2019.pdf)

Skardhamar, T., & Telle, K. (2012) Post-release Employment and Recidivism in Norway. *J Quant Criminol* 28, 629–649 doi:10.1007/s10940-012-9166-x

Smith, D. M., & Woodbury, S. A. (1999). *Low-wage labor markets: The business cycle and regional differences*. Retrieved May 2020, from <https://aspe.hhs.gov/report/low-wage-labor-market-challenges-and-opportunities-economic-self-sufficiency>

Sutton, S. (2001) *Health Behavior: Psychosocial Theories*. International Encyclopedia of the Social & Behavioral Sciences. Elsevier. 6499-6506. doi:/10.1016/B0-08-043076-7/03872-9.

Visher, C., Baer, D., & Naser, R. (2006). *Ohio's prisoners' reflections on returning home*. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute, Justice Police Center.

Visher, Christy., Debus-Sherrill, Sara., & Yahner, Jennifer. (2011). Employment After Prison: A Longitudinal Study of Former Prisoners. *Justice Quarterly*. 28. 698-718. doi:10.1080/07418825.2010.535553.

Appendix

Appendix A – Background questions

1. Hvert er kyn þitt?

- Karl
- Kona
- Annað

2. Hver er aldur þinn ?

- 18-24 ára
- 25-34 ára
- 35-44 ára
- 45-54 ára
- 55-64 ára
- 65 ára eða eldri

3. Hvert er hæsta menntunarstig sem þú hefur lokið?

- Grunnskólapróf
- Stúdentpróf
- Iðnnám/Starfsnám
- Grunnám (BA/BSc/Diplóma)
- Framhaldsnám (MA/MSc)
- Doktorsgráða

4. Við hvað starfar þú?

- Sjálfstætt starfandi
- Á vinnumarkaði
- Án atvinnu
- Á eftirlaunum
- Nemi

~ ~ ~

Appendix B

5. Hversu fylgjandi eða andvíg/ur ert þú því að fyrirtæki biðji um sakavottorð við ráðningar?

- Mjög fylgjandi
- Frekar fylgjandi
- Hvorki né
- Frekar andvíg/ur
- Mjög andvíg/ur

6. Hversu fylgjandi eða andvígur ert þú því að vinna með einstaklingi sem hefur hlotið refsisdóm (setið inni í fangelsi) ?

- Mjög fylgjandi
- Frekar fylgjandi
- Hvorki né
- Frekar andvíg/ur
- Mjög andvíg/ur

7. Hversu fylgjandi eða andvígur ert þú því að vinna með fyrrum karlkyns afbrotamanni?

- Mjög fylgjandi
- Frekar fylgjandi
- Hvorki né
- Frekar andvíg/ur
- Mjög andvíg/ur

8. Hversu fylgjandi eða andvígur ert þú því að vinna með fyrrum kvenkyns afbrotamanni?

- Mjög fylgjandi
- Frekar fylgjandi
- Hvorki né
- Frekar andvíg/ur
- Mjög andvíg/ur

9. Hversu fylgjandi eða andvígur ert þú því að almennir starfsmenn viti hvort þeir starfi með fyrrum afbrotamanni?

- Mjög fylgjandi
- Frekar fylgjandi
- Hvorki né
- Frekar andvíg/ur
- Mjög andvíg/ur

10. Hversu fylgjandi eða andvígur ert þú því að þeir sem setið hafa af sér sinn dóm eigi skilið annað tækifæri á almennum vinnumarkaði?

- Mjög fylgjandi
- Frekar fylgjandi
- Hvorki né
- Frekar andvíg/ur
- Mjög andvíg/ur

11. Hversu fylgjandi eða andvígur ert þú því að íslenskir fangar hafi aðgang að samfélagsþjónustu hér á landi.

- Mjög fylgjandi
- Frekar fylgjandi
- Hvorki né
- Frekar andvíg/ur
- Mjög andvíg/ur

Appendix C

Hversu miklu eða litlu máli skipta eftirfarandi fullyrðingar þig? ✕ ⋮

Description (optional)

12. Ef einstaklingur sem hefur brotið af sér er ráðinn til starfa á þínum vinnustað, finnst þér eða finnst þér ekki skipta máli hversu langur tími hefur liðið frá því að afbrotið átti sér stað (t.d. vikur, mánuðir, ár, áratugur) ?

- Skipta miklu máli
- Skipta frekar miklu máli
- Hvorki né
- Skipta frekar litlu máli
- Skipta litlu máli

13. Þegar kemur að fyrrum afbrotamönnum, finnst þér skipta máli eða ekki skipta máli hvort einstaklingurinn hafi verið undir áhrifum áfengis og eða vímuefna þegar brot hans átti sér stað?

- Skipta miklu máli
- Skipta frekar miklu máli
- Hvorki né
- Skipta frekar litlu máli
- Skipta litlu máli

14. Finnst þér skipta máli eða ekki skipta máli hvort einstaklingur var unglingur eða fullorðin þegar brotið átti sér stað?

- Skipta miklu máli
- Skipta frekar miklu máli
- Hvorki né
- Skipta frekar litlu máli
- Skipta litlu máli

15. Finnst þér skipta máli eða ekki skipta máli í hvaða geira fyrrum afbrotamaður vinnur eftir afplánun (t.d. iðnaði, fjármálum, leikskóla) ?

- Skipta miklu máli
- Skipta frekar miklu máli
- Hvorki né
- Skipta frekar litlu máli
- Skipta litlu máli

16. Finnst þér skipta máli eða ekki skipta máli hvar einstaklingurinn lauk afplánun? (T.d. Litlahraun, Kvíabryggja, Hólmsheiði)

- Skipta miklu máli
- Skipta frekar miklu máli
- Hvorki né
- Skipta frekar litlu máli
- Skipta litlu máli

Appendix D – Icelandic translated version of ACS

Hversu sammála eða ósammála ertu eftirfarandi fullyrðingum? Merktu í EINN reit í HVERJUM líð.

	Mjög sammála	Sammála	Hvorki né	Ósammála	Mjög ósammála
Afbrotamenn eru fæddir afbrotamenn	<input type="radio"/>				
Aukið frjálsræði í samfélaginu getur aukið afbrotatíðni	<input type="radio"/>				
Glæpir ráðast af andlegum sjúkdómum/geðsjúkdómum	<input type="radio"/>				
Glæpahneigð er meðfædd	<input type="radio"/>				

Afbrotamenn geta ekki breytt örlögum sínum	<input type="radio"/>				
Glæpir ráðast af erfðabáttum einstaklings	<input type="radio"/>				
Ástæða glæpa eru skortur á efnahagslegum tækifærum og atvinnutækifærum	<input type="radio"/>				
Ástæða glæpa eru eingöngu félagslegu umhverfi að kenna	<input type="radio"/>				
Atvinnuleysi er ein aðal orsök glæpa	<input type="radio"/>				
Flestir afbrotamenn hafa fengið slæma eða takmarkaða menntun í skóla	<input type="radio"/>				
Eiturlyf eru meginástæða glæpa	<input type="radio"/>				
Ef einstaklingur fremur glæp er það útaf því að hann langar til þess	<input type="radio"/>				
Ástæða fyrir glæpum er frekar samfélaginu að kenna heldur en afbrotamanninum sjálfum	<input type="radio"/>				

Að lokum, þekkir þú einhvern persónulega sem hefur setið inni í fangelsi?

Já

Nei

Appendix E - ACS

Attitude Toward Crime Scale

Hereditary and individual causes

1. Criminals are *born* criminals.
2. Crime is caused by an excess of freedom in society
3. Crime is caused by mental illness
4. Criminality is predestined
5. Criminals cannot change their destiny
6. Crime is due only to hereditary factors

Social and environmental causes

7. Crimes is due to a shortage of economic and labor resources
 8. Crime is due only to social and physical environment
 9. Unemployment is the most important cause of crime
 10. Most criminals received a poor quality of education at school
 11. Drugs are the main cause of crime
 12. If a person commits a crime it is because he/she wants to
 13. Crime is more often a flaw in our society than a flaw in the offender
-