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ABSTRACT

In this study it was hypothesized that there would be a positive correlation between the attitudes that Social Workers hold on Capital Punishment and the value that they place on life. In addition to testing the hypothesis, the writer set out to determine whether or not a sample of Social Workers would favour the complete abolition of Capital Punishment as well as their rationale for this position. It was also the purpose of the project to determine whether or not the Social Workers in this study would perceive their attitudes towards Capital Punishment to be consistent with Social Work values as well as to determine the basis upon which they would perceive these attitudes to be either consistent or inconsistent.

A total of eighty-three subjects comprised the sample used in this study. The sample consisted of the following sub-samples: Social Work Educators, Field Instructors and Associate Field Instructors, and Degree Candidates in the final year of both the M.S.W. and B.S.W. Degree programs, at the School of Social Work, University of Windsor, as well as Community Social Workers who were members of the Ontario Association of Professional Social Workers.

The data for testing the hypothesis and seeking answers to the additional research questions was obtained by a questionnaire distributed to Social Workers in the Windsor area.
In testing the hypothesis, a statistically significant positive relationship was found to exist between Social Workers' attitudes towards Capital Punishment and the value they placed on life.

It was also found that 71.1 per cent of the Social Workers in this study favoured the complete abolition of Capital Punishment; 19.3 per cent advocated partial abolition, 7.2 per cent were undecided and only 2.4 per cent were in favour of its full retention.

In analyzing the reasons for the Social Workers' stated positions on Capital Punishment, it was found that abolitionists placed a high value upon life. Retentionists also placed a high value upon life but from a differing perspective. Abolitionists emphasized the dignity and value of the individual as well as the potential for rehabilitation of the offender, while retentionists emphasized the protection of life and the social utility of the death penalty as a deterrent.

Analysis of the data also indicated that many Social Workers in this study did not appear to place an absolute value on life. Rather, they seemed to be influenced by factors such as the priorities of personal protection and the protection of significant others which superceded the absolute value of life.

The majority of Social Workers in this study saw their position on Capital Punishment to be consistent with Social Work values.

Analysis of the data also indicated that the value placed upon human life may be viewed from the differing
perspectives of either the innate dignity of the individual
or the social responsibility of the individual to live in
harmony with other members of society. Although this duality
of values may be seen in the general Social Work literature,
it is not necessarily reflected by Social Workers when
discussing Capital Punishment. Retentionists seem to hold
their views in light of individual responsibility to members
of society, while abolitionists focus upon the innate worth of
the individual, in particular the offender.

It was suggested that a similar type of study might be
extended to include a wider sample of Social Workers, Social
Workers employed in Correctional settings as well as a com-
parative study of Social Workers and the general population.
Also, since many subjects focused upon the rehabilitation of
the offender, it was recommended that Social Workers conduct
research to determine how their skills might be more
effectively utilized to this end. As well, in order to shed
some light upon the conflicting theories of deterrence
promulgated by both retentionists and abolitionists, it was
suggested that research be conducted regarding the deterrent
effect of Capital Punishment, utilizing a sample of offenders
who were sentenced to life imprisonment for capital offences.
Finally, it was also suggested that further research might be
undertaken to determine the ways that graduate and under-
graduate Social Work students develop, incorporate and
maintain Social Work values.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

A. Purpose of the Study

On December 29, 1967, a five year moratorium on the use of the death penalty took effect in Canada. Only the killing of a policeman, warden or prison guard would still be punishable by death under the provisions of this legislation. The moratorium expires on December 28, 1972, and unless the legislature takes some prior action, the provisions for dealing with capital offenders which were in effect before the five year term will automatically apply.

Since the beginning of the moratorium there have not been any executions for capital offences. All persons sentenced to death have had their sentences reduced to life imprisonment by the action of the Cabinet of the Canadian Government.

In 1961, during the public debate prior to the implementation of this experiment in the partial abolition of Capital Punishment in Canada, the Canadian Association of Social Workers adopted a policy statement favouring the abolition of Capital

---


2Ibid., C. 35, S. 1-4.

1.
Punishment. This policy statement notes that Social Workers "believe firmly in the worth and dignity of every human being, and Capital Punishment is contrary to this belief." The Canadian Association of Social Workers therefore opposed the use of Capital Punishment in Canada.  

With the approaching end of the moratorium, the public debate on Capital Punishment is again emerging, and Canada will need to determine and evaluate its position in this regard.

To help clarify the position of the Social Work profession on this issue, the purpose of this research project is to investigate the attitudes of a sample of Social Workers towards Capital Punishment and the value they place on life.

The inherent "worth and dignity" of the individual is variously emphasized throughout Social Work literature as the foundation of Social Work practice.  As Social Work focuses upon the rehabilitation and habilitation of the individual, the basic premise of Social Work is to enhance life rather than to take life.

Although statements similar to the one made by the Canadian Association of Social Workers have been made by other Social Work services concerning Capital Punishment, little is actually

---


known about how Social Workers actually respond to the subject of Capital Punishment or the basis for their attitudes. It appears that, based upon the humanitarian tenets of the Social Work profession and the emphasis placed upon the dignity and worth of the individual, it might be expected that Social Workers would favour the abolition of Capital Punishment.

This research project responds to this assumption. It is the purpose of this project to determine whether or not there will be a positive relationship between the attitudes that Social Workers in this study hold on Capital Punishment and the value that they place on life as a measure of the dignity and worth of the individual. It is also intended to determine whether or not Social Workers do indeed favour the complete abolition of Capital Punishment as well as the bases for their position.

Additionally the researcher seeks to determine whether or not Social Workers perceive their attitudes towards Capital Punishment to be consistent with Social Work values. Finally, this research intends to determine the basis upon which these subjects perceive their attitudes towards Capital Punishment to be either consistent or inconsistent with Social Work values.

B. Review of the Literature Related to Capital Punishment

1. Arguments For and Against the Application of Capital Punishment

It is not the purpose of this review to present a detailed account of all arguments concerning the application of Capital Punishment, but rather to present an overview of the
major statements made on behalf of the retention and abolition of the death penalty. These arguments represent the views of society. Social Workers, like other professionals, do not operate in a vacuum but rather function within society and interact with the values and norms of that society.

Although there are many arguments for and against the abolition of Capital Punishment, the most frequently stated concern the rights of the individual versus the rights of the state; the effectiveness of Capital Punishment as a deterrent; and the possibility of reform and rehabilitation.

a. The rights of the individual and the rights of the state

A major argument offered by Capital Punishment advocates is that this form of dealing with crime is essential to protect society; it stands as an absolute sanction against the inhumanity of murder or other capital offences. Without it, respect for law and order would be diminished, leading to increased criminality and societal chaos. The state, then, has not only the right to take life but is obliged to do so in order to protect innocent persons and to preserve law and order.

Edward J. Allen, Chief of Police in Santa Ana, California, a retentionist, notes that:

Capital Punishment is the guarantee against murder and the brutalization of human nature. It places an inestimable value on human life—the forfeiture of the life of the despoiler. To allow criminals to commit their crime without commensurate reparation of the death penalty would surely brutalize and denigrate human nature and reduce society to a state of barbarism.5

Jacques Barzun, a noted American social philosopher and advocate of Capital Punishment, sees the protection of others as a prime basis for the use of Capital Punishment. He states that, "The uncontrollable brute whom I want put out of the way is not to be punished for his misdeed, nor used as an example or as a warning; he is to be killed for the protection of others." 6

Conversely, the abolitionist argument is that the state does not have the absolute right to take life. In this respect, the sanctity of life should not be interfered with even for the most serious offences against society. When life is interfered with, it brutalizes society. As Michael V. DiSalle states:

the death penalty solves nothing. It treats symptoms, ignoring the disease, the primary cause of crime. It eliminates the possibility of rehabilitation, thus denying a second chance to a potentially useful citizen. Capital Punishment becomes merely a communal experience of vengeance—a debasing passion in any society that calls itself civilized. 7

In line with the view that Capital Punishment is actually a form of legalized murder, Arthur Koestler affirms that the state should act as an example to the rest of society, emphasize the value of life, and cease acting as an instrument of calculated homicide. 8


It is argued by both abolitionists and retentionists that Capital Punishment is consistent with or contrary to the principles of religion in modern society, depending upon their view. Abolitionists argue that the Talionic Code, the blood-justice of the Judaeo-Christian heritage, is outdated and contravenes the humanistic component of modern religious thinking, the principle element of which is reformation rather than calculated retribution. These modern religious philosophers and laymen have interpreted that the concept of "an eye for an eye" includes a demand not only for justice but also for mercy.²

However, retentionists believe that retributive justice is not only legitimate and sanctioned by the "Law of God", seeing the "eye for an eye" philosophy to demand the enactment of due justice, but also essential for the protection of society.³

On the one hand, abolitionists often argue that Capital Punishment is retributive and vengeful punishment, having no place in a civilized penal system. On the other hand, retentionists argue that vengeance is an acceptable and integral part of justice. No form of punishment can exist without vengeance playing an integral part in the administration of justice. Bernard Cohen, a former Montreal lawyer, believes


that hatred and vengeance are a fact of life. In this regard he says:

Love and hatred, recompense for benefits received and vengeance in some form for injuries sustained are everlasting opposite sides of the same coin; and in no society is it possible to maintain one in the absence of the other.\textsuperscript{11}

C.S. Lewis, in speaking generally about the application of a humanitarian theory of punishment, indicates that the criminal:

from the moment he breaks the law is deprived of the rights of a human being. The reason is this. The humanitarian theory removes from punishment the concept of desert. But the concept of desert is the only connecting link between punishment and justice. It is only as deserved and undeserved that a sentence can be just or unjust.\textsuperscript{12}

Within this context, the death penalty is the only form of punishment that can give legitimate satisfaction to society for the crime of murder. The crime of murder, by this philosophy, demands not only satisfaction but revenge.

Those who favour the abolition of the death penalty argue that the application of the death penalty is open to the error of the judicial system. As long as the possibility of error exists, the rights of the individual are seriously threatened. Abolitionists support this view with examples of instances in which there have been miscarriages of justice, in which innocent men have been executed. Koestler, after citing such instances, supports the sentiment voiced by Lafayette:


"I shall continue to demand the abolition of the death penalty until I have the infallibility of human judgment demonstrated to me."

Retentionists, like Cohen, on the other hand, state that miscarriages of justice are indeed possible and an innocent person may be executed; however, these possible errors are minimal in our system of justice and are outweighed by the utility of Capital Punishment as a deterrent. They further argue that with the use of the adversary system and the legal defence available to the accused, the judicial system in our society seldom errs.

Abolitionists point out that the death penalty is often a discriminatory sanction applied to the poor, the uneducated or members of minority groups. Access to wealth may provide the accused with expert defence, whereas those who are socio-economically deprived must rely upon court appointed duty lawyers who often have less expertise and presumably exert less effort in defence of their clients. Retentionists counterargue that the present legal aid systems available provide an adequate defence for any person who is tried for a crime punishable by death.

Another objection to the death penalty raised by abolitionists which concerns the rights of the individual is that the legal taking of life is cruel and unusual punishment.

---


forcing the individual to endure the cruelty of waiting for
death at an appointed hour and finally experiencing an in-
humane death that is often neither swift nor efficient.\textsuperscript{16}
Retentionists say that Capital Punishment methods are swift
and humane. In fact, they often say that death is more humane
than having the individual endure a life sentence of imprison-
ment.\textsuperscript{17}

It is apparent from this controversy that those persons
who favour the abolition of Capital Punishment focus their
attention on the rights of the individual as well as upon
the innate dignity of the individual while retentionists,
on the other hand, focus upon human rights and dignity from
the perspective that the death penalty is an instrument that
protects society, insuring the dignity of individual members
of society who might be brutalized by the capital offender.

b. The effectiveness of Capital Punishment as a deterrent

The question of the deterrent effect of Capital Punishment
has been debated for centuries. As early as 1764 Beccaria
questioned the value of the death penalty for this purpose.
He said that to be effective, punishment must be repeated.
The human spirit, he says, is more deeply affected by slight
but repeated impressions than by powerful but momentary action.
The spectator observes servitude over a long period of time

\textsuperscript{16}Gerald H. Gottlieb, "Capital Punishment," \textit{Crime and

\textsuperscript{17}Department of Economic and Social Affairs of the United
and this inspires terror in him. Death has one powerful impact and then it is over and liable to be forgotten. He argues that by using life imprisonment rather than the death penalty the deterrent factor is actually increased because one crime then supplies a lasting example of what happens to offenders. Beccaria also points out that the man who considers the laws of society as unjust or who simply wants to break the law will do so, enjoying the fruits of this disregard for the law as long as he can and then will be willing to pay ultimately with his death, having had his way while he lived. Life imprisonment, according to Beccaria, does not allow a man to think this way because life imprisonment is too long lasting and a much heavier debt to pay than the one brief moment of dying. Punishment, he feels, should be certain, immediate, and just severe enough to deter the criminal. 18

The idea that Capital Punishment is not a deterrent is shared by some modern writers, though sometimes for reasons different from Beccaria. Both Joyce and Koestler contend that Capital Punishment does not deter because the types of people who commit most murders are not the type who can be deterred. Koestler states that Capital Punishment might only deter those murderers who are of the professional criminal class and then he goes on to say that both abolitionists and their opponents agree that "murder is not a crime of the

criminal class; it is a crime of amateurs, not professionals."  
Joyce considers the argument that Capital Punishment is ineffective as a deterrent to most murderers to be the very basis of his book on Capital Punishment.  
The National Council on Crime and Delinquency, in their Policy Statement on Capital Punishment stated that:  
Those who receive the death penalty are rarely professional killers or confirmed criminals. With rare exception they are persons of low social status, predominantly members of minority groups, and often mentally retarded or defective although deemed legally sane. Their crimes are impulsive rather than planned—another factor bearing on the question of deterrence.  
Thorsten Sellin, after examining the data concerning murder rates within groups of American states having similar social and economic conditions and populations, but with differing laws on Capital Punishment, concluded that executions do not have any effects upon homicide rates. Capital Punishment, he says, "has failed as a deterrent. If it has utilitarian value it must rest upon some other attribute than its power to influence the future conduct of people."  
In regard to the point that Capital Punishment will deter criminals from making fatal attacks upon police officers,  

19 Koestler, Reflections on Hanging, p. 49.  
Sellin has demonstrated, in a study of police killings in abolitionist and non-abolitionist states, that there is no basis for this argument. In fact, from his study it appears that there was appreciable little difference in the number of policemen killed in abolitionists and non-abolitionists states.  

On the side of the retentionists, the point it often made that it is impossible to count the crimes that do not occur because of the death penalty. The illustration of a lighthouse is often given. It is impossible to know how many ships have been saved from shipwreck because it is there; but no one, on that basis, would recommend that it be removed.

The answer that Cohen gives to the question of whether the death penalty is a deterrent or not is, as he says, both negative and positive. Obviously, he says, it is not completely effective. If it were, murder would no longer exist. On the other hand, he finds ludicrous the contention that in no instance does the fear of death prevent a person from committing a crime:

No statistics are available nor indeed any other kind of recordings as to the number and variety of murders that are perhaps being daily considered but not proceeded with...In all such instances, where the commission of a mortal offence is refrained from, there is obviously some inhibiting factor.

And Cohen believes that in at least some cases this factor is the fear of the death penalty.

---


The British Royal Commission on Capital Punishment suggests agreement with the point of view expressed by Cohen when it reported that it is not possible to arrive at a "firm conclusion about the deterrent effect of the death penalty or indeed any form of punishment." However, the Commission concluded that, "prima facie, the penalty of death is likely to have a stronger effect than any other form of punishment and there is some evidence (though no convincing statistical evidence) that this is in fact so." 26

The Canadian Commission on Capital and Corporal Punishment and Lotteries reported that, "the committee has concluded that Capital Punishment does exercise a deterrent effect that would not result from imprisonment or other forms of punishment." On this basis, the Committee recommended the continued application of Capital Punishment in Canada. 27

The arguments for and against the deterrent value of Capital Punishment have been debated for centuries and will continue to be debated both intuitively and objectively. Abolitionists and retentionists alike often use the same statistical evidence to support their particular point of view. Statistical analyses appear to have focused upon the commission


of criminal acts as a basis for comparative analysis of the
effects of the deterrent value of Capital Punishment rather than
an analysis of the offender's reaction to the deterrent
component of Capital Punishment.

c. Rehabilitation and reformation

Advocates of the retention of the death penalty often
argue that rehabilitation and reformation of the capital
offender is not possible. Society must be protected from the
individual returning to society and committing another capital
offence. Imprisonment, it is argued, offers the potentiality
of parole or escape. The absolute protection of society is
guaranteed by the application of the death penalty, which
absolutely prevents recidivism. Rehabilitation is cited as
extremely costly and impossible in cases of the psychopathic
personality or the criminally insane. In this respect, Capital
Punishment is sometimes perceived as serving a eugenic function
by eliminating socially undesirable strains from society and
reducing costs to society, both socially and economically.²⁸

Advocates of the abolition of Capital Punishment affirm
that imprisonment is a suitable alternative to Capital Punishment.
They do not contend that the offender should be rewarded for
his crime, but rather that he should be given the opportunity
to meet the demands of society for justice with dignity.
Imprisonment serves as a protection of society and as a possible

²⁸Sir Ernest Gowers, A Life for a Life?: The Problem of
basis for rehabilitation. Such rehabilitation is precluded in the finality of the death penalty. MacNamara, an American criminologist, contends that the death penalty is "the antithesis of the rehabilitative, non-punitive, non-vindicitive orientation of twentieth century penology." He also believes that Capital Punishment impedes the reform of penal institutions. New approaches to treating the criminal are "impossible so long as the death penalty and the discredited penology it represents pervades our criminal justice system."

2. Trends towards the Abolition of Capital Punishment

In primitive societies, retaliatory murder was an acceptable act of revenge against an individual who committed an act of murder or personal injury. With the codification of law, the act of revenge was institutionalized and carried out by the state on behalf of the offended party or relatives. Linked to the Talionic Code of blood revenge, "action by the state was purely retaliatory" and "embraced no idea other than vengeance."

During the seventeenth, eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, executions were frequent, abundant, and often accompanied by torture. There was a wide range of crimes

---


30 Ibid., p. 193.

which carried a mandatory death sentence. 32

During the first quarter of the nineteenth century, accompanying the rise of liberal democratic institutions and the development of a working class during the industrial revolution, pressures were exerted upon governments to reform the penalties applied to criminal offences. Along with the attempts to generally reform the judicial and penal processes, reformers sought to attain imprisonment as a viable alternative to the death penalty for many petty crimes, a general reduction of the number of capital offences as well as humane forms of execution. As the result of societal pressure and the reform movement, many governments limited the use of the death penalty and narrowed the offences for which it would apply. 33

Great Britain is a classic example of the trend towards both the limitation of offences and the abolition of Capital Punishment. At the beginning of the nineteenth century, the number of offences for which Capital Punishment could apply reached a total of 222. It could apply for such petty crimes as shooting a rabbit, the forgery of a birth certificate, the theft of a pocket handkerchief or the adoption of a disguise. 34 By 1837, the number of offences for which the death penalty could apply was limited to fifteen. These involved such offences as murder, arson, rioting, serious sexual crimes, robbery with violence, piracy, anarchy, and a single crime against property--


33 Scott, The History of Capital Punishment, pp. 76-86.

34 Ibid., pp. 39-44.
the theft of government documents. In 1861 there were only four capital crimes: murder, treason, piracy with violence and arson in Government dockyards or arsenals.

The narrowing of offences for which Capital Punishment applied in Great Britain continued and in 1965 the application of the death penalty was suspended for a trial period of five years. In December, 1969, the House of Commons and the House of Lords approved the permanent abolition of the death penalty in Great Britain.

The trend noted in the history of Capital Punishment in Great Britain is repeated in most European countries, the United States, where the Supreme Court, in 1972, declared the death penalty as unconstitutional, and in Canada where, during the past five years, there has been a moratorium on the application of the death penalty.

Confirming this trend, the 1960 Ancel Report, a cross cultural study on Capital Punishment conducted by the United Nations, affirmed that the number of countries where offences other than murder are punishable by death is on the decline. However, the same report indicated that there is evidence that Capital Punishment often reappears in abolitionist states


Ibid., p. 17.

for political crimes in times of political crisis. 38

The 1968 Morris Report, a second cross cultural analysis of Capital Punishment conducted by the United Nations, indicates that there is a tendency towards fewer executions and infrequent application of the death penalty where countries have existing legislation for its use. This Morris study also indicates that there is an apparent steady movement towards abolition. Despite the trend towards the reapplication of Capital Punishment in exceptional circumstances as pointed out in the Ancel Report, the Morris Report states that Capital Punishment appears to be becoming a discretionary rather than a mandatory sentence. 39

The Morris Report also notes that: "Almost all countries have provision for the exclusion of certain offenders because of their mental and physical condition, extenuating circumstances, age and sex; the scope of categories thus exempted is broadening." There appears to be a gap, it reports, between the "legal provisions" for its use and the application of those provisions. This study reveals an increasing number of offenders sentenced to the death penalty are not executed as the result of executive intervention or judicial processes. It is also noted that offenders who are faced with the death


penalty but who have been spared execution are often confined in normal prison settings and are provided with processes for their eventual release. Finally the Morris Report indicates that:

all of the available data suggest that where the murder rate is increasing, abolition does not appear to hasten the increase. Where the rate is decreasing, the abolition does not appear to interrupt the decrease; where the rate is stable, the presence or absence of Capital Punishment does not appear to affect it.40

3. Capital Punishment in Canada

a. Legislative trends

Attempts to abolish Capital Punishment in Canada date back at least to 1914 when a Montreal Liberal, Robert Bickerdike, attempted to have the death penalty legislatively removed from the Criminal Code of Canada and to substitute a life sentence.41 The Bickerdike Bill was defeated by the House.

A bill similar to the Bickerdike legislation was introduced by William Irvine of East Calgary in 1924, again asking for the substitution of the life sentence for the death penalty.42 This bill was defeated by the House of Commons.

In 1950, before he became a Liberal and the Premier of Saskatchewan, Ross Thatcher, then a CCF member of the Federal Legislature, introduced a private member's bill providing

40Ibid., p. 82.


for the abolition of Capital Punishment. This bill was withdrawn when he believed that it would not pass.\textsuperscript{43} Again in 1953, Thatcher introduced another Capital Punishment abolition bill.\textsuperscript{44} This second bill was withdrawn on the assurance that a special committee would be established by the Government of Canada to survey and study the subject of Capital Punishment.\textsuperscript{45}

In 1954, the Joint Committee of the House of Commons and the Senate began a study of Capital and Corporal Punishment and Lotteries in Canada. After two years of study and hearing of testimony, the Joint Committee tabled a report on Capital Punishment which recommended the retention of Capital Punishment. This committee affirmed a belief in the deterrent value of the death penalty to Canadian society.\textsuperscript{46}

In 1961, the Federal Government introduced legislation which defined two types of murder: capital and non-capital. The death penalty would apply only for those offences within the category of capital murder. Under provisions of Section 202A of the Canadian Criminal Code, capital murder was defined as premeditated murder and murder carried out in the commission of other crimes.\textsuperscript{47}

\begin{itemize}
\end{itemize}
In April of 1966, legislation introduced by the Federal Government to completely abolish the death penalty was voted down and total abolition of Capital Punishment was rejected by the Legislature. However, the following year, the Government introduced compromise legislation to abandon the death penalty for a five year trial period. During this period, Capital Punishment would apply only for the capital murder of police officers and wardens or prison guards killed in the line of duty. 48 This legislation was ratified by both Houses and on December 29, 1967, the moratorium on the application of the death penalty took effect for a period of five years. This moratorium will terminate on December 28, 1972.

Within the period of this moratorium, in response to the Quebec crisis, a notice of motion was given by M.P. Mr. Thompson on October 13, 1970, that political kidnapping should be made a crime subject to the death penalty. It was argued that society must defend itself against anarchy, protect political institutions, and place severe penalties on crimes against the state. 49 Similar strong feelings have been expressed in Parliament regarding seditious acts and the hijacking of aircraft. This reflects the tendency noted in the United Nations report to enact Capital Punishment legislation in times of political crisis. 50


Since 1962, no person has been executed in Canada for any offence. Since the moratorium of the death penalty for offences other than the killing of police officers and prison guards, no condemned person has been executed for these specific offences. The Cabinet, in each instance, has reduced the death sentence to one of life imprisonment. Thus Canada, while maintaining a "de jure" position of retaining the death penalty, has in fact attained a position of "de facto" abolition by the commutation of all death sentences to life imprisonment.

b. Public opinion

Although there has been a political trend towards the abolition of Capital Punishment in Canada, public opinion has apparently not supported this position. Canadian Gallup Polls on the issue conducted in 1943 and 1953 showed that "more than 7 in 10 adults felt that the death penalty should be retained on our criminal code. About 2 in 10 were against it."51 There was a shift in public opinion noted in 1958. Although the public still favoured the use of Capital Punishment, "From 71% in favour of Capital Punishment in 1953, the ratio had dropped to 52% in 1958. Thirty three per cent wanted to abolish executions and a larger number than usual were confused."52

A Canadian Gallup Poll conducted a year before the implementation of the moratorium again showed that 53 per cent of

52 Ibid., p. 2.
the Canadian public wanted the retention of the death penalty, while 37 per cent wanted to abolish it; 6 per cent had no opinion; and 4 per cent had qualified responses.53

However, the most recent Gallup Poll conducted in February, 1972, at the beginning of the fifth year of the moratorium indicated another shift, in that a growing number of Canadians surveyed supported the retention of Capital Punishment. In this most recent poll, 63 per cent of the Canadians surveyed believed that Capital Punishment should be reinstated, and 30 per cent felt that it should not be reinstated; 7 per cent were undecided. This survey indicated that of those who favoured the reinstatement of Capital Punishment, the majority felt that the incidence of murder has increased since the main deterrent to murder was eliminated by the moratorium. The report also indicated that, "Others believe it is simple justice and quote the biblical law. A number believe that life sentence means early parole and release of dangerous criminals to kill again." of the 30 per cent who felt that Capital Punishment should not be reinstated, 46 per cent indicated that one should not take a life and that two wrongs do not make a right. Twenty-four per cent saw a life sentence as sufficient punishment; 13 per cent felt that the present situation is acceptable and that the death penalty is not a deterrent to crime.54

53Ibid., p. 2.

As a group whose main function it is to serve and protect the public, the police are intimately involved in the issue of Capital Punishment since their lives are often threatened in the line of duty. The police have long favoured the retention of Capital Punishment and have been very vocal about their position. Under present legislation in effect during the moratorium, the killing of policemen or prison guards is punishable by death. However, during this moratorium no person convicted of either of these crimes has been executed. The Cabinet has commuted the sentences of all those convicted of these crimes. Police officers and their associations have been vocal in their opposition to this state of affairs.

The 66th Annual Conference of the Canadian Association of Chiefs of Police adopted the following resolution on Capital Punishment:

WHEREAS, there is a decided increase in the number of murders committed in Canada from year to year, and

WHEREAS, the murder of police officers and prison guards forms a percentage of this increase, and

WHEREAS, it is apparent the mandatory death penalty for those convicted of the offence of capital murder is not being applied as it is intended to be applied; now therefore be it

RESOLVED that the Canadian Association of Chiefs of Police make representation to the Minister of Justice of Canada to have the law enforced as provided for in the Criminal Code of Canada; now, therefore be it further

RESOLVED that consideration be given to a review of the penalty of the crime of murder to determine whether any true deterrent values are now being derived from the current day application of the law.55

55 Quoted from a letter to the researcher from the Executive Director of the Canadian Association of Chiefs of Police, Mr. Bernard E. Poirier, March, 1972.
During the 1972 Annual meeting of the Canadian Police Association held in St John's, Newfoundland, the Association resolved that Capital Punishment should be reinstated for all crimes "in which acts of violence result in the death of any person." The same resolution stated that individuals should face the death penalty if they take a life "while committing such crimes as child molestation, rape, conspiracy, political assassination, treason and robbery...." As well, this same organization indicated that when judicial appeal processes have been exhausted and where no recommendation for clemency exists, the Federal Cabinet should not be permitted to commute the death sentence. The alternative to the death sentence should be limited to natural or true life imprisonment. They also stated that the issue of Capital Punishment should be taken to the Canadian public in the form of a national referendum.56

4. Literature Related to Social Work and Capital Punishment

In reviewing the literature on Capital Punishment there appears to be little information that is directly related to Social Work and Capital Punishment. Canadian information that is available is dated prior to the Government moratorium on Capital Punishment.

However, in March, 1954, the Canadian Welfare Council presented a brief to the Joint Committee of the Senate and House of Commons on the revision of the Criminal Code concerning the retention of the death penalty. The Council stated that

they favour the eventual abolition of Capital Punishment based on the following arguments: "the responsibility for crime does not rest with the individual alone," the criminal "is a product of his environment." They recognized the need for punishment but did not see punishment based on vengeance as having any part in criminal law. They questioned the deterrent effect of Capital Punishment, stating that "experience with the abolition of the death penalty in connection with crimes other than murder would indicate there is no risk in abolition." And finally they pointed out the risk of error in adjudication. However, they also stated that they were aware that many thoughtful and humanitarian persons have misgivings about what the results of abolishing the death penalty would be. They realize that some of these persons believe that the death penalty has a unique deterrent effect and until a means is found to remove the causes of crime this means of deterrence may be needed. Some of these people feel that society is not ready for the abolition of Capital Punishment, although at some time in the future it may be ready. Finally, the Canadian Welfare Council realizes that some believe that treatment services have not attained the level of perfection that would seem desirable, which raises the question of what would happen to the murderer if no means of dealing with him, except imprisonment, were available.\footnote{The Canadian Welfare Council, "On the Retention of the Death Penalty as a Punishment under the Provisions of the Criminal Code," a brief presented to the Joint Committee of the Senate and House of Commons on Revision of the Criminal Code, March, 1954, pp. 1-11.}
Larry Heinemann, a Social Worker, as Executive Director of the John Howard Society of Saskatchewan, indicated that he believed that "it is morally wrong for anyone, including the state, to take a human life," as well as perceiving it morally wrong to punish one individual as an example to others. Instead, punishment should be of some benefit to the offender rather than to a hypothetical unknown person. He also believed that there is no basis for claiming that Capital Punishment acts as a deterrent to homicides: "an examination of the facts available might lead one to believe that the reverse is actually true." Although he does not believe that "Capital Punishment contributes to a higher homicidal rate...it appears that there is a direct connection between the value placed on life in any given state or country and the homicide rate":

Societies which place a high value on human life have low homicide rates and rarely or never inflict the death penalty. Societies in which there is much discrimination, large well integrated and effectively isolated minority groups in which violence against the person is an accepted value, have a high homicidal rate and inflict the death penalty frequently. 58

Stephen Cumas, as Executive Director of the John Howard Society of Quebec, in a letter to the editor of the Montreal Star discussed the question of Capital Punishment. He felt it significant that a large number of prison wardens who are directly involved with carrying out executions do not favour Capital Punishment. He says that the most vocal retentionists are judges, district attorneys, policemen and general law

enforcement agents, while the most vocal abolitionists are social scientists, clergymen, and members of humanitarian organizations. Mr. Cumas is convinced that Capital Punishment is not a deterrent in cases of the insane, the confused or the passion killer, or the syndicated or organized crime killer and therefore it has no place in the administration of justice. 59

Although this study is mainly concerned with the issue of Capital Punishment as it relates to Social Workers in Canada, the policy statement on Capital Punishment developed in April, 1964, by the National Council on Crime and Delinquency is both topical and relevant. This United States organization adopted the following policy statement:

WHEREAS, the death penalty is not a unique deterrent, and

WHEREAS, many who are executed are persons who have limited intellect and are mentally ill, their crimes being impulsive, not planned, and hence committed without thought of the penalty, and

WHEREAS, the fallibility of human beings and the legal process has resulted and may again result in the conviction of innocent persons, and their execution so long as the death penalty is used, and

WHEREAS, sentences should not be based on vengeance, therefore, be it

RESOLVED that the Board of Trustees of the National Council on Crime and Delinquency condemns the use of the death penalty and urges its discontinuance and abolition in states in which it still exists. 60


This policy statement effectively sums up many of the arguments used by Social Service organizations who favour the abolition of Capital Punishment.

More directly related to Social Work, its theory, and Capital Punishment, the Canadian Association of Social Workers, in 1961, adopted a policy statement on Capital Punishment. The Association recommended the immediate abolition of the death penalty on the basis that, "Social Workers believe firmly in the worth and dignity of every human being, and capital punishment is contrary to this belief." As well, it stated that "the provision of capital punishment does not reduce the incidence of murder or any other crime, as the experience of 30 other countries that have abolished it shows." In fact, there is reason to believe that murder is less frequent when human life, including the life of the convicted murderer, is respected. The Association also indicated that "the purpose of law is to provide justice to the criminal and to society against which he has offended. The best defence against crime is the elimination of the causes of crime and the rehabilitation of the offender." Clearly, the focus of this organization's position is one of the value of human life and of the reformation and rehabilitation of the offender.61

Imrie Nemeth, a Social Worker, has stated that, "the philosophical position which the idea of reformation represents in criminology and penology is the same which motivates Social

Work." He indicates that the individual "has a personal dignity which is of ultimate value in and of itself, that the realization of this dignity is necessary for human growth and development and is achieved in interaction with other persons." He emphasizes that "the unique dignity of the individual and the improvement of individual and social conditions are indispensable concepts of the profession." The idea of deterrence and retribution are, according to Nemeth, a negation of the person which leads him to conclude that Capital Punishment is "incompatible with the philosophical position upon which the ethical principles of Social Work depend as Capital Punishment excludes the possibility of reformation."  

Again, the obvious emphasis placed upon the rehabilitation and dignity of the individual should be noted.

In examining the general literature concerning Social Work values this same emphasis may be seen.

Felix Biestek, a Social Worker, has stated that in the hierarchy of Social Work values, the dignity and worth of the human being is of supreme value. Gisela Konopka points out, "the demand for human dignity to be accorded everyone, even the offender, is not just the request of sentimentalists. It is based on increased knowledge of human beings. Without it, 


change towards improvement is impossible." 64 Oren and Kidneigh state that "the inherent dignity and worth of the individual establishes the right to survive in terms which are satisfying to him and the world." 65 Muriel Pumphrey, in a study of the teaching of values and ethics in Social Work education, found that one of the most frequently mentioned ultimate values in questionnaires, course content, class audits and professional literature was that "each human being should be regarded by all others as an object of infinite worth. He should be preserved in a state commensurate with his innate dignity and protected from suffering." 66 Helen Northen indicates that a conviction of the inherent worth of the individual is a fundamental tenet of professional Social Work:

He who has this conviction will hold dear certain specific values. Each person should be treated with respect—he should have opportunities to grow towards the fulfillment of his potential for his own sake and so that he may contribute to the building of a society better able to meet human needs. 67

Additionally, Northen indicates that the Social Worker needs to have a dual concern for the self-realization of the individual


and the betterment of the society of which he is a member. 68

Clearly there appears to be a dual focus upon both the belief in the dignity of the individual as well as the potentiality of helping the individual achieve a personal growth in ways that are satisfying to the individual. However, it is also evident, especially in the statement by Helen Norten, that this value base functions in terms not only of the individual but also in terms of the social well-being, security and harmony of both the individual and society.

In this respect, the value placed upon the dignity and worth of the individual is directly related to the social responsibility of the individual to seek fulfillment in a manner which does not interfere with the well-being of society and members of that society. This idea of individual responsibility and the duality of Social Work values is discussed by numerous persons writing on Social Work. Among them are Herbert Aptekar in "Basic Values of North American Social Work," 69 Cren and Kidneigh in "Attitudes Reflecting Social Work Values," 70 Lillian Bye in "Social Work Values and Social Work Education," 71 and Ruth Smalley in Theory.

68 Ibid., p. 2.


for Social Work Practice. 72

As seen in the review of the general literature relating to Social Work values, emphasis is placed upon the individual worth and dignity of the human being, but emphasis is also placed upon the theme of social responsibility. However, this dual focus does not appear to be strongly emphasized in the literature directly related to Social Work and Capital Punishment. Here, the dignity of the individual is viewed from the perspective of the offender. It is felt that this individual, despite his conflict with societal norms, should be valued and regarded as a person of worth and his dignity as a human being preserved. On this basis, Capital Punishment is seen as antithetical to the values of Social Work and in this regard the focus of the arguments against Capital Punishment indicate that the offender should be preserved and attempts should be made to rehabilitate him.

To explore whether individual Social Workers do indeed favour the abolition of Capital Punishment and hold the absolute value of life which is suggested in the Review of the Literature concerning Social Work and Capital Punishment, will be the purpose of this research study.

CHAPTER II

RESEARCH DESIGN

A. Hypothesis and Research Questions

It is the purpose of this research project to test the hypothesis which states: THERE WILL BE A POSITIVE CORRELATION BETWEEN THE ATTITUDES THAT SOCIAL WORKERS HOLD ON CAPITAL PUNISHMENT AND THE VALUE THAT THEY PLACE ON LIFE.

In addition to testing this hypothesis, the researcher wishes to determine answers to the following research questions:

- Do Social Workers favour the complete abolition or retention of Capital Punishment?
- On what basis do Social Workers favour the complete abolition or the retention of Capital Punishment?
- Do Social Workers perceive their attitudes towards Capital Punishment as being consistent with Social Work values?
- On what basis do Social Workers perceive that their attitudes towards Capital Punishment are consistent with Social Work values?

B. Operational Definitions

For the purpose of testing the hypothesis, operational definitions are offered on Capital Punishment, attitudes towards Capital Punishment and values placed on life.

34.
"Capital Punishment" refers to the judicial punishment by death for a crime.

"Attitudes towards Capital Punishment" refers to the Social Workers' attitudes towards Capital Punishment as determined by both the subjects' stated position on Capital Punishment as well as the score that subjects achieved on a Capital Punishment rating scale.

"Values that they place on life" shall refer to Social Workers' attitudes towards life as determined by the score that subjects achieved on a life rating scale.

C. Population

The research population was made up of the following groups: Social Work educators of the School of Social Work, University of Windsor; graduating Social Work students enrolled in the graduating year of the Masters of Social Work and the Bachelor of Social Work programs at the University of Windsor, and Community Social Workers residing and

73Social Work educator refers to an individual who teaches Social Work full or part time in the School of Social Work, University of Windsor. These educators will also be referred to as Social Work faculty.

74This group makes up the student sub-sample. It includes Masters of Social Work Degree Candidates and the Bachelor of Social Work Degree Candidates which includes two groups: Four Year Bachelor of Social Work Degree Candidates enrolled in the fourth year of the undergraduate Social Work program and who have not yet an undergraduate degree and the One Year Make-Up Bachelor of Social Work Degree Candidates who are enrolled in the fourth year of the Bachelor of Social Work program and who have earned a prior undergraduate degree.
working in the Essex County area of Ontario. 

The operational criteria used to define who were Social Workers and who were to be included in this research study were as follows:

- an official list of the 1971-72 full time or part time Faculty of the School of Social Work, University of Windsor, obtained from the School of Social Work, University of Windsor;

- registration lists of the graduating year of the 1971-72 Masters of Social Work students and Bachelor of Social Work students, obtained from the School of Social Work, University of Windsor;

- an official list of the 1971-72 Social Work Field Work Instructors for the University of Windsor School of Social Work, obtained from the School of Social Work, University of Windsor;

- an official list of all members of the Ontario Association of Professional Social Workers, Windsor and Essex County Branch, as of December, 1971.

These criteria excluded all professional Social Workers who are not members of the Ontario Association of Social Workers and those Social Workers who are not directly connected with the University of Windsor School of Social Work in a teaching role.

75 Community Social Workers refers to that portion of the total population or total sample which consists of Field Work Instructors and Social Workers who are registered members of the Ontario Association of Professional Social Workers, Windsor and Essex County Branch.
capacity. Since there was a possibility that an individual might be included on more than one list, these lists were examined and edited for duplication of names. The names on these edited lists, a total of 125 subjects, comprised the population from which the sample was obtained.

D. Sample

Since there was not a compiled list available of all Social Workers residing and working in the Essex County area of Ontario, the researcher used a sample based upon the criteria outlined above. The researcher sought to achieve a quota of at least 51 per cent of all sub-samples of the population in order to assure a degree of representativeness.

A questionnaire was distributed to all persons named on the edited list comprising the research population. Sixty-six (53 per cent) of these questionnaires were distributed to non-student Social Workers and 59 (47 per cent) were distributed to Social Work Degree Candidates. Table 1 gives a complete presentation of the population receiving questionnaires.

Diagram 1 graphically illustrates the distribution of questionnaires according to the criteria used for inclusion in the research population.

On the basis of the information received, returned questionnaires were grouped according to the three following categories: Social Work Educators; Community Social Workers; and graduating Social Work students.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Work Educators (full and part time)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Social Workers</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>42.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.S.W. Degree Candidates</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.S.W. Degree Candidates (Four Year)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.S.W. Degree Candidates (One Year)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>125</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since there were three distinct sub-groups within the graduating student population, Social Work students' returns were grouped according to their graduating year: Masters of Social Work graduating students; Bachelor of Social Work (Four Year) graduating students; and Bachelor of Social Work (One Year) graduating students.

A total of eighty-five questionnaires were returned by the predetermined closing date. Two of these questionnaires were not used because they were incomplete. Thus, a total of eighty-three questionnaires made up the total sample. Six questionnaires were received after the predetermined closing date, too late for inclusion in this analysis.

Table 2 indicates the frequency and percentage of questionnaires that were returned by subjects.
Diagram 1

Graphic representation of the population receiving questionnaires.
### TABLE 2: Returned Questionnaires Comprising the Sample.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composition of Sample</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Work Educators (full and part time)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Social Workers</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>42.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.S.W. Degree Candidates</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.S.W. Degree Candidates (Four Year)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.S.W. Degree Candidates (One Year)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>83</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All returns comprise 72.8 per cent of the questionnaires distributed. The returns included in the sample comprise 66.4 per cent of the questionnaires distributed to the total population. Non-students comprise 55.4 per cent of the sample and students comprise 44.6 per cent of the sample.

Diagram 2 graphically illustrates the make-up of the sample used in this research project.

**E. Method of Data Collection**

A questionnaire was developed as a means of collecting data in order to reach as many Social Workers as possible in the time available. It was perceived that this method was an appropriate means of obtaining information from those members of the population who were known to the researcher and who might possibly not respond openly and freely within the context of a structured interview. In addition, due to the personal
DIAGRAM 2

GRAPHIC REPRESENTATION OF SOCIAL WORK SAMPLE -- SOCIAL WORK EDUCATORS, COMMUNITY SOCIAL WORKERS AND GRADUATING SOCIAL WORK STUDENTS.
and controversial nature of the subject being researched, this method was also chosen in order to insure confidentiality and to protect the anonymity of respondents.

The questionnaire (see Appendix A) was pretested on a group of twenty undergraduate Social Work students who were not subjects of the population to be surveyed. Following the pretest, the questionnaire was distributed to all subjects of the research population. All subjects were instructed to return the questionnaire to the School of Social Work, University of Windsor, in the envelope that was provided. Social Workers in the community who had received questionnaires were provided with a stamped return envelope in order to facilitate a maximum number of responses.

A cut-off date was preselected, allowing five weeks for subjects to return questionnaires. At least one reminder was given to the total population, either in writing, by telephone or by personal communication.

The questionnaire was originally designed to elicit information on the attitudes of Social Workers in regard to Capital Punishment and persons convicted of murder. However, only those questions and sections which were directly related to the testing of the hypothesis and to answering the research questions outlined previously have been included in this report.

Questions 1, 9, 11, and 12 in Part I of the questionnaire were designed and used to collect biographical data that would facilitate the grouping of returned questionnaires in predetermined categories, as well as to describe the character-
istics of the sample. Questions 13, 14, 16, and 17 were constructed and used to elicit information concerning the attitudes of the respondents towards Capital Punishment.

In Part II of the questionnaire, subjects were requested to rank a series of forty-eight statements related to Capital Punishment on a five part scale. Two sections of these forty-eight statements were used in this research project: statements 1–21 and statements 26–32. The first set of statements, 1–21, centre upon a variety of issues related to Capital Punishment and comprises the Capital Punishment Scale used in testing the hypothesis. The second set of statements, 26–32, focus upon the research subjects' personal orientation towards the taking of life and comprises the Life Scale used in testing the hypothesis.

F. Methods of Data Analysis

Questions 13, 14, 16, and 17 in Part I of the questionnaire were analyzed for content, and with the exception of Question 13 were not statistically tested. Rather, due to the nominal nature of the data, the responses to these questions have been presented in tabular form as numerical values or percentages. Where applicable, the collected data has been presented in categories derived from the subjects' responses.

Responses to statements 1–21 and 26–32 in Part II of the questionnaire were scored on a weighted rating of 1 to 5 corresponding to the following categories: strongly agree; agree; indifferent or can't decide; disagree; and disagree strongly. With the exception of statements 5, 7, 19, and 20,
the responses indicated were scored on the 1 to 5 scale coinciding with the strongly agree-strongly disagree continuum. Statements 5, 7, 19, and 20 were scored in reverse order of 5 to 1 coinciding with the strongly agree-strongly disagree continuum due to the presentation of these statements in negative form. The category of "indifferent or can't decide", the midpoint on the rating scale, was scored as a 3 since this is considered as a positive ranking position between agree and disagree rather than as a neutral position. To rate this as a 0 when this position may represent either a mild agree or disagree could radically alter the total scores and present a depressed scoring pattern.

The individual scores for each statement in sections 1-21 and 26-32 were totalled seperately for each subject. This total represents a raw score for each subject on the Capital Punishment Scale and Life Value Scale. These scores were used as a basis for comparing the respondents' position on Capital Punishment and their personal values on the taking of life.

The scores for statements 1-21 and 26-32 obtained from all groups and sub-groups were correlated using the "Pearson r" and tested for significance using the "Pearson r" t table for tests of significance.

In consideration of the nominal nature of the data derived from Question 13 which indicates the respondents' position on


Capital Punishment, the scores for statements 1-21 and 26-32 were each correlated with Question 13 using the rΦ correlation and tested for significance using the rΦ conversion formula for Chi-square.

In order to dichotomize the raw scores obtained for statements 1-21 and 26-32 and use an rΦ 2x2 table, the mean of the raw scores of all subjects in the total sample for statements 1-21 and 26-32 were calculated and used as the basis for dichotomization.78 Those scores that fell above the mean were ranked as "high" and those that fell below the mean were ranked as "low". In order to likewise dichotomize the responses to Question 13 for all groups and subgroups, it was necessary to consolidate the responses into two categories: those favouring the total abolition of Capital Punishment and those not favouring the total abolition of Capital Punishment. Those subjects who indicated that they were undecided were grouped in the non-abolitionist category on the basis that they did not indicate that they favoured the abolition of Capital Punishment.

CHAPTER III

ANALYSIS OF DATA

A. Introduction

The null hypothesis states that THERE WILL NOT BE A POSITIVE CORRELATION BETWEEN THE ATTITUDES THAT SOCIAL WORKERS HOLD ON CAPITAL PUNISHMENT AND THE VALUE THAT THEY PLACE ON LIFE. In order to test this null hypothesis for significance at the .05 level, the researcher determined the subjects' stated position on Capital Punishment as well as the scores that they achieved on both the Capital Punishment Scale and Life Scale. Section B of this chapter deals with the presentation and analysis of the subjects' stated position on Capital Punishment, the scores that were achieved on both the Capital Punishment and Life Scales as well as the testing of the hypothesis. Section C presents and analyzes additional data as related to the research questions.

B. Presentation and Analysis of Data Related to the Testing of the Hypothesis

1. Stated Position on Capital Punishment

Question 13 of the questionnaire requested the subjects to indicate which statement was most representative of their position on Capital Punishment. The following six choices were
presented to them:

- Capital Punishment should be fully retained.
- Capital Punishment should be abolished completely.
- Capital Punishment should be partially abolished except for a specific number of criminal offences.
- Capital Punishment should be made mandatory for an increased number of offences.
- My position on Capital Punishment is undecided at this time.
- I do not have a specific position on Capital Punishment.

a. Stated position on Capital Punishment--total sample

Table 3 outlines the frequency and percentage of the total sample’s stated position on Capital Punishment according to the categories outlined in Question 13.

TABLE 3.--Statement on Capital Punishment: Frequency and Percentage of Total Sample.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position on Capital Punishment</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Complete Abolition</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>71.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partial Abolition</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Retention</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Stated position on Capital Punishment as derived from Question 13 in Appendix A.
It is found, from the data in Table 3, that 90.4 per cent of the total sample considered their position on Capital Punishment to be within either of the two categories of complete abolition or partial abolition. In these two categories, 71.1 per cent of the total sample indicated that they favoured the complete abolition of Capital Punishment while 19.3 per cent favoured partial abolition.

A small percentage of the total sample, 7.2 per cent, indicated that they were undecided and an even smaller percentage, 2.4 per cent, indicated a preference for the full retention of Capital Punishment. None of the subjects responded that they did not have a specific position on Capital Punishment or that they favoured its application for an increased number of offences.79

Although there was only a small percentage of the total sample who favoured the full retention of Capital Punishment, 2.4 per cent, when those subjects are included with those who favoured partial abolition, it is seen that 21.7 per cent of the total sample favoured the application of Capital Punishment in some form. Finally, on the basis of the data presented in Table 3 it is concluded that a sizable majority of the total sample considered themselves in favour of the complete abolition of Capital Punishment.

79Since there were no subjects who chose these categories, these categories are not included in any of the tables.
b. Stated position on Capital Punishment--Community Social Workers and Social Work Faculty Sub-Sample

Table 4 indicates the frequency and percentage of the position on Capital Punishment chosen by subjects in the non-student sub-sample, consisting of Community Social Workers and Social Work Faculty.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position on Capital Punishment</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Complete Abolition</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>65.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partial Abolition</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>26.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Retention</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As may be noted in Table 4, 65.2 per cent of the sub-sample favoured the complete abolition of Capital Punishment, 6.5 per cent were undecided, 26.1 per cent favoured the partial abolition of Capital Punishment, and 2.2 per cent saw full retention as most representative of their position. The combination of those subjects who favoured partial abolition and full retention indicates that 28.3 per cent of this sub-sample favoured the use of Capital Punishment in some form.

Noting the obvious differences in the size of the sub-samples, the positions on Capital Punishment for both the Community Social
Workers and Social Work Faculty who comprise the total non-student sub-sample may be observed and compared in Table 5.

TABLE 5.--Frequency and Percentage of Stated Positions on Capital Punishment--Community Social Worker and Social Work Faculty Sub-Samples.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position on Capital Punishment</th>
<th>Community Social Workers</th>
<th>Social Work Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete Abolition</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>62.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partial Abolition</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Retention</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It was found that the majority of Social Workers in both sub-samples stated that they favoured the complete abolition of Capital Punishment. It was also found that a higher percentage of Social Work Faculty (72.7 per cent) favoured the complete abolition of Capital Punishment when compared to Community Social Workers (62.8 per cent). It was also observed that 28.6 per cent of the Community Social Workers favoured the partial abolition of Capital Punishment while only 18.2 per cent of the Social Work Faculty favoured partial abolition.

Among the Community Social Workers, 5.7 per cent were undecided
while 9.1 per cent of the Social Work Faculty responded this way. While none of the Social Work Faculty stated that they favoured the full retention of Capital Punishment, 2.9 per cent (1 of 35) of the Community Social Workers stated a preference for this position.

c. Stated position on Capital Punishment--M.S.W. and B.S.W. Candidate Sub-Sample

Table 6 indicates the stated position on Capital Punishment of the total M.S.W. and B.S.W. Candidate sub-samples.

TABLE 6.--Frequency and Percentage of Stated Positions on Capital Punishment--Total M.S.W. and B.S.W. Degree Candidate Sub-Sample.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position on Capital Punishment</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Complete Abolition</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>78.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partial Abolition</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Retention</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>37</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The majority of Degree Candidates stated that they favoured the complete abolition of Capital Punishment. When the positions of those who favoured the partial abolition of Capital Punishment are grouped with those who favoured its full retention, it is seen that 13.5 per cent of the sub-sample has indicated that some form of the death penalty would be acceptable to them.
Keeping in mind the differences in the size of the sub-
samples, the stated position for both the M.S.W. Degree
Candidates and B.S.W. Degree Candidates who comprise the total
student sub-sample may be compared in Table 7.

TABLE 7.--Frequency and Percentage of Stated Positions on
Capital Punishment--M.S.W. and B.S.W. Degree
Candidates.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position on Capital Punishment</th>
<th>M.S.W. Candidates</th>
<th>B.S.W. Candidates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete Abolition</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partial Abolition</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Retention</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Again, the majority of subjects within this sub-sample
stated that they favoured the complete abolition of Capital
Punishment. There was a significant difference between the
M.S.W. and the B.S.W. Degree Candidates, however. Only 60.0
per cent of the M.S.W. Candidates favoured its complete abolition,
whereas 85.2 per cent of the B.S.W. Candidates favoured this
position. One of the two subjects from the total sample who
favoured the full retention of Capital Punishment came from
this B.S.W. sub-sample.

The positions on Capital Punishment of the One Year B.S.W. Candidates and the Four Year B.S.W. Candidates are compared in Table 8.

**TABLE 8**—Frequency and Percentage of Stated Positions on Capital Punishment—One Year and Four Year B.S.W. Candidates.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position on Capital Punishment</th>
<th>1-year B.S.W. Candidates</th>
<th>4-year B.S.W. Candidates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete Abolition</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>90.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partial Abolition</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Retention</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As may be seen in Table 8, the majority of both Social Work Degree Candidate sub-samples have stated a preference for the complete abolition of Capital Punishment. Only a small percentage of both sub-samples have indicated preference for any other position. Also, by comparing the data outlined in Table 8 with the data in Table 5 and Table 7, it was observed that the highest percentage of subjects favouring the complete abolition of Capital Punishment was obtained by both the One Year and Four Year B.S.W. Degree Candidates.
d. Summary of stated positions on Capital Punishment.

Table 9 summarizes the subjects' stated position on Capital Punishment by sub-samples.

As can be seen in Table 9, on the basis of their stated position on Capital Punishment alone, Social Workers appear to favour the abolition of Capital Punishment. This finding shows this sample of Social Workers to differ from the general Canadian population. In the most recent Canadian Gallup Poll, only 30 per cent of the Canadian citizens surveyed favoured the abolition of Capital Punishment whereas 71.1 per cent of all the Social Workers in this sample favoured its complete abolition and 19.3 per cent favoured its partial abolition. However, it is also of note that all Social Workers do not favour its complete abolition.

It is perhaps significant that the highest percentage of those subjects within the sample who favoured the complete abolition of Capital Punishment are students in the B.S.W. program. Among these students, 90.0 per cent of the One Year B.S.W. Candidates and 82.4 per cent of the Four Year B.S.W. Candidates favoured complete abolition. The sub-sample demonstrating the next highest percentage is the Faculty (72.7 per cent) followed by Community Social Workers (62.7 per cent) and the M.S.W. Candidates (60.0 per cent).

The data available seems to suggest that, other than among the Social Work Faculty, there may be a drop-off of ideal values as one approaches professional practice. Ernest Witte has stated:
TABLE 9.--Stated Position on Capital Punishment Showing Frequency and Percentage by Sub-Sample.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Samples</th>
<th>Complete Abolition</th>
<th>Partial Abolition</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Full Retention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f. %</td>
<td>f. %</td>
<td>f. %</td>
<td>f. %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Social Social Workers (N=35)</td>
<td>22 62.8</td>
<td>10 28.6</td>
<td>2 5.7</td>
<td>1 2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty (N=11)</td>
<td>8 72.7</td>
<td>2 18.2</td>
<td>1 9.1</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>30 65.2</td>
<td>12 26.1</td>
<td>3 6.5</td>
<td>1 2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree Candidates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSW Candidates (N=10)</td>
<td>6 60.0</td>
<td>2 20.0</td>
<td>2 20.0</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-yr. BSW Candidates (N=10)</td>
<td>9 90.0</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
<td>1 10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-yr. BSW Candidates (N=17)</td>
<td>14 82.4</td>
<td>2 11.7</td>
<td>1 5.9</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>29 78.4</td>
<td>4 10.8</td>
<td>3 8.1</td>
<td>1 2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>59 71.1</td>
<td>16 19.3</td>
<td>6 7.2</td>
<td>2 2.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It is my observation...that Social Work students, at the time they are admitted to schools of Social Work, have been more idealistic, more concerned to build an equitable society, and more enthusiastic about the potential contribution of Social Work than they are when they graduate.

He also says that:

The corroding influence of the materialistic society in which Social Work is practiced appears to change the behavior and values of Social Workers and make their responses more nearly like that of the general public despite the professional goals which would suggest a different pattern.\footnote{Ernest F. Witte, "Student Wisdom and Values: The Positive Force of Affection", in Social Work Values in an Age of Discontent, ed. by Katherine A. Kendall (New York: Council on Social Work Education, 1970), p. 95.}

Although the preferred position on Capital Punishment among all sub-samples still indicates a strong contrast to Canadian public opinion, the Faculty stands at the midpoint of a continuum of very high ideal values to a lower set of ideal values. The researcher does not believe that it is possible to state conclusively, within the parameters of this study, that such an erosion of values has taken place, since the position on Capital Punishment of these subjects prior to entry into Social Work studies was not determined; however, the point is worthy of consideration and possibly could be the basis for further study.

2. Scores on Capital Punishment Scale and Stated Position on Capital Punishment

It was possible for any subject, in responding to the twenty-one Capital Punishment statements, to obtain a weighted score ranging from 21 to 105. Tabulated weighted scores for
the total sample on Capital Punishment statements ranged from 50 to 105 with a calculated median of 86.8 and a mean of 84.4. The mode of these weighted scores was found to be 93.

As can be observed in Diagram 3, the distribution of the scores on the Capital Punishment Scale were skewed in the direction of the higher range of scores. It would appear that the distribution of scores generally coincides with the sample's preference for the complete abolition of Capital Punishment. Yet, as was demonstrated by the subjects' stated positions on Capital Punishment, there appear to be important differences among the sample as to scored positions on Capital Punishment.

The scores that were achieved on the Capital Punishment Scale were used to further verify subjects' stated position on Capital Punishment. This check was effected using an r correlation as a basis for comparison and statistical analysis. Scores on the Capital Punishment Scale were dichotomized in terms of those scores that fell either above or below the mean achieved by the total sample on the Capital Punishment Scale. As a basis of analysis, the stated positions on Capital Punishment were dichotomized in terms of those subjects who favoured or did not favour the complete abolition of Capital Punishment. The results of the statistical analysis of this comparison are found in Tables 10 and 11.

As may be seen in Tables 10 and 11, the findings regarding the total sample demonstrate that there is a statistically significant relationship between the subjects' stated position on Capital Punishment and the scores that have been achieved
Diagram 3

Frequency distribution of scores that subjects achieved on the capital punishment scale.


TABLE 10.--Correlation Coefficient and Significance Comparing Scores on Capital Punishment Scale with Stated Position on Capital Punishment--Non-Student and Student Sub-Samples.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Samples</th>
<th>Number of Subjects</th>
<th>$r_\phi$ Correlation</th>
<th>Chi-Square Value</th>
<th>Significance .05</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Social Workers and Faculty</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>.649</td>
<td>19.348</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Social Work Degree Candidates</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>.773</td>
<td>22.130</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Sample</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>.703</td>
<td>41.027</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 11.--Correlation Coefficient and Significance Comparing Scores on Capital Punishment Scale with Stated Position on Capital Punishment--All Sub-Samples.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Samples</th>
<th>Number of Subjects</th>
<th>$r_\phi$ Correlation</th>
<th>Chi-Square Value</th>
<th>Significance .05</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Social Workers</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>.629</td>
<td>13.836</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>.770</td>
<td>6.519</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.S.W. Degree Candidates</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>10.000</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All B.S.W. Degree Candidates*</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>.606</td>
<td>9.928</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Sample</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>.703</td>
<td>41.027</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Seventeen 4-year B.S.W. Candidates demonstrated an $r_\phi$ correlation of .595 with significance at the .05 level. Ten 1-year B.S.W. Candidates demonstrated an $r_\phi$ correlation of .666, with significance at the .05 level.
on the Capital Punishment Scale ($r \phi = 0.703, \chi^2 = 41.027, df=1, \alpha = <.05$). As well, it is found that this same relationship significant at the .05 level, was also demonstrated by all sub-samples of the total sample.

It appears, then, that the positions on Capital Punishment held by subjects in this research project are verified by the scores that were achieved on the Capital Punishment Scale. This leads the researcher to conclude that the subjects' stated position on Capital Punishment and the scores on the Capital Punishment Scale may be interpreted as reliable indicators of the total sample's attitude towards Capital Punishment.

3. Correlation of Capital Punishment Scale with Life Scale

In responding to the seven statements on the Life Scale in the questionnaire, it was possible for any subject to obtain a weighted score ranging from 7 to 35. Based upon the subjects' responses, tabulated weighted scores for the total sample on the seven life statements ranged from 14 to 35 with a calculated median of 24.1 and a mean of 24.8. The mode for these weighted scores of all subjects was observed to be 26.

The frequency and distribution of these weighted scores are illustrated in Diagram 4. It is noted that these weighted scores have approximated a normal distribution in contrast to the skewed distribution of scores on the Capital Punishment statements, suggesting that there were important differences among the subjects of the sample as to the value that they place upon life.
DIAGRAM 4

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF SCORES THAT SUBJECTS ACHIEVED ON THE LIFE SCALE
Tables 12 and 13 indicate the statistical findings in comparing the scores on the twenty-one Capital Punishment statements with the scores on the seven life statements using the Pearson r test.

**TABLE 12.**--Correlation of Capital Punishment Scale* with Life Scale**—Non-Student and Student Sub-Samples.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Samples</th>
<th>Number of Subjects</th>
<th>Pearson r Coefficient</th>
<th>Significance .05</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Social Workers and Faculty</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>.556</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Social Work Degree Candidates</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>.362</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Sample</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>.495</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*See questions 1-21 in Appendix A.
**See questions 26-32 in Appendix A.

From the results of the statistical tests presented in Table 12, it was observed that a statistically significant positive correlation was demonstrated to exist between the scores of all subjects on the twenty-one Capital Punishment statements and the scores of all subjects on the seven life statements (r = .495, df = 81, \( \alpha = .05 \)).

This relationship is similarly demonstrated by the non-student sub-sample consisting of Community Social Workers and Social Work Faculty (r = .556, df = 44, \( \alpha = .05 \)) as well as by the Social Work Degree Candidate sub-sample (r = .362, df = 35, \( \alpha = .05 \)).
TABLE 13.—Correlation of Capital Punishment Scale with Life Scale—All Sub-Samples.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Samples</th>
<th>Number of Subjects</th>
<th>Pearson r Coefficient</th>
<th>Significance .05</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Social Workers</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>.551</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>.554</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.S.W. Degree Candidates</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.362</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 year B.S.W. Candidates</td>
<td>10*</td>
<td>.674</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 year B.S.W. Candidates</td>
<td>17*</td>
<td>-.045</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Sample</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>.495</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*All B.S.W. Degree Candidates (N=27) demonstrated a Pearson r coefficient of .289 with no significance at the .05 level.

With some variation in significance, all sub-samples demonstrated a positive correlation between the scores achieved on the Capital Punishment Scale and the Life Scale with the exception of the Four Year B.S.W. Degree Candidates who demonstrated a negative correlation of -.045 which was not statistically significant.

On the basis of the statistically significant correlation that was found to exist between the scores of the total sample on the Capital Punishment Scale and the Life Scale, it was concluded that these subjects demonstrated a positive relationship between their attitudes towards Capital Punishment and the value that they place on life.
4. Life Scale and its Relationship to the Stated Positions on Capital Punishment

In order to further test the hypothesis in terms of the subjects' stated position on Capital Punishment, the scores on the Life Scale were compared with the subjects' stated position on Capital Punishment. An rφ correlation was used as a basis of comparison and statistical analysis. Thus, scores achieved by subjects were dichotomized in terms of those that were either above or below the mean of the scores of the total sample which were achieved on the Life Scale. Additionally, the research subjects' stated positions on Capital Punishment were dichotomized on the basis of those persons who indicated that they either favoured the complete abolition of Capital Punishment or did not favour the complete abolition of Capital Punishment. The data derived from the statistical analysis of the subjects' stated positions on Capital Punishment and the subjects' scores on the Life Scale using an rφ correlation is found in Table 14.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Samples</th>
<th>Number of Subjects</th>
<th>rφ Correlation</th>
<th>Chi-Square Value</th>
<th>Significance .05</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Social Workers and Faculty</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>.461</td>
<td>9.757</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Social Work Degree Candidates</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>.101</td>
<td>.377</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Sample</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>.363</td>
<td>11.139</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From the data presented in Table 14, it may be observed that a positive relationship was demonstrated to exist between the scores that all subjects of the total sample achieved on the Life Scale and their stated position on Capital Punishment.

A similarly positive relationship was demonstrated to exist within the major of sub-samples of Community Social Workers and Faculty ($r^2 = .461, \chi^2 = 9.757, df = 1, \alpha = <.05$) as well as among all Social Work Degree Candidates ($r^2 = .101, \chi^2 = .377, df = 1, \alpha = n.s.$). Whereas the correlation coefficient of the Community and Faculty sub-sample is significant at the .05 level, the correlation coefficient of the Social Work Degree Candidate sub-sample is not significant.

However, as can be seen in Table 15, there are noticeable differences among the Social Work Degree Candidate sub-samples. In particular, both the M.S.W. Candidates and the Four Year B.S.W. Candidates have demonstrated a lack of correlation between the scores achieved on the Life Scale and their stated positions on Capital Punishment, whereas the One Year B.S.W. Candidates have demonstrated a positive $r^2$ correlation of .509 which was not significant.

In contrast to the M.S.W. Candidates and the Four Year B.S.W. Candidates, the One Year B.S.W. Candidate sub-sample, by definition, was a select group, chosen as candidates for their Social Work program not only on the basis of academic qualifications but also maturity and Social Work experience. The researcher suggests that this may have influenced the statistical findings in regard to this group.
TABLE 15.--Correlation of Stated Positions on Capital Punishment with Scores Achieved on the Life Scale--All Sub-Samples.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Samples</th>
<th>Number of Subjects</th>
<th>rφ Correlation</th>
<th>Chi-square Value</th>
<th>Significance .05</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Social Workers</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>.555</td>
<td>10.787</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>.149</td>
<td>.244</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.S.W. Degree Candidates</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 year B.S.W. Candidates</td>
<td>10*</td>
<td>.509</td>
<td>2.593</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 year B.S.W. Candidates</td>
<td>17*</td>
<td>-.142</td>
<td>3.699</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Sample</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>.363</td>
<td>11.139</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*All B.S.W. Degree Candidates (N=27) demonstrated an rφ correlation of .112 and a Chi-square value of .338 which was not statistically significant at the .05 level.

The Four Year B.S.W. Candidates, by the nature of the undergraduate program, are younger than the One Year B.S.W. Candidates, have had less work experience and, in particular, the least Social Work experience of all members of the Social Work Degree Candidate sub-samples. The researcher suggests that the statistical findings with regard to this sub-sample may be related to these factors. This student sub-sample may not have had the opportunity to internalize or test out the values that they believe they hold. This lack of internalization might be revealed by the scores that they achieved on the Life Scale when compared with both their stated position on
Capital Punishment and the scores they achieved on the Capital Punishment Scale.

Since no firm conclusion in this regard can be drawn from the data of this study, the researcher points out that further research is warranted. Further research could possibly determine the impact of Social Work experience upon the development, integration and maintenance of the values of professional Social Work by students of that profession.

5. Acceptance of the Hypothesis

On the basis of the positive relationship demonstrated in correlating the scores of all 83 subjects on the Capital Punishment Scale with their stated positions on Capital Punishment ($r_\phi = .703, \chi^2 = 41.027, \alpha = .05$), the positive relationship obtained in correlating the scores of all 83 subjects on both the Life Scale and the Capital Punishment Scale using the Pearson r test ($r = .495, \alpha = .05$), and finally the positive relationship achieved in correlating the scores of the 83 subjects on the Life Scale with their stated positions on Capital Punishment ($r_\phi = .363, \chi^2 = 11.139, \alpha = .05$), the researcher rejects the null hypothesis and accepts the alternate hypothesis which states: THERE WILL BE A POSITIVE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE ATTITUDES THAT SOCIAL WORKERS HOLD ON CAPITAL PUNISHMENT AND THE VALUE THAT THEY PLACE ON LIFE.
C. Additional Data Related to the Research Questions

1. Comparison of the Distribution of Capital Punishment Scores and Life Scores

Acceptance of the hypothesis was based on the fact that a statistically significant relationship was demonstrated between the attitudes that Social Workers of this sample hold on Capital Punishment and the value that they place on life. In order to explore this relationship, the overall distribution of scores on both the Capital Punishment and Life Scales have been examined and analyzed. Table 16 points out the frequency and percentage of all scores that fell above or below the mean according to the stated positions on Capital Punishment of the total sample.

From the data presented in Table 16, it may be observed that of those subjects who stated that their position on Capital Punishment was that of partial abolition, the major proportion of scores fell below the mean on both the Capital Punishment and Life Scales. A total of 18.8 per cent fell above the mean; 12.5 per cent of these scores fell above the mean on the Life Scale and 6.3 per cent fell above the mean on the Capital Punishment Scale.

Similarly, with those subjects who stated that they favoured the full retention of Capital Punishment, the total number of scores fell below the mean on both the Capital Punishment and Life Scales.

From the above data, it would indeed seem that of the subjects who favoured either the partial abolition of full retention of Capital Punishment, their scores fell almost consistently
below the mean. It would appear that for the majority of these subjects, the taking of life is acceptable in some circumstances.

TABLE 16.—Frequency and Percentage of Scores on the Capital Punishment and Life Scales Falling Above and Below the Mean According to Stated Positions on Capital Punishment—Total Sample.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positions on Capital Punishment and total number of subjects choosing that position</th>
<th>C.P. Scale</th>
<th>Life Scale</th>
<th>C.P. Scale</th>
<th>Life Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete Abolition N=59</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>86.4</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>57.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partial Abolition N=16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided N=6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Retention N=2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The mean on the Capital Punishment Scale was 84.6.
** The mean on the Life Scale was 24.8.

Among those subjects who stated that their position on Capital Punishment was undecided, it was found that 66.7 per cent of their scores on the Capital Punishment Scale fell below the mean and 33.3 per cent above the mean. Whereas the major proportion of scores on the Capital Punishment Scale fell below the mean for those whose stated position was undecided, the frequency and percentage of scores on the Life Scale were equally divided above and below the mean.
In terms of the overall distribution of scores exhibited by the total sample, it would appear that, of the individuals who stated that they were undecided, a sizable portion of them indeed favour the application of Capital Punishment but were undecided as to when and under what circumstances a life might be taken. It appears that these subjects are undecided as to the acceptability of taking life rather than the acceptability of the death penalty as a sanction.

In examining the distribution of scores of those subjects who stated that they favoured the complete abolition of Capital Punishment, it was found that 51 out of 59 (86.4 per cent) of the scores on the Capital Punishment Scale fell above the mean, with 8 out of 59 (13.6 per cent) falling below the mean. Of the scores that fell below the mean on the Capital Punishment, 6 out of 8 (75.0 per cent) are accounted for by Community Social Workers and 2 out of 8 (25.0 per cent) by Four Year B.S.W. Candidates. Additionally it was discovered that of those subjects who favoured the complete abolition of Capital Punishment, 34 out of 59 (57.6 per cent) of the scores on the Life Scale fell above the mean and 25 out of 59 (42.4 per cent) fell below the mean.

It is important to note that these scores were also achieved by subjects other than members of the Social Work Degree Candidate sub-samples which were the sub-samples that demonstrated almost none or no correlation in the preceding statistical tests.81

81 See Table 13, p. 63 and Table 15, p. 66.
This precludes the idea that this is simply a reflection of the inconsistency of the students.

Ten of the 25 scores (40.0 per cent) that fell below the mean on the Life Scale were achieved by Community Social Workers, 4 out of 25 (16.0 per cent) by Social Work Faculty, 3 out of 25 (12.0 per cent) by M.S.W. Degree Candidates and 8 out of 25 (31.0 per cent) by the B.S.W. Degree Candidates. Fourteen of the 25 scores (56.0 per cent) that fell below the mean on the Life Scale for this abolitionist group were achieved by Community Social Workers and Faculty, while 11 out of 25 (42.4 per cent) were obtained by Social Work Degree Candidates.

It appears that, although the greatest majority of scores on the Capital Punishment Scale of those who favoured the abolition of Capital Punishment fell above the mean, these scores on the Life Scale are significantly divided above and below the mean. Based upon the nature of the statements contained in the Life Scale, this division may be explained by the fact that there are both personal and impersonal statements in the rating scale. It would seem then, that there may be, among this group, a differentiation between the values placed on life in more personal and proximate situations. This points out that among these Social Workers, and in particular a sizable number of Community Social Workers, life is not valued absolutely. The value placed upon life may be influenced by their personal response to protecting themselves, their family or significant others.

It is not surprising that the scores of subjects who
favored the application of Capital Punishment in some form were more consistent than of those who favored its abolition, since their stated position already allows for the taking of life under certain circumstances.

2. Rationale for Stated Positions on Capital Punishment

Subjects were requested to give the rationale for their stated position on Capital Punishment in Question 14, in order to explore the reasons why Social Workers would favor either the abolition or retention of Capital Punishment. There were 119 responses obtained from 71 subjects in the total sample. Twelve subjects gave no response. Of the responses from these 71 subjects, 5 of them were not used because the responses given could not be understood. This means that a total of 114 responses from a total of 66 subjects could be used. Table 17 presents the responses of subjects to this question.

Consistent with the often stated opinion that Capital Punishment acts as a deterrent,\(^\text{82}\) of the eighteen persons who stated that they favored Capital Punishment in some form, eight saw Capital Punishment as a deterrent. Of these eight, five also saw Capital Punishment as an effective means of protecting the lives of citizens and public servants, e.g. police or prison guards. Another ten subjects who favored Capital Punishment in some form gave no response as to their reasons for holding this position.

Three persons who were undecided gave no response to this question. The remaining three indicated that their knowledge

\(^{82}\) See the Review of the Literature, p. 12.
TABLE 17.—Rationale for Stated Position on Capital Punishment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rationale for Stated Position</th>
<th>Number of Responses*</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capital Punishment is not a deterrent.</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No one has the right to take a life.</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus should be on rehabilitation rather than upon the termination of life.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The value placed on life.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Punishment is revengeful.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opposition is based on ethical, moral or religious principles.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Punishment serves no useful purpose.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Punishment acts as a deterrent.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Punishment is irreversible and there is the possibility of error.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Punishment serves as a protection to society.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because of the explosive and emotional nature of murder, Capital Punishment serves no purpose.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure of society.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The victim's life cannot be restored through execution.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>114</td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* A total of 114 responses from only 66 subjects could be used.
of the subject was so limited that they could not make a decision at this time; one indicated that he felt he was in a position between complete abolition and partial abolition and had not considered the matter fully because he had not been in a position which would force him to clarify his thinking. Finally, another subject who was undecided indicated that changing situations regarding prison reform and the possibility of new means of rehabilitation leave much to be desired in terms of a person making a contribution to society even if contained in a prison setting, suggesting that he questions the value of the prison experience.

Since the greatest number of responses came from those subjects who favoured the complete abolition of Capital Punishment, their responses concerning the rationale for their position have been outlined in Table 18.

In analyzing the responses of those subjects who favoured the abolition of Capital Punishment, it appears that the greatest proportion of responses fell into categories 1, 3 and 4 which relate to the value of life. The subjects who responded in this manner appear to hold the view that the value of life is important enough to serve as the partial basis for their decision to favour the abolition of Capital Punishment. It should also be noted that 14 out of 101 (13.9 per cent) of these responses indicated that the focus of society should be on rehabilitation, not the termination of life. Another 31 of these responses (30.7 per cent) point out that either Capital Punishment does not act as a deterrent, or more generally that
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason for Position Favouring Abolition</th>
<th>Number of Responses*</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. No one has the right to take a life.</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Capital Punishment is not a deterrent.</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Focus should be on rehabilitation and not on the termination of life.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The value placed on life.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Capital Punishment serves no useful purpose.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Opposition is based on ethical, moral or religious principles.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Capital Punishment is revengeful.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Capital Punishment is irreversible and there is the possibility of error.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Because of the explosive and emotional nature of murder, Capital Punishment serves no purpose.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Failure of society.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. The victim's life cannot be restored through execution.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>101</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Responses are from 59 persons.
it serves no useful purpose or that it is unable to restore
the life of the victim (categories 2, 5, 9, and 11). Because
of the spontaneous and emotional nature of murder, not only
may Capital Punishment serve no purpose, but it may also be
too severe a punishment. Another 9 (8.9 per cent) of the
responses state that Capital Punishment is revengeful and
punitive and therefore has no place in a civilized society.

Another factor in this group's rationale (5 out of 101
responses or 5.0 per cent) is the irreversibility of the death
penalty and the possibility of error in adjudication. Another
3 (3.0 per cent) saw the failure of society to provide
resources for the prevention of crime as an important factor
in forming their decision.

While religious, moral or ethical reasons are often
given as the basis for the use of Capital Punishment, as seen
in the Review of the Literature, none of the respondents
who favoured the partial or full retention of Capital Punish-
ment gave these reasons, such as "an eye for an eye", to
support their position. In contrast, however, 9 of the
reasons (8.9 per cent) given by those who favoured the abol-
ition of Capital Punishment fell into this category. For
example, they said that life is a God-given right; they quoted
the Commandment "Thou shalt not kill"; they saw the taking of
life in any form as being immoral.

As a result of the analysis of the data received from
the subjects related to the rationale for their stated position

83 See page 6.
on Capital Punishment, subjects who favoured the complete
abolition of Capital Punishment seem to place a high priority
on the value of the life of the individual, do not see Capital
Punishment as a deterrent, and are concerned with the
rehabilitation of the offender. Although these responses
appear to be consistent with the espoused values of professional
Social Work which place emphasis upon sustaining and enhancing
life rather than upon the taking of life, these same reasons
are given by the general population as a basis for the
abolition of Capital Punishment.

The majority of statements received in response to the
rationale for stated positions on Capital Punishment were
received from those subjects who favoured the abolition of
Capital Punishment—101 out of 114. The remaining 13 responses
came from those 10 subjects who favoured the partial or full
retention of Capital Punishment. Eight of these subjects
saw Capital Punishment as an effective deterrent, and 5 also
saw it as protecting the lives of citizens and public servants.

There are several interesting factors to note in examining
the rationale given by the Social Workers in this sample who
favoured the retention of Capital Punishment in some form.
Although there was a small response rate from this group,
those who did respond to the question evidently view Capital
Punishment as a means of protecting life. They see Capital
Punishment acting as a deterrent and thus protecting the life
of the potential victim. This may be interpreted to indicate
that the individual who favours the use of Capital Punishment
values life just as highly as the abolitionist but from a different perspective and with a different focus than that used as the basis of this research project where life was given an absolute value. In particular, they appear to identify more closely with the potential victim, while the abolitionist tends to identify with the offender and sees the potentiality of rehabilitating that offender as paramount.

Thorsten Sellin has indicated that:

Capital Punishment is characteristically advocated by persons who have deeply rooted beliefs in retribution, atonement or vengeance. Capital Punishment is characteristically opposed by persons who have deeply rooted beliefs in the personal value and dignity of the common man and in the scientific approach to understanding of the motives underlying human behavior.84

However, from the research findings of this study, it would appear that the Social Workers who favoured the application of Capital Punishment and who did respond as to their reasons, do not focus upon retribution, atonement or vengeance. As was noted above, none of these subjects gave as a reason for their position the need for retribution, i.e. "an eye for an eye." Rather, they focused upon Capital Punishment acting as a deterrent and as a protection for the lives of people in society.

3. Attitudes towards Capital Punishment and Social Work Values

Question 16 asked the research subjects whether their attitudes on Capital Punishment were consistent with the values of Social Work. Three alternatives were given to the respondents:

---

84Thorsten Sellin, quoted in Canada, Department of Justice, Capital Punishment: Material Relating to its Purpose and Value (Ottawa: Queen's Printer, 1965), p. 32.
Yes; No; and Do Not Know. Table 19 indicates the distribution of responses of the subjects to this question according to the sub-samples and the total sample.

**TABLE 19.---Consistency of Attitudes towards Capital Punishment with Social Work Values.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Samples</th>
<th>Consistent with Social Work Values</th>
<th>Not Consistent with Social Work Values</th>
<th>Do Not Know</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Social Workers</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Work Faculty*</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.S.W. Candidates</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.S.W. Candidates</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>68</strong></td>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
<td><strong>82</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* One subject did not respond.

A total of 81.9 per cent of the subjects saw their position on Capital Punishment as being consistent with Social Work values, whereas 7.3 per cent saw their position as not being consistent, 9.9 per cent did not know and 1.2 per cent gave no response.

Table 20 indicates the subjects' responses to Question 16 which asked whether they felt that their views on Capital Punishment were consistent with Social Work values. These responses are then compared with their stated position on Capital Punishment.
TABLE 20.—Consistency of Attitudes towards Capital Punishment with Social Work Values Compared to Stated Positions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position on Capital Punishment</th>
<th>Consistent with Social Work Values</th>
<th>Not Consistent with Social Work Values</th>
<th>Do Not Know</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Complete Abolition</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partial Abolition*</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Retention</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>68</strong></td>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
<td><strong>82</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* One subject did not respond.

From the data found in Table 20, it is found that 57 out of 59 (96.6 per cent) of those who favoured the complete abolition of Capital Punishment stated that their attitudes on Capital Punishment were consistent with the values of Social Work. Of those who favoured the complete abolition of Capital Punishment, 2 out of 59 (3.4 per cent) indicated that they did not know whether their position was consistent with Social Work values.\(^8^5\)

When examining the responses of those persons who favoured the partial abolition of Capital Punishment, it was found that 7 out of 15 (43.7 per cent) saw their position as consistent

---

\(^8^5\) One of those subjects who did not know was a member of the Social Work Faculty and one was from the B.S.W. sub-sample.
with Social Work Values, 4 out of 15 (25.0 per cent) did not see their position as being consistent, 4 out of 15 (25.0 per cent) did not know, and 1 out of 15 (6.3 per cent) gave no response.\footnote{86}

Among those subjects who were undecided as to their position on Capital Punishment, 2 out of 6 (33.3 per cent) stated that they felt their attitudes were consistent with Social Work values, 2 out of 6 (33.3 per cent) indicated that their position was not consistent, and 2 out of 6 (33.3 per cent) indicated that they did not know.\footnote{87}

The two subjects who stated that they favoured the full retention of Capital Punishment both indicated that they felt this position was consistent with Social Work values.

It is apparent that the majority of subjects who favoured the complete abolition of Capital Punishment considered their position to be consistent with Social Work values. However, it is also evident that 9 out of the total sample (10.8 per cent) who favoured the retention of Capital Punishment in some form also considered this position to be consistent with Social Work values. This is 9 out of 18 (50.0 per cent) of those

\footnote{86}{It may be of interest to some readers that of those subjects who thought that their position of partial abolition was consistent with Social Work values, 6 were members of the Community Social Workers sub-sample and 1 was from the One Year B.S.W. Candidate sub-sample.}

\footnote{87}{Of those two subjects who stated that this undecided position was consistent with Social Work values, 1 was from the M.S.W. Candidate sub-sample and 1 was from the Social Work Faculty sub-sample. Both subjects who said that their position was not consistent with Social Work values were from the M.S.W. Candidate sub-sample.}
subjects who favoured the application of Capital Punishment in some form.

The basis for these divergent points of view will be seen and discussed in the following section in which subjects state the reasons for their answer.

4. Position on Capital Punishment as Consistent or Not Consistent with Social Work Values—Rationale

a. Subjects who favoured the complete abolition of Capital Punishment

There were 10 out of 59 subjects who perceived themselves as favouring the complete abolition of Capital Punishment who did not give a rationale for seeing this position as either consistent or inconsistent with Social Work values, two of whom stated that they did not know. However, the remaining 49 subjects gave the 54 responses outlined in Table 21.

It is interesting to note the type of responses given. There is emphasis placed on the value of human life and the idea of rehabilitation. These subjects see their position as consistent with the value that Social Work places upon the innate dignity, worth and capacity for change in the individual as seen in the Review of the Literature. 88

b. Subjects who did not favour the complete abolition of Capital Punishment

There was again a low response rate among persons who did not favour the complete abolition of Capital Punishment as there was when it came to giving reasons for their stated position on

88 See page 29.
TABLE 21.--Rationale of Subjects Who Favoured the Complete Abolition of Capital Punishment for Seeing Their Position as Consistent with Social Work Values.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons for Seeing Position as Consistent</th>
<th>Frequency of Responses*</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Work emphasizes the worth and dignity of the individual.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>22.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Work emphasizes a belief in the ability of the individual to change.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Work is a helping profession.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The rehabilitative nature of Social Work.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Work values are opposed to Capital Punishment.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Work places a high value on human life.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Work emphasizes the individual's right to life.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Work focuses upon improving life, not on the termination of life.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Work is humanitarian in nature.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>54</strong>*</td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The 54 responses in this table were given by 49 subjects who favoured the complete abolition of Capital Punishment.
Capital Punishment. However, from the responses that were given certain suggestions may be made.

Of those who favoured the partial abolition of Capital Punishment and felt that their position was inconsistent with Social Work values, two stated that they felt their position was not consistent because Social Work is oriented towards rehabilitation and would not, therefore, condone the use of Capital Punishment or their position favouring its use. One thought that as a professional he should not simply be undecided, and another questioned what he believed to be Social Work's position favouring the abolition of Capital Punishment.

However, two who favoured partial abolition stated that they felt their position was consistent with Social Work values because, although Social Work values are often idealistic and unattainable, nevertheless they felt their position could be seen as consistent.

Of the two subjects who favoured the full retention of Capital Punishment, one did not respond but the other stated that his position was consistent with Social Work values because Social Work would have to learn to accept the realities of society and be less idealistic and act accordingly with regard to Capital Punishment.

These last three responses, from the two who favoured partial abolition and the one who favoured the full retention of Capital Punishment and see their position as consistent with Social Work values, seem to indicate a conflict with the abstract ideal of the worth and dignity of the individual but seem to recognize another aspect of Social Work values—the idea of
social responsibility with which they can see their position as consistent.

This conflict is also suggested by the two respondents who favoured the partial abolition of Capital Punishment but who stated that they did not know whether this position was consistent with Social Work values. One stated that there appears to be a "gap between the ideals of Social Work theory and the applicability of this theory in the field," while another stated that Social Work does not appear to value life absolutely as demonstrated by its position on family planning and abortion and that on this basis he believed that his position could very possibly coincide with the values of Social Work, though he was not sure.

In the case of those who were undecided as to their position on Capital Punishment and saw this as consistent with Social Work values, one member of the sample stated that Social Work possesses the resources to possibly effect changes in individuals; however, prison would have to be reformed drastically before this could take place. One subject who was undecided stated that this was consistent with the "non-judgmental attitude of Social Workers."

The low response rate from those subjects who favoured the retention of Capital Punishment in some form does not allow the researcher to draw firm conclusions concerning why these subjects saw their position as consistent or not consistent with Social Work values. However, on the basis of previous findings concerning the value placed upon Capital Punishment
as a deterrent as well as on the responses that were given by these subjects, the writer believes that certain tentative conclusions may be suggested.

Social Workers who favoured the application of Capital Punishment because it has a social utility may interpret the value placed upon the dignity of the individual as inextricably linked to social responsibility. From their point of view, Capital Punishment as a deterrent appears to be a legitimate sanction as a means of achieving social order and responsibility. It was also stated that Social Work appears to be unrealistic in its approach to Capital Punishment and that Social Work values may be so ideal as to be unattainable in practice. These findings, as well as the fact that 10.8 per cent of the total sample who favoured the retention of Capital Punishment in some form saw this position as consistent with Social Work values, suggest that in regard to Capital Punishment the dignity and worth of the individual as well as all Social Work values may be open to personal interpretation, depending upon the interpretation the individual wishes to place on its ultimate value.

Possibly because of the abstract nature of many Social Work values, these values are open to interpretation across a broad spectrum. Where this may be the case and when Social Work values do conflict with personal value "bases", the resultant interpretation may be influenced by the interpreter's personality and socialization independent of Social Work. Based upon the orientation of the Social Workers, they may focus
upon the other aspect of Social Work values as outlined in the Review of the Literature--the need for social responsibility and social order in which individual members of a society may grow and develop in harmony and security.
CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

A. Summary

It was the purpose of this research project to test the hypothesis which states: THERE WILL BE A POSITIVE CORRELATION BETWEEN THE ATTITUDES THAT SOCIAL WORKERS HOLD ON CAPITAL PUNISHMENT AND THE VALUE THAT THEY PLACE ON LIFE. The researcher also sought to determine whether or not the Social Workers in this sample would favour the complete abolition of Capital Punishment as well as the rationale for their position. Additionally, the researcher sought to determine whether or not the Social Workers within the parameters of this study perceived their attitudes towards Capital Punishment to be consistent with Social Work values. Finally, the researcher set out to determine the bases upon which Social Workers in this sample would perceive their attitudes to be either consistent or inconsistent with Social Work values.

A total of 125 questionnaires were distributed to Social Work educators at the School of Social Work, University of Windsor, Social Work Field Instructors and Associate Field Instructors of the School of Social Work, University of Windsor, Community Social Workers who were members of the Ontario Association of Social Workers, Windsor and Essex County Branch, 88.
as well as to all Degree Candidates in the final year of both the M.S.W. and B.S.W. programs at the University of Windsor School of Social Work. A total of eighty-three subjects comprised the sample used in this study. Approximately fifty per cent were Social Work Degree Candidates about to enter professional practice and approximately fifty per cent were practicing professional Social Workers. The sample, by definition, excluded all Social Workers in the Metropolitan Windsor area who were not associated with the School of Social Work in a teaching capacity or Social Workers who did not belong to the Windsor and Essex County Branch of the Ontario Association of Professional Social Workers.

The hypothesis was tested for significance at the .05 level using three statistical tests. In this regard, the scores that subjects achieved on a Capital Punishment Scale, which consisted of twenty-one statements designed to test their attitude towards Capital Punishment, were compared with their stated position on Capital Punishment using an rₚ correlation. The scores subjects achieved on the Life Scale, which consisted of seven statements designed to test the absolute value that research subjects placed on life, were then compared with their stated positions on Capital Punishment using an rₚ correlation. Finally, the scores that subjects achieved on both the Capital Punishment Scale and Life Scale were compared using a "Pearson r" test.

In compiling the data required for statistical testing of the hypothesis, it was found that 71.1 per cent of the Social Workers in the sample stated that they favoured the complete
abolition of Capital Punishment, 19.3 per cent favoured its partial abolition, and 2.4 per cent favoured its full retention, while 7.2 per cent were undecided. None of the subjects indicated that they either favoured the application of Capital Punishment for an increased number of offences or that they did not have a position on Capital Punishment. With the exception of the M.S.W. Degree Candidates, a higher percentage of the student sub-sample favoured the complete abolition of Capital Punishment: 90.0 per cent of the One Year B.S.W. Degree Candidate sub-sample and 82.4 per cent of the Four Year B.S.W. Degree Candidate sub-sample favoured this position. Of the M.S.W. Degree Candidate sub-sample, 60.0 per cent chose this position. Of the faculty sub-sample, 72.7 per cent favoured the complete abolition of Capital Punishment, as did 62.7 per cent of the Community Social Workers. Among both the total sample and the total sub-samples, it is evident that the majority of Social Workers and Social Work Degree Candidates perceive themselves as favouring the complete abolition of Capital Punishment.

It was found that the calculated scores that subjects achieved on the Capital Punishment Scale were skewed toward the high range of values, seemingly consistent with the choice of the majority of subjects in the total sample favouring the complete abolition of Capital Punishment. The range of scores on the Capital Punishment scale was 50 to 105 with a mean of 84.4, a median of 86.8, and a mode of 93.

The scores that subjects achieved on the Life Scale
appeared to be more normally distributed throughout the total range of scores than did the scores on the Capital Punishment Scale, indicating that there is some variation between the scores achieved on the Life Scale and the Capital Punishment Scale. The mean for the scores on the Life Scale was found to be 24.1, the median 24.8, the mode 26, with a range from 14 to 35.

When the scores for the total sample on the Capital Punishment Scale were compared with their stated position on Capital Punishment, a positive relationship was demonstrated, significant at the .05 level. In addition to indicating that the scores on the Capital Punishment Scale were consistent with the subjects' stated position on Capital Punishment, this also suggests a degree of reliability and validity in the instrument used to measure these variables.

It was also found that when the subjects' scores on both the Life Scale and Capital Punishment Scale were compared using a "Pearson r" test, a positive correlation, significant at the .05 level, was demonstrated by the total sample. Within the sub-samples a similarly positive correlation with variation in significance was found to exist, except for the Four Year B.S.W. Candidates who demonstrated almost no correlation when their scores on both tests were compared.

In testing the subjects' stated position on Capital Punishment with the scores achieved on the Life Scale using an $r_p$ correlation, it was found that the total sample demonstrated a positive correlation significant at the .05 level. With the
exception of the M.S.W. Candidates and the B.S.W. Candidates, all other sub-samples demonstrated a positive correlation with variations in significance. The B.S.W. Candidates achieved almost no correlation, while the M.S.W. Candidates achieved no correlation, indicating a statistical inconsistency between their stated position on Capital Punishment and the value they place on life. In contrast, the One Year B.S.W. Candidates, a small sub-sample, achieved a positive correlation which was not statistically significant.

On the basis of the correlation of the total sample's stated position on Capital Punishment with their scores on the Capital Punishment Scale, the findings of the Pearson r test comparing scores achieved by the total sample on the Life Scale with the scores achieved on the Capital Punishment Scale, and finally the statistical results of the correlation of the total sample's stated position on Capital Punishment with their scores on the Life Scale, the researcher rejected the null hypothesis and accepted the alternate hypothesis, concluding that a positive correlation was demonstrated to exist between the attitudes that Social Workers hold on Capital Punishment and the value that they place on life.

When the scores that fell above and below the mean on both the Capital Punishment Scale and Life Scale were analyzed according to the subjects' stated position on Capital Punishment, it was observed that among those subjects who favoured either the partial abolition or full retention of Capital Punishment, their scores almost consistently fell below
the mean on both Scales. Consistent with their stated position, it would appear that the taking of life for these subjects is generally acceptable in order to protect society. It was noted when the scores of those subjects who stated that their position on Capital Punishment was undecided were analyzed, that the majority of scores on the Capital Punishment Scale fell below the mean and the scores on the Life Scale were equally divided above and below the mean. From this observation it appears that subjects who are undecided are undecided as to the value of taking life, but they appear to be more decided as to the application of Capital Punishment as a legitimate sanction.

Finally, of those subjects who favoured the complete abolition of Capital Punishment, it was found that although 86.4 per cent of the scores fell above the mean on the Capital Punishment Scale, 57.6 per cent of the scores achieved by these subjects on the Life Scale fell above the mean and 42.4 per cent fell below the mean, indicating that among this group life is not valued absolutely and it is valid to take life for the protection of one's own person and other members of society.

From both statistical analysis and stated positions on Capital Punishment, although the majority of Social Workers do favour the complete abolition of Capital Punishment, not all Social Workers in this sample necessarily adopted this position. Some were undecided and some favoured the retention of Capital Punishment in some form. Social Workers who favoured
the complete abolition of Capital Punishment appear to base their position on the value of human life as well as upon the potential for rehabilitation of the offender. Those who favoured the retention of Capital Punishment in some form base their position upon what they perceive as the deterrent and protective value of Capital Punishment to society. Vengeance and retributive justice do not appear to influence the rationale of those subjects who responded. In this respect, it would seem that those Social Workers who did respond and did favour the retention of Capital Punishment in some form place value upon the dignity and worth of the individual but from a differing perspective. Social Workers in this sample who favoured the abolition of Capital Punishment focused upon the value of the life of the offender, emphasized the potential of rehabilitation and saw Capital Punishment as not having any social utility, whereas those who favoured its retention in some form indicated that Capital Punishment has social utility as a deterrent and as a protection of members of society.

It was also found that 81.9 per cent of the Social Workers in this sample perceived that their position on Capital Punishment was consistent with the values of Social Work, 7.3 per cent saw their position as not consistent, 9.9 per cent did not know, and 1.2 per cent did not give a response. Among the subjects who favoured the complete abolition of Capital Punishment, 96.4 per cent perceived that their position was consistent with Social Work values, while only 3.4 per cent did not know. However, among those subjects who stated
that they favoured the retention of Capital Punishment in some form, 52.9 per cent also saw their position as consistent with Social Work values, while 23.5 per cent did not know and 23.5 per cent stated that this position was not consistent.

There are two important factors to be noted here. First of all, a high percentage (96.4 per cent) of those who favoured the complete abolition of Capital Punishment saw this position as consistent with Social Work values. Also important is the fact that more than half of those who favoured the retention of Capital Punishment in some form also saw their position as consistent with Social Work values. This apparent contradiction suggests a differential interpretation of Social Work values.

Those Social Workers who favoured the complete abolition of Capital Punishment, it would seem, see their position on Capital Punishment as consistent with Social Work values on the basis that Social Work emphasizes the value of human life, the innate dignity of the individual and the capacity of the individual to change. Subjects who favoured the retention of Capital Punishment in some form, where they formulated reasons, apparently see their position as consistent with Social Work values on the basis of Capital Punishment acting for the good of society as a whole, protecting its individual members and insuring social responsibility.
B. Limitations of Study

There are several limitations of this study that the reader should note and take into account when weighing the findings of this research project.

Although it would have been interesting, in a year when the issue of Capital Punishment will receive much attention from both the general public and Canadian legislators, to survey a larger sample of Social Workers, this was not possible due to obvious limitations of time and financial resources. As a result, the sample used in this project was not a random sample of all Social Workers in Canada, or even in Ontario, but was restricted to a sample from the Windsor area, using a quota of Social Workers and Social Work Degree Candidates who were about to enter the profession. By definition, the sample has excluded all professional Social Workers in the Metropolitan Windsor area who did not belong to the Ontario Association of Professional Social Workers, Windsor and Essex County Branch, and those who were not associated with the University of Windsor in a teaching capacity.

The instrument used to test the hypothesis, namely the Capital Punishment Scale and the Life Scale were developed for this study and levels of confidence were not previously determined by any other research project. Although this is the case, the researcher points out that significance at the .05 level was obtained when the scores achieved by the total sample on both the Capital Punishment and Life Scales were compared using a "Pearson r" test for correlation. Significance
at the .05 level was also obtained when the scores achieved by the total sample were compared with the total sample's stated positions on Capital Punishment. These findings appear to suggest not only a degree of reliability but also validity in the instruments used to test the hypothesis.

Although efforts were made to maintain the anonymity of the respondents, the fact that the researcher knew many of the subjects may have influenced the type and number of responses.

C. Conclusions

Based upon the data derived in testing the hypothesis of this research project, as well as the information obtained in the analysis of the research questions of the study, the writer presents the following conclusions:

1. Capital Punishment and the Value of Life

It is found that when life is measured in absolute terms, Social Workers who favour the complete abolition of Capital Punishment score higher on the Life Scale than do those who favour the retention or partial abolition of Capital Punishment. Those who favour the complete abolition of Capital Punishment seem to place a higher value upon life in absolute terms than do those who favour the retention of Capital Punishment in some form. This was pointed out in testing the hypothesis where it was found that there is a significant positive relationship between the attitudes that Social Workers hold towards Capital Punishment and the value that they place on life according to the criteria of this study.
However, when other factors are considered, it does not appear that one group actually values life to a greater extent than the other. On the one hand, those who favoured the complete abolition of Capital Punishment, in stating their reasons for this position, indicated that they place a strong emphasis upon the dignity and value of life, the potential for rehabilitation and the non-utility of Capital Punishment. On the other hand, those subjects who favoured the retention of Capital Punishment in some form emphasized its social utility and its effectiveness as a protection of human life and social order. These considerations cannot be divorced from the idea of the value of life.

Also, based upon the scoring patterns of abolitionists and retentionists on the Life Scale, it appears that there is a sizable portion of subjects who favoured the complete abolition of Capital Punishment whose scores are closely related to the scores of those who favoured its retention in some form. This leads the researcher to believe that the taking of life for these individuals who stated that they favoured the complete abolition of Capital Punishment but whose scores on the Life Scale approached those of the retentionists, is acceptable where there is a question of personal protection and is less acceptable in more remote situations where there is less personal involvement.

On this basis, as well as based on the fact that retentionists favour the taking of life for the protection of society, it appears that among this sample, Social Workers do not value life absolutely. They are influenced by factors other than the
absolute value, dignity and worth of the human being. It seems that the personal priorities of the protection of themselves and significant others may override this absolute value placed on life.

2. Social Workers' Position on Capital Punishment

In answer to the research question concerning the position of Social Workers on Capital Punishment, it was found that a high percentage of Social Workers (71.1 per cent) in this sample do indeed favour the complete abolition of Capital Punishment. Not only do they state this, but their scores on the Capital Punishment Scale corroborate their stated position. Of the remaining 28.9 per cent, only 2.4 per cent favoured its full retention and 7.2 per cent were undecided, while 19.3 per cent, by stating that they favoured its partial retention, placed limits upon its use. It is also interesting that none of the subjects favoured its application for an increased number of offences or stated that they did not have a position on Capital Punishment.

There is, then, some evidence to support the Policy Statement drafted by the Canadian Association of Social Workers in 1961 in which this organization stated that Canadian Social Workers favour the complete abolition of Capital Punishment.

The fact that 71.1 per cent of Social Workers in this sample are in favour of the complete abolition of Capital Punishment stands in strong contrast to the results of the 1972 Gallup Poll mentioned in the Review of the Literature in which it was found that only 30 per cent of the Canadians
surveyed favoured its abolition. It is evident that among this sample of Social Workers, their attitude towards Capital Punishment differs markedly from the attitude of the general population.

It is perhaps not surprising to find that the position of Social Workers is in contrast to that of the general population because of the focus in the profession of Social Work on the enhancement of the life of all individuals and the goal of the profession to assist the individual to function in society. In this respect, Social Workers are advocating reform of long established means of treating the offender based upon the rehabilitative values of the Social Work profession, a reform which the general public may not yet be ready to accept. Since Social Workers in this study have focused upon the value of the individual and his potential for rehabilitation, not only may it be the responsibility of Social Workers to recognize this conflict with society in general, but it may also be their responsibility to continue leading in this reform and to use their professional knowledge and skills to develop innovative and effective penological alternatives to Capital Punishment despite societal pressures to maintain the death penalty.

Social Work might be considered as a relatively "safe" profession in contrast to police or prison guards who may often be the recipients of direct aggression. Since Social Workers are not generally involved in direct aggression, this may have some influence on their attitudes towards Capital Punishment. It is perhaps important for Social Workers, when speaking as
a profession, to realize this as they formulate and advocate their position on Capital Punishment.

3. Social Workers' Rationale for their Position on Capital Punishment

Consistent with the positions outlined by the Canadian Association of Social Workers and by other Social Workers who favour the complete abolition of Capital Punishment, Social Workers in this study based their position of supporting abolition on the dignity and worth of the individual, the value of life and the potentiality for rehabilitation in the offender weighed against the finality of the death penalty and its lack of utility as a deterrent. However, those persons who favoured the retention of Capital Punishment in some form and who responded as to their reasons for holding this position, focused upon the deterrent and protective effect of the death penalty. The reasons given on either side of the issue by this sample of Social Workers are not unique to Social Workers as can be seen in the Review of the Literature outlining the arguments for and against Capital Punishment.

However, the researcher believes that it is important to note that the belief in the worth and dignity of the individual forms the basis for such a high percentage of Social Workers to favour the abolition of Capital Punishment in comparison with the low percentage among the general population. Even among those Social Workers who favoured the retention of Capital Punishment and who did respond as to their rationale, it appears that they also place emphasis upon the dignity and worth of the individual, though from a different perspective and not
on the basis of revenge or retribution. It may well be then, that one group does not value life more or less than the other. Rather, both groups are apparently trying to preserve life but from obviously different perspectives. The abolitionist focuses upon the life of the offender whereas the retentionist focuses upon the life of a potential murder victim.

It is apparent, then, that there is room for disagreement among Social Workers on their position on Capital Punishment; but it is also interesting to note that this disagreement is based upon a differential interpretation of the same value—the value they place upon life.

4. Capital Punishment and Social Work Values

Social Workers in this study who favoured the abolition of Capital Punishment saw their position as consistent with Social Work values. Some of the subjects who favoured the retention of Capital Punishment in some form did not see their position as being consistent. However, 52.9 per cent of those who favoured the retention of Capital Punishment in some form did see this position as being consistent with Social Work values. The researcher believes that those who favoured the retention of Capital Punishment and saw this position as being consistent with Social Work values may view Capital Punishment as a means of insuring social responsibility in the individual.

Based upon this apparent difference, the researcher suggests that Social Work values, and in particular the value placed upon the worth and dignity of the individual, may be open to personal interpretation. In effect, the value placed on the
dignity of the individual can be seen from either the point of view of the social responsibility of all individuals to function in harmony with each other, or from the point of view of the innate dignity of each human being, including the offender.

This duality of values can be seen in the general Social Work literature. However, when discussing Capital Punishment, it seems to become a "one or the other" proposition and the subjects in this sample seem to reflect this "one or the other" approach. Those who favour the abolition of Capital Punishment see it in terms of the worth and dignity of the individual, even of the offender. Those who favour the retention of Capital Punishment in some form hold this view in light of the individual's relationship to his society. It appears, then, that this research study has tapped both extremes of a continuum of Social Work values which are not absolute but rather are open to personal interpretation and application.

D. Recommendations for Further Study

As was noted in the Limitations of Study, the sample used in this project was restricted. It would be interesting to extend this study beyond the Windsor area to a wider sample of Social Workers in Canada and in particular to Social Workers employed in correctional settings. Likewise, in order to further explore the findings of this project, it would be interesting to conduct a comparative study of Social Workers and the general population in regard to Capital Punishment and see if the discrepancy noted in this project between the attitudes of Social Workers and the attitudes of the general population is consistent.
Social Workers in this study who favoured the abolition of Capital Punishment focused upon the potentiality of rehabilitating the capital offender. It is suggested that Social Workers need to undertake research to determine in what ways their professional skills may be more effectively utilized to this end.

Many Social Workers questioned the deterrent effect of Capital Punishment. However, some maintained that Capital Punishment does act as a deterrent. The writer suggests that research be undertaken to explore the deterrent effect of Capital Punishment. In particular, since there have been numerous commutations of the death sentence in Canada during and prior to the moratorium on Capital Punishment, such an exploration could be conducted using a sample of offenders who had been sentenced to the death penalty and who later had their sentences commuted to life imprisonment. Such a study could possibly shed some light upon the conflicting theories of deterrence maintained by many abolitionists and retentionists.

Finally, in the course of this study, it was found that there was an inconsistency between the scores that the M.S.W. and Four Year B.S.W. students achieved on the Life Scale and their stated positions on Capital Punishment. In this regard, further research may be indicated concerning the ways that graduate and undergraduate Social Work students develop, incorporate and maintain the values of Social Work. Such research may not only prove interesting but also useful in future Social Work curriculum building for both graduate and undergraduate Social Work students.
APPENDICES
APPENDIX A

QUESTIONNAIRE ON CAPITAL PUNISHMENT

INSTRUCTIONS:

ALL RESPONSES TO THE QUESTIONNAIRE WILL BE KEPT STRICTLY CONFIDENTIAL.

PLEASE ANSWER ALL QUESTIONS THAT ARE APPLICABLE TO YOU.

PLEASE DO NOT PLACE YOUR NAME ON THE QUESTIONNAIRE.

PLEASE FEEL FREE TO USE THE SPACE PROVIDED AT THE END OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE FOR ANY ADDITIONAL COMMENTS OR REMARKS THAT YOU WOULD LIKE TO MAKE ON THE SUBJECT OF CAPITAL PUNISHMENT, ETC.

PLEASE RETURN THE QUESTIONNAIRE IMMEDIATELY IN THE ENVELOPE PROVIDED FOR THAT PURPOSE.

THANK YOU FOR TAKING THE TIME TO COMPLETE THIS QUESTIONNAIRE.

FRANK A. YOUNG, B.S.W.
GRADUATE STUDENT
THE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL WORK
UNIVERSITY OF WINDSOR
WINDSOR, ONTARIO
QUESTIONNAIRE ON CAPITAL PUNISHMENT

Date:___________

Part I.

1. PLEASE INDICATE THE FOLLOWING:
   i) Sex.  Male □  Female □
   ii) Age.  CHECK THE APPROPRIATE CATEGORY FOR
            YOUR PRESENT AGE:
            15-20 □  41-50 □
            21-30 □  51-60 □
            31-40 □  61-65 □
            66-70 □
   iii) Canadian citizen
        Other citizenship (specify) _________________
   iv) Indicate the length of time lived in Canada ______
   v) Marital Status _____________________________________
   vi) Please state the number of children. ______
   vii) Religious Preference (specify) _________________
   viii) Do you practice the religion of your preference?
         YES □  NO □

2. Have you ever worked in a Correctional setting?
   YES □  NO □

3. If you have worked in a Correctional setting, please indicate the type of employment and the length of time employed in that setting.
   TYPE OF EMPLOYMENT  LENGTH OF TIME EMPLOYED

4. Have you ever worked in a Social Work setting?
   YES □  NO □

5. If you have worked in a Social Work setting, please indicate the type of employment and the length of time employed in that setting.
   TYPE OF EMPLOYMENT  LENGTH OF TIME EMPLOYED
6. Indicate the TOTAL NUMBER OF YEARS that you have worked in ALL employment settings. ________ years.

7. Check the following areas in which you have taken courses and give the number of courses and the date the last course was completed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUMBER OF COURSES</th>
<th>YEAR LAST COURSE COMPLETED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corrections</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Please indicate all degrees, certificates or diplomas that you have earned to date.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNIVERSITY</th>
<th>MAJOR</th>
<th>COMPLETION DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B.A., B.Sc., B.Ed., etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.S.W. (4 yr. honours)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.S.W. (1 yr. post Bachelor)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.S.W.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma-Social Work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificate-Social Work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.S.W.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9. If you are presently enrolled in a University as a full time student, please indicate:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>The year in which you are now enrolled</th>
<th>Major</th>
<th>Degree Sought</th>
<th>Expected Date of Graduation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

10. Which of the following do you consider to be your Social Work specialization?

- [ ] Administration
- [ ] Casework
- [ ] Community Organization
- [ ] Other (specify) __________________________

11. Check the Social Work setting in which you are now employed:

- [ ] Children's Services
- [ ] Community Development
- [ ] Correctional
- [ ] Family Services
- [ ] Other (specify) __________________________

12. If you are presently involved with Social Work Education, or have been so in the past, please check as many of the following as are applicable and please state the number of years experience in that capacity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Total Number of Years Experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Field Work Supervisor (full time)</td>
<td>_______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Work Supervisor (part time)</td>
<td>_______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Professor (full time)</td>
<td>_______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Professor (part time)</td>
<td>_______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (specify)</td>
<td>_______</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
13. Which of the following statements is most representative of your position on Capital Punishment?

☐ Capital Punishment should be fully retained.
☐ Capital Punishment should be abolished completely.
☐ Capital Punishment should be partially abolished except for a limited number of specific criminal offences.
☐ Capital Punishment should be made mandatory for an increased number of criminal offences.
☐ My position on Capital Punishment is undecided at this time.
☐ I do not have a specific position on Capital Punishment.

14. What are your reasons for the above response?

15. How long have you held your present views on Capital Punishment?
   PLEASE CHECK ONE OF THE FOLLOWING:

☐ less than 6 months
☐ between 6 months and 1 year
☐ between 1 year and 3 years
☐ between 3 years and 5 years
☐ more than 5 years

   COMMENTS:

16. Do you consider your views on Capital Punishment to be consistent with the "values" of Social Work?

☐ YES ☐ NO ☐

   DO NOT KNOW ☐

17. What are your reasons for the above response?
18. Do you consider your views on Capital Punishment to be consistent with the views of the majority of Canadian citizens?

   YES □       DO NOT KNOW □       NO □

19. What are your reasons for the above response?

20. Please indicate those factors which have influenced your present views on Capital Punishment. INDICATE AS MANY FACTORS AS YOU CONSIDER APPLICABLE AND POINT OUT THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THEIR INFLUENCE.

   Parents' views □
   Religious Teachings □
   Social Work Education □
   Societal Attitudes □
   University Education □
   Other factors (specify): ______ □

21. Have you ever expressed your opinions on Capital Punishment to any of the following? PLEASE CHECK ALL THAT ARE APPLICABLE.

   □ Acquaintances
   □ Family
   □ Friends
   □ Members of Parliament
   □ Social Work Colleagues
   □ Social Work Professional Association
   □ Students
   □ The Canadian Government
   □ Other (specify) ______
22. What do you consider appropriate alternatives to Capital Punishment?

23. Why do you think that Capital Punishment is used to deal with specific criminal offences in our society?

24. If Capital Punishment is retained, for what offences do you think it should be applied?

25. If Capital Punishment is retained, what do you consider the most humane form of execution?

☐ Drugs  ☐ Hanging

☐ Electrocution  ☐ Lethal Gas

☐ Firing Squad  ☐ Other (specify)

26. Would the retention of Capital Punishment for certain crimes be acceptable to you if a humane method of execution was implemented?

YES  ☐

DO NOT KNOW  ☐

NO  ☐

27. Do you believe that Social Workers should take an official position on Capital Punishment?

YES  ☐

DO NOT KNOW  ☐

NO  ☐
28. If you believe that Social Workers should take an official position on Capital Punishment, what position should they take and what means should they use to express this position?

29. If you believe that Social Workers should take an official position on Capital Punishment, would you be willing to participate directly in the preparation of material, the development of briefs, etc., on the subject of Capital Punishment?

   YES □       NO □
   DO NOT KNOW □

COMMENTS:

30. Have you ever had personal contact with any of the following? CHECK AS MANY AS ARE APPLICABLE.

   □ A convicted murderer.
   □ A paroled murderer.
   □ An individual accused of murder.
   □ An individual who later became a murder victim.
   □ The family of a convicted murderer.
   □ The family of a murder victim.
   □ The family of an accused murderer.

31. Do you know of any Social Work organizations that have taken an official stand on Capital Punishment?

   YES □       NO □

32. If you know of any Social Work organizations which have adopted an official position on Capital Punishment to which we might write for information, please indicate the name and location of the organization as well as the date that this position was adopted.

   ORGANIZATION    LOCATION    DATE
**Part II**

In the following section, please read each statement carefully and then check the response that most closely coincides with your opinion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Indifferent or can't decide</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The murder rate would increase greatly if the death penalty was abandoned.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Respect for the law would decrease with the abolition of the death penalty.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The possibility of the death penalty acts as a deterrent for a person.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The death penalty is necessary to maintain law and order in our society.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Murder is a spontaneous and impulsive act of passion; therefore the death penalty should not be invoked.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Because of the nature and severity of the crime, the death penalty is the only just punishment for the crime of murder.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Murderers are mentally ill and therefore should receive treatment.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Premeditated murders should require a mandatory death penalty.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Indifferent or can't decide</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Murders committed in the course of carrying out another crime involving force and deliberation should require a mandatory death penalty.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. The murder of police personnel should require a mandatory death penalty.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Rape should be considered a crime punishable by the death penalty.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Infanticide is a crime that should be punishable by the death penalty.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. The murder of prison personnel should require a mandatory death penalty.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Persons convicted of mercy killings should face a mandatory death penalty.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Persons convicted of carrying out an abortion should face a mandatory death penalty.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Crimes such as piracy and skyjacking should require a mandatory death penalty.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Hired murderers should face a mandatory death penalty.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Under some circumstances, young people under the age of 18 (sec. 206b, C.C.C.) should be sentenced to the death penalty.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Under no circumstances should young people under the age of 18 (sec. 206b, C.C.C.) be sentenced to death.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>No person, institution, group or organization has the right to take a man's life.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>In accordance with the law, the state should have the power to take a man's life.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>The taking of a life is acceptable only in time of war.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>The Government should have the power to commute the death sentence prescribed by any court of law.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>The death penalty should be invoked in time of war for such crimes as espionage, treason, cowardice under fire, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>The death penalty is the only way in which murderers can give satisfaction to society for their crimes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Indifferent or can't decide</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. If a member of my family were murdered, I would wish the murderer to face the death penalty.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. I would be prepared to kill an individual in order to protect my property.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. I would be prepared to kill an individual in order to protect another person's life.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. I would be prepared to kill an individual in order to protect my life.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. I would be prepared to kill an enemy in time of war.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. If I were called upon for jury duty in a murder case, I would be prepared to condemn a man to death if he were found guilty.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. I could carry out an execution in the line of duty if called upon to do so.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. I would be willing to help a client who had been convicted of murder.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. I would be willing to invite a paroled murderer into my home.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Indifferent or can't decide</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. I would permit my children to play with the children of a paroled murderer.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Other things being equal, I would consider placing a child with a paroled murderer.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Other things being equal, I would consider placing a foster child with a paroled murderer.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Other things being equal, I would consider hiring a paroled murderer as a worker in my agency.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. Other things being equal, I would consider hiring a paroled murderer as a Social Worker.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. Under no circumstances would I hire a paroled murderer.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. The death penalty is of no concern to Social Workers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. The retention or abolition of Capital Punishment is a political question and therefore not a responsibility of Social Workers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. A murderer would be an appropriate client for Social Workers to help.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. Social Workers have the skills needed to rehabilitate a convicted murderer.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Indifferent or can't decide</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. Punishment is an acceptable form of treatment.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. Convicted murderers would be suitable candidates for parole.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. A life sentence without the opportunity for parole would be a fitting substitute for the death penalty.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. Life imprisonment without the opportunity for parole is more humane than the death penalty.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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