# CANADIAN THESES ON MICROFICHE

# THÈSES CANADIENNES SUR MICROFICHE

National Library of Canada
Collections Development Branch

Canadian Theses on
Microfiche Service

Ottawa, Canada
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale du Canada
Direction du développement des collections

Service des thèses canadiennes
sur microfiche

## NOTICE

The quality of this microfiche is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us an inferior photocopy.

Previously copyrighted materials (journal articles, published tests, etc.) are not filmed.

Reproduction in full or in part of this film is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30. Please read the authorization forms which accompany this thesis.

## AVIS

La qualité de cette microfiche dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de qualité inférieure.

Les documents qui font déjà l'objet d'un droit d'auteur (articles de revue, examens publiés, etc.) ne sont pas microfilmés.

La reproduction, même partielle, de ce microfilm est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30. Veuillez prendre connaissance des formules d'autorisation qui accompagnent cette thèse.

THIS DISSERTATION
HAS BEEN MICROFILMED
EXACTLY AS RECEIVED

LA THÈSE A ÉTÉ
MICROFILMÉE TELLE QUE
NOUS L'AVONS REÇUE

NL 339 (r. 85/09)

Canada

# PERCEIVED CHARACTERISTICS OF EFFECTIVE CORRECTIONAL OFFICERS

Cindy Wahler

Thesis submitted to the School of Graduate Studies of the University of Ottawa in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Ottawa, Ontario.

UNIVERSITÉ D'OTTAWA
UNIVERSITY OF OTTAWA

**Acknowledgements**

This thesis was supervised by Dr. P. Gendreau, Regional Co-ordinating Psychologist for Eastern Ontario, Ministry of Correctional Services and Adjunct Professor, University of Ottawa. I am indebted to Dr. P. Gendreau for his guidance and assistance in the preparation of this thesis. I would also like to thank Mr. S. Shoom, Regional Director, and Dr. A. Birkenmayer, Director of Research Services, Ontario Ministry of Correctional Services for granting approval to conduct this research.

Appreciation is expressed to Mr. D. Gorman, Superintendent, and Dr. H. Marquis, Rideau Correctional Centre, Mr. A. Sial, Deputy Superintendent, and Dr. J. Bonta, Ottawa-Carleton Detention Centre, Mr. L. Hudson, Superintendent, Brockville Jail and Mr. C. Stewart, Superintendent, Perth Jail for their advice and assistance on the logistics of the research.

I would also like to thank the correctional officers, union representatives, and the inmates for their agreement to partake in this research.

I am also grateful to my husband, Leon, for his never-ending support, reassurance and optimism throughout the entire project.

## Curriculum Studorium

Cindy Wahler (nee Avrich) was born on January 6, 1958, Montreal, Canada. She received her Bachelor of Arts, Honors Psychology from McGill University, Montreal, 1980.

Table of Contents

## List of Tables

## List of Tables

## Abstract

The purpose of this study was to identify the behavioral skills of a correctional officer. The Correctional Personnel Rating Scale was administered to supervisors, correctional officers, and inmates at four institutional settings. A factor analysis was performed by combining the ratings produced by the three subject groups. Three factors emerged. Responsibility/Leadership Skills was comprised of routine job skills that included: a) report writing; b) enforcement of rules and regulations; c) working independently without excessive supervision; d) working effectively with other staff and occasionally, adopting the role of a leader; e) providing inmates with appropriate information on various aspects of their incarceration and; f) providing clear directions and instructing inmates on how to improve unacceptable behavior prior to applying negative consequences. Behavior Skill Deficits was depictive of a poorly functioning correctional officer which included the following behaviors: a)lethargy and failure to meet deadlines; b) denial of responsibility for errors; c) requiring excessive supervision; d) minimal communication and consultation with co-workers; e) giving up quickly in an argument/emotionally volatile with co-workers and inmates and; f) providing inaccurate information to inmates and demonstrating a difficulty in working with them. Inmate-Relationship Skills portrayed the correctional officer in a therapeutic role which included: a) an attempt to understand the inmates' feelings and thoughts; b) support given to inmates who are experiencing difficulties and; c) interacting with inmates regularly and providing counselling.

An analysis of variance was performed on each factor by institution and subject group. There was a significant main effect for subject group for Responsibility/Leadership Skills. Correctional officers and supervisors attached significantly more importance to Responsibility/Leadership Skills than inmates. There was a significant main effect for subject group, whereby inmates attached greater importance to Inmate-Relationship Skills than correctional officers and supervisors.

The demographic variables that significantly correlated with each factor and subject groups included: 1) For supervisors, age was significantly negatively correlated with Inmate-Relationship Skills; 2) For inmates, a) age; b) previous length of time incarcerated and; c) previous number of times incarcerated were all significantly negatively correlated with Responsibility/Leadership Skills; d) percentage of the sentence served was significantly negatively correlated with Behavior Skill Deficits; and e) the length of time previously incarcerated in a maximum institution was significantly negatively correlated with Inmate-Relationship Skills.

The extension and further development of the CPRS was provided. A set of behaviors or skills which defined an effective correctional officer were discussed in light of the findings and with reference to recruitment, selection, and training issues.

# INTRODUCTION

Despite the fact that correctional officers represent the largest number of individuals in correctional institutions next to inmates, there still exists little information on the role of the correctional officer. It, therefore, becomes difficult to establish criteria for their effective functioning in the absence of any concrete definition of what are the actual behaviors necessary to perform the role properly.

Traditionally, correctional officers have been selected on the basis of physical requirements, thus, ensuring good security. Another approach that later emerged was the implementation of personality assessments to identify the personality traits of those officers with good performance ratings.

Most recently, it has been argued that the evaluation of the correctional officer's role should focus on the actual tasks of the correctional officer's position. In the field of industrial psychology, the primary method for evaluation is the identification of the particular behaviors that are required to perform the job. This information forms the development of a behavioral method for job selection. A candidate is assessed on these behavioral indices which can then be used as predictors of successful job performance.

The purpose of this study was to identify the behavioral skills of a correctional officer. These skills could be further operationalized in future studies of correctional officers through the use of observational methods and role-playing of the various tasks. Once these critical job behaviors are identified, simulation of these behaviors could be used in the selection process and serve as useful predictors of job performance.

## REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

One of the more interesting anomalies in the history of corrections, is the manner in which the role of the correctional officer (CO) has been ignored. Alexander Paterson (1951) of the British Prison Commission opposed any time being allocated to the study of COs, on the basis that, "It is much better to leave them to their own natural good will and common sense than to stuff their ears and memories with scientific jargon" (p.401). On the other hand, another view has it that the CO can be the single most important person in terms of influencing the inmate and having the potential for enhancing, or minimizing, through his or her actions, the effectiveness of the various treatment programs (Glaser, 1964; Lombardo, 1981; Teske and Williamson, 1979; Wicks, 1980). The above opinions, however, are primarily based entirely on anecdotal evidence.

Unfortunately, despite the assumed importance of the CO, little attention has been directed to the fundamental issue of recruitment. That is, what are perceived to be the desirable characteristics of effective COs?

## Historical Selection Criteria

Over a quarter of a century ago, Lundberg (1947) wrote, "methods of selection of the prison guard are generally loose and have little empirical validity. Of some 13,000 guards in this country, it is safe to say that over three-fourths have been selected by unscientific methods" (p.38). In 1983, the warden of Jackson Prison, Michigan outlined his description-based hiring criteria, "We would hire them if they were warm and alive" (American Correctional Association, 1970, p.67). One of the state officials responding to a survey of United States selection procedures indicated that "any warm body passing the test would likely be hired" (Goldstein, 1975, p.11). The "test" referred to, comprised a routine civil service written examination of general information and a 5 to 10 minute oral test on "human relation skills". As recently as 1981, Toch stated that "the correctional officer is a residue of the dark ages. He requires 20/20 vision, the IQ of an imbecile, a high threshold for boredom and a basement position in Maslow's hierarchy" (p.20).

A concrete example of the hiring process taken from the Canadian Penitentiary system is illustrative (Willet, 1973). He found that selection procedures were neither standardized nor formalized. Basic information was lacking at interviews, references were not required, and objective assessment tools were not employed. The interviewers did not appear to be trained in selection techniques and functioned as a group with minimal prior consultation. The pre-selection briefing of candidates was often based on incorrect information about

their work and as a rule, there was no member of personnel present to answer any questions pertaining to the details of the work. Once selected, officers were enrolled in a training course, presumably specifically related to the job, however, due to the course's perceived low-credibility by the staff and their supervisors at the host prisons, candidates were treated as if they had been on "holiday".

By and large, even when job descriptions have depicted the CO as a person with multi-faceted roles - including inmate counselling - the actual criteria for selection have usually been based on physical requirements, security considerations and an assumed position of authority as in any military hierarchy (Cressey, 1959). Schrag (1961) remarked that it is an illusion that COs are able to control inmates because they have unlimited authority and their orders carry the full sanctions of prison administration. Rather, Schrag regarded skill in interpersonal relations and the ability to obtain voluntary cooperation as being the crucial factors in securing and maintaining control. A high school diploma is no guarantee of the possession of such skills. In the absence of a training program where they may acquire the necessary skills, the recruitment of officers with the necessary ability is entirely fortuitous.

There are some data bearing on the CO's role within a security-oriented setting. Wilkins (1975) pilot project surveyed three institutions and collected data through the use of interview and observation of COs. All the COs considered maintenance of inmate security to be the primary function of their role and counselling

inmates to be ranked as secondary. The relative importance of these two tasks varied with each institution. But, even in the case of the treatment oriented institution studied, the security role was still prominent.

Williams and Soutar (1984) administered rating scales to assess COs attitudes towards various dimensions of their role. The sample included 402 COs who were employed at 14 different institutions. The subjects were divided into two groups according to the level of security at each institution, i.e.; minimum/medium or maximum. Based upon a discriminant analysis, the authors stated that "COs in maximum institutions had a much more custodial view of their job, with consequently more negative stereotyping of inmates" than their colleagues employed in minimum/medium institutions. "Staff at the minimum/medium security institutions were more treatment oriented and perceived less need for disciplinary control of inmates" (p.90) than COs working in maximum security institutions.

## Studies Involving Personality Assessment

In 1958, Downey and Signori asserted that "so far as one can discover, there are no attempts to investigate the problem of prison guard selection in terms of interest and personality testing procedures" (p.234). It did not, however, take an inordinate amount of time before the use of psychological tests were claimed to be an effective means of improving the selection process. It was assumed

that these assessment tools effectively identified candidates who had the potential to become "good" COs. The Report of the Parliamentary Sub-Committee on Penitentiary Services in Canada advocated personality testing to help ensure that COs had the aptitude and self-discipline required for their job (MacGuigan, 1977). In a review sponsored by the American Bar Association (Goldstein, 1975) a belief in psychological tests as effective screening procedures was further affirmed. All but four of the forty-six jurisdictions surveyed claimed to test prospective employees. Most, however, did not specify what psychometric instruments they used. Five reported using the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI); two of them administered it only after hiring and one only if indicated after a routine psychological interview. One jurisdiction reported the use of the Cattell 16PF during training; ten used "general information tests" and three used in-house CO examinations. No data were presented that would allow an assessment of the efficacy of these methods in selection. The most recent survey of such practices (Behrens, 1985) reported that 25% of the United States government agencies have implemented psychological screening requirements as part of minimum applicant standards for law enforcement and/or corrections positions.

There have been a few studies employing psychological tests as screening devices that reported data as to their effectiveness. Psychological tests were used to differentiate between guards rated as "good" by their supervisors and those rated as "poor". For

example, Downey and Signori (1958) administered four objective, ability and personality tests; the Wessman Personnel Classification Test, the Kuder-Preference Record-Vocational Test, the MMPI and the Manson Evaluation. They found that 14 out of an aggregate 38 scales discriminated between "good" and "poor" job performance-rated COs. On the MMPI significant negative correlations in the range of $r$=-.26 to -.30 were obtained on the F scale, Psychasthenia, Depression, Hostility, and Social Introversion. The highest positive correlations were obtained on the Verbal scale ($r$=.49; $p$.01) of the Kuder Preference Record Vocational Test. Despite the obtained significance, the above-noted correlations, cannot be considered high for practical use.

In another study by Hammer (1968) MMPI subscales did not discriminate between "good" and "poor" COs. Perdue (1964, 1966) reported the use of the Johnson Temperment Analysis in screening applicants for custodial work. This test purports to measure nine basic behavioral characteristics: Nervous, Depressive, Active, Cordial, Sympathetic, Subjective, Aggressive, Critical and Self-Mastery. The test was administered to the total guard force ($n$=160) of the institution. From this group, 37 officers with "superior" job performance ratings were selected and the test profiles were compared with the guard force as a whole. Statistical tests of significance were not conducted. Inspection of the results indicated that the differences between the two groups did not appear to be significantly large and all the subscale scores for both groups were within the average range of published norms for the general population.

The author concluded, however, that the "good" COs were distinguished by several traits. "Those employees with better stability on such variables as nervousness and work habits, more self-control and self-mastery and perhaps more reserve and caution in dealing with others, make the better type of custodial officer" (p. 18). Schuerger, Kochevar and Reinwald (1982) administered Cattell's 16PF questionnaire and found that male officers with the highest performance ratings appeared on the 16PF as bright, controlled, conservative and self-sufficient. High rating female officers appeared to have a similar pattern except rated as more group-dependent than their male counterparts. The correlations between the high and low rated male and female COs were not significant and the authors stated that "their results may represent only chance variations in the data" (p. 227).

Shusman, Inwald and Landa (1984) assessed the predictive validity of two psychological inventories, the MMPI and the Inwald Personality Inventory (IPI) for 716 male COs for retention or termination as well as absenteeism, lateness and formal disciplinary interviews. The IPI consists of 26 scales designed to measure stress reactions and deviant behavior patterns by focusing on absence and lateness problems, alcohol or drug use and antisocial behaviors. The IPI accurately classified subsequent retention or termination of 73% of the recruits. The MMPI accurately classified 63% of the COs. Together, the IPI and MMPI correctly assigned 73% of the recruits as to job status. Terminated officers had higher means on scales including such items as family conflicts, substance abuse,

absenteeism, lateness, disciplinary interviews, trouble with the law and spouse conflict. The 665 officers who were not terminated were then randomly divided into two groups for cross-validation purposes. The MMPI and IPI were used to predict absenteeism, lateness and occurrence of disciplinary interviews. On these variables, the IPI produced classifications rates in the range of 67 to 69%. Upon cross-validation, the classification rates were between 58 to 64%. The MMPI produced classification rates between 60 to 67%, and upon cross-validation the classification rates were between 56 to 61%. The IPI correctly classified a higher number of individuals as to actual job performance than the MMPI, but regardless of the statistical significance of the test results, there still appears to be a large percentage of COs whose behaviors were not correctly identified by these psychological inventories.

The literature pertaining to the recruitment and selection of COs does not appear to be of sufficient quantity or empirical quality to render drawing conclusions about the efficacy of psychological testing in the selection process. It is apparent, as Goldstein has remarked, that the design of many of these studies does not provide an adequate basis for drawing conclusions about the utility of the instruments for future selection purposes. The results, when significant, are not statistically potent. In addition, almost all these studies are post-dictive. Selection criteria have been based on global qualities, which not only may not have predictive power because they are so general, but appear not to be unique to the job requirements of a CO.

## Behavioral Skills as a Basis for Selection

One of the trends in the field of diagnostics has been to move from the assessment of global personality traits to the measurement of specific behavioral skills. In the field of industry and organizational psychology, personnel selection criteria and job evaluation are based upon behavioral analysis (Ghorpade and Atchinson, 1980). The United States Department of Labor views a job as a collection of behaviours that comprises the work assignments of one or more workers (O'Leary, 1976). The development of a behaviorally based instrument depends upon the judgement of those employees and supervisors who are closest to the job itself. The result is a pool of specific items describing effective and ineffective behaviour in the language of those closest to the job (Szilagyi and Wallace, 1980). For example, some recent studies examining on the job performance during training sessions of occupations as diverse as sales representatives (Bray and Campbell, 1968), machinists (Siegal and Bergman, 1975) and engineers (Olson, Fine, Myers and Jennings, 1981) have reported potent predictors of eventual job performance. As a case in point, Cleff (1980) found a correlation of $r=.82, p<.001$ with job performances measures.

Thus, the data generated from this approach has credibility for other professions such as CO's. McGregor (1957) and Ross and McKay (1981) have argued that the necessary apprpach toward officer selection should be from a behavioral perspective. Selection should be based on the assessment of the skills and/or potential to acquire such skills through training.

A study conducted by Willis, Jessup, Savage, Cooper and Slesser (1979, a, b) reported data from a preliminary development of a behavioral rating scale designed to measure officer performance on the job. This Correctional Personnel Rating Scale (CPRS) is a broadly based behavioral scale which attempts to measure common CO behaviours that are considered important by correctional personnel.

Forty staff were interviewed at a minimum security centre for young adult offenders. The interviewees were composed of correctional staff, supervisors and professional staff. They were asked to describe behaviours regarded as important components of the CO's job. Both desirable and undesirable behaviours were requested. A second group composed of senior COs, supervisors and superintendents were provided with the list of behaviours and were asked to identify a set of categories that would be useful in making employment selection, placement, promotion and training decisions. Five categories and the definition of these categories were generated. The categories were routine job tasks, leadership, emotional control, staff and inmate relations. Each of the items was then assigned to a category. Item reliability ranged from 85% to 100% with a mean of 97% ($p<.01$). The internal reliability for each subscale ranged between .76 to .93 with a mean of .89. Low correlations were obtained between the individual items and the subscales other than to which they were assigned, therefore, indicating the subscales do measure different aspects of the CO's job. Convergent and discriminate validity coefficients were .82 and .46, respectively.

The result is a rating scale that is composed of the actual tasks of the CO position, with a behavioral or skill orientation. Unfortunately, this research was never followed up. Given the current concern over exactly what the appropriate role for the CO is, it would appear crucial that this issue be pursued not only from COs themselves as to what they consider to be the desirable behavioral characteristics, but other groups as well. The two that obviously come to mind, are the supervisors of COs and the inmates.

To date no empirical studies exist whereby supervisors of COs have objectively defined from a behavioral perspective, the qualities of an effective CO.

Inmates' views on what constitutes an effective CO are mainly descriptive in nature. "I act respectable and they give me respect. I want an officer that has understanding, knows how to talk to inmates, helps the inmates as much as he can, an officer who can do his job" (May, 1976, p. 42).

Glaser (1964) requested inmates to outline the qualities of an effective CO. The inmates described an effective CO as being friendly, accommodating, fair, dependable, predictable, nice, flexible and sociable. Those officers who were viewed as ineffective were described as being hostile, weak, stupid, rigid and aggressive. Homant (1979) had inmates rate COs on job performance based on a 5 point rating scale. They were then requested to describe the qualities of the officers who had received both poor and excellent ratings. The officers who were attributed an excellent rating were

described as being "extremely good with making men feel they are genuinely concerned about their welfare and problems. They are fair, consistent and in every sense of the word humane". The officers that received poor ratings were described as being "disrespectful, insensitive and to a large degree without much of a positive personality to display to the resident" (p. 59).

These data, like those reported on the psychological test literature are of little value, because they focus on general traits found for many occupations and not specific to the CO's tasks.

There are only two existing studies, noted previously, (Wilkins 1975; Williams and Soutar, 1984) that have looked at the CO role in three different correctional settings. It is important to assess whether the effective behavioral characteristics are common across different types of correctional settings. The role of the CO may vary across such settings. Furthermore, individual differences i.e., age, length of experience in corrections, amongst COs and those that supervise them may influence the ratings. Also, individual differences such as age and previous incarcerated history on the part of the inmates may also have an influence.

It is proposed, therefore, to assess the effective behavioral characteristics of COs using the Correctional Personnel Rating Scale and compare the ratings amongst COs, their supervisors and inmates. The ratings derived from these three groups will be compared across three different types of correctional settings e.g., a minimum/medium security correctional centre, two jails, and a maximum security

detention centre. Individual differences amongst the three groups tested will be correlated with ratings produced on the scale.

A factor analysis will be performed on the CPRS using the principal components model. Varimax rotation will be applied to determine orthogonality of subscales. Due to the limited sample size, the three subject groups will be combined to perform this analysis. A three-way factorial analysis of variance will be performed on each factor to determine differences between subject groups and institutions. Tukey's post-hoc tests will be conducted to determine further significance that may emerge from the analysis of variance. A Pearson product moment correlation matrix will be performed for each factor and the demographic variables for each subject group. Spearman-Brown split-half reliability and Cronbach's alpha will be applied to determine the internal consistency of the CPRS.

Results emanating from this study should have meaningful implications for personnel policy and practice as viewed from the perspective of both CO and management. That is, reliable, baseline information will be provided regarding the desired and essential characteristics of the CO's role. The potential complexities of the CO's roles, moreover, will be revealed if, in fact, ratings of effectiveness vary as to work location, who is doing the rating, and individual differences.

## METHOD

The Correctional Personnel Rating Scale (CPRS) was administered. The data consisted of ratings on a 4 point scale as to the desirability of 69 behaviors previously identified as being important to a CO's effectiveness. Due to language difficulty for inmates, 15 items were revised. An open-ended question was added to the instrument to allow subjects to include behaviors characteristic of an effective CO that were not considered in the original item pool. Demographic data were also obtained. Individual responders were not identified as questionnaires were filled out anonymously. A covering letter explaining the nature and purpose of the study was attached to each questionnaire (see Appendix A).

Data were collected from Rideau Correctional Centre, Ottawa-Carleton Detention Centre, and the jails at Brockville and Perth. The data from the two jails were combined due to their small size. It was arbitrarily decided to test 30 full-time male COs and 30 inmates from each of the three different settings. As a result of their limited number, all of the possible supervisors were tested. There were an insufficient number of female COs for the purposes of this study. Due to the variability in administration of the questionnaire and sample size, the procedure and subjects will be described by institution.

## Rideau Correctional Centre

Rideau Correctional Centre (RCC) is located in a rural area, approximately 35 miles south of Ottawa. It is a minimum/medium security institution receiving individuals with sentences of up to 2 years less a day. Treatment is perceived as an integral programming goal.

Due to the nature of the shift work, a supervisor was responsible for distributing the questionnaires to the COs and supervisors. The questionnaire was filled out on an individual basis and when completed, returned to the supervisor.

Thirty two COs (65% of the population) returned questionnaires. Two questionnaires were randomly eliminated for a final $n$=30. For supervisors, the return rate was 100% ($n$=9).

Inmates were randomly selected by choosing every third inmate from the current inmate files. The minimum length of time served at RCC at the time of questionnaire administration was 30 days to allow for familiarity and interaction with COs. Inmates were administered the questionnaire individually to ensure comprehension and reliable responses. Inmate files were reviewed in conjunction with the information provided by the inmates to verify the validity of the demographic data. The first 30 inmates selected agreed to testing.

Ottawa-Carleton Detention Centre

Ottawa-Carleton Detention Centre (OCDC) is located on Innes Road just east of Ottawa in Blackburn Hamlet. It is a maximum security institution holding individuals awaiting trial, those with short sentences and those awaiting transfer to federal or provincial institutions.

Due to the different shifts and work schedule of the COs and supervisors, questionnaires were attached to the pay cheques, filled out on an individual basis and returned to the Department of Psychology. After 3 weeks, 31% of the full-time COs and 50% of the supervisors had completed and returned the questionnaires. A letter to encourage the correctional staff to participate in the study was attached to the pay cheques for the following pay period. This strategy was not effective as no questionnaires were returned. Questionnaires were then placed in the staff duty offices and the examiner met with the correctional staff personally to establish cooperation and participation in the study. The time to meet the staff was chosen when one shift was terminating and the other just commencing so as to enable as many individual contacts as possible. The response to the study was not at all favorable and appeared to be related to union concerns. The sentiments of the correctional staff may be reflected by some of the following quotes. "What you got, is all you're going to get!". "Don't expect anymore questionnaires back." "We don't know you and therefore we go on the premise that

those we don't know, we don't trust." "Anyone knows that you can distort statistics anyway you like." "You can use this information against us and present it to management." "Besides, we heard that you had been administering the same questionnaire to inmates, why should they be asked, who cares what they have to say." "Also, the superintendent's name was on your cover letter, we interpreted that as an order, and we refuse to be ordered." "So what you got, is all you're going to get".

The final sample size of the COs was 24, which is 35% of the total full-time COs. For supervisors, the final return rate was 50%, ($n$=6).

Inmates were randomly selected by choosing every third inmate from the current inmate files. Only sentenced inmates were included in the study. The minimum length of incarceration at OCDC at the time of questionnaire administration was 30 days to allow for familiarity and interaction with the COs. Inmates were administered the questionnaire individually to ensure comprehension and reliable responses. Inmate files were reviewed in conjunction with the information provided by the inmates to verify the validity of the demographic data. Thirty-six inmates were approached in order to obtain a sample of 30 inmates agreeable to testing.

Brockville and Perth Jails

Brockville Jail is located in Brockville, (approximately 60 miles south of Ottawa) a city with a population of 30,000. The jail in Perth is located approximately 45 miles south-west of Ottawa, in a town with a population of 5,000. They are both maximum security institutions holding individuals awaiting trial, those with short sentences and those awaiting transfer to federal or provincial institutions.

Due to the different shifts and work schedule of the COs and supervisors, questionnaires were attached to the pay cheques. The questionnaires were filled out on an individual basis and when completed, were returned to the Administration Office within the jails.

The return rate for the COs was 100% at each jail, with a total sample of 30 COs. For supervisors, the return rate was 83% at each jail with a total sample of 10 supervisors.

At the time of the study, Perth Jail was undergoing major structural renovations. All inmates were retained for approximately one day and then a majority of them were transferred to Brockville Jail. All inmates, therefore, were administered the questionnaire at Brockville Jail. Due to the high rate of turnover and relatively short period of incarceration, the minimum length of time served at Brockville Jail, at the time of questionnaire administration was 2

weeks to allow for familiarity and interaction with COs. Only sentenced inmates were included in the study. Inmates were administered the questionnaires individually to ensure comprehension and reliable responses. Inmate files were reviewed in conjunction with the information provided by the inmates to verify the validity of the demographic data. Thirty-two inmates were approached in order to obtain a sample of 30 inmates agreeable to testing.

A summary allowing for easy comparison of the various demographic variables for COs and supervisors may be seen in Tables 1 and 2, respectively. Table 3 provides a summary of the demographic variables for inmates.

Table 1

Means for Demographic Variables for Correctional Officers

| | RCC n=30 | OCDC n=24 | Jails n=30 | N=84 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Age | 36.5 | 36.1 | 32.9 | 35.2 |
| Level of education | 13.2 | 13.9 | 12.7 | 13.4 |
| Number of years employed at current institution as a correctional officer | 8.2 | 6.0 | 6.7 | 7.0 |
| Number of months previously employed in a minimum institution as a correctional officer | 7.0 | 1.3 | 4.4 | 3.7 |
| Number of months previously employed in a medium institution as a correctional officer | 2.8 | 1.2 | 3.6 | 3.0 |
| Number of months previously employed in a maximum institution as a correctional officer | 1.6 | 2.3 | 6.4 | 4.1 |
| Total number of months previously employed as a correctional officer regardless of level of security | 11.4 | 4.9 | 14.0 | 10.8 |

Table 2

Means for Demographic Variables for Supervisors

| | RCC n=9 | OCDC n=6 | Jails n=10 | N=25 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Age | 47.8 | 43.0 | 44.4 | 45.2 |
| Level of education | 13.9 | 14.5 | 13.0 | 13.7 |
| Number of years employed at current institution as a supervisor | 13.2 | 9.3 | 7.5 | 10.0 |
| Number of years previously employed in a minimum institution as a supervisor | 3.2 | 1.5 | 0 | 1.5 |
| Number of years previously employed in a medium institution as a supervisor | 3.2 | 0 | 0 | 1.2 |
| Number of years previously employed in a maximum institution as a supervisor | 2.11 | 2.2 | 6.0 | 3.5 |
| Total number of years previously employed as a supervisor regardless of level of security | 8.6 | 3.7 | 6.0 | 6.0 |

**Table 3**
Means for Demographic Variables for Inmates

| | RCC n=30 | OCDC n=30 | Jails n=30 | N=90 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Age | 24.2 | 24.0 | 24.3 | 24.2 |
| Level of education | 9.4 | 9.6 | 10.1 | 9.7 |
| Number of months incarcerated at time of study | 3.3 | 2.6 | 1.2 | 2.5 |
| Length of sentence in months | 6.4 | 6.4 | 3.9 | 5.8 |
| Percentage of sentence served at time of study | 51.6 | 47.3 | 48.0 | 49.0 |
| Mean number of times previously incarcerated in a minimum institution | .93 | .83 | .27 | .68 |
| Mean number of times previously incarcerated in a medium institution | .80 | .63 | .50 | .54 |
| Mean number of times previously incarcerated in a maximum institution | .80 | 1.8 | .93 | 1.1 |
| Total number of times previously incarcerated regardless of level of security | 2.2 | 3.3 | 1.7 | 2.4 |
| Number of months previously incarcerated in a minimum institution | 8.2 | 6.8 | 3.6 | 5.5 |
| Number of months previously incarcerated in a medium institution | 1.7 | 6.9 | 9.2 | 5.5 |
| Number of months previously incarcerated in a maximum institution | 2.6 | 13.4 | 4.2 | 7.1 |
| Total number of months previously incarcerated regardless of the level of security | 12.4 | 19.0 | 15.0 | 16.0 |

## RESULTS

The ratings on each of the 69 items from the three subject groups (N=199) were combined to perform a factor analysis. Principal components with varimax rotation was applied. From this analysis three factors were conceptually interpreted. A correlation cut off of .4 of the item to the factor was selected. The score on each item was multiplied by its optimal weight to obtain a factor score for each subject. Factor A was comprised of 27 items; 21 items constituted factor B; and a total of 10 items in factor C. A total of 11 items were eliminated, resulting in an instrument composed of 58 items (see Appendix B).

### Factor A

Factor A was labelled Responsibility/Leadership Skills and may be characterized by the following description. The CO performs the basic or routine jobs of a CO. This includes providing oral or written reports where required or needed, as well as adherence to and enforcement of rules of the institution including those related to security.

The job is performed independently without the need for excessive supervision. The CO solves most routine problems on his own and can predict or anticipate many problems in advance and act accordingly. While there are situations that require assistance or advice, the CO seeks it and holds himself accountable for the

consequences of his behavior. He accepts supervision and directions willingly and is able to reconcile contrary decisions from supervisors.

Working effectively with other staff and communicating ideas and suggestions to co-workers, which at times may be implemented is valued. The CO is regarded as a leader, whereby he can bring divergent opinions together in a consensus.

Inmates are provided with appropriate information on such topics as parole procedures, day passes, temporary absence programs, etc. When supervising inmates, the CO provides clear directions, lets them know when they have done well and instructs them on how to improve unacceptable behavior prior to applying negative consequences.

Factor B

Factor B was labelled Behavior Skill Deficits and is depictive of a poorly functioning CO. For example, the CO is lethargic and allows work to lag behind, often failing to meet deadlines. He may act impulsively without considering the consequences of his behavior and often denies responsibility for any errors. Excessive supervision is required, whereby the CO has to be constantly told what to do next.

He fails to inform co-workers on the next shift of any problems that arose. His views have minimal influence on co-workers, and expresses little interest in obtaining other opinions from staff.

The CO may give up easily in an argument or may be quite emotionally volatile, arguing with co-workers in front of inmates, making derogatory statements to staff, teasing inmates, and is easily prone to losing his temper. He provides inaccurate information to inmate's questions which may include details about institutional regulations, day passes, parole procedures, etc. Demonstrates a difficulty in working with inmates and is often perceived as unapproachable by inmates.

Factor C

Factor C was labelled Inmate-Relationship Skills and portrays the CO in a therapeutic role. The CO requires the inmates to face the responsibility for the direction of their lives. He regularly interacts with inmates, listens to them and provides counselling. An attempt is made to understand the inmate's feelings and thoughts. The CO helps inmates to find solutions to their various problems. He respects their rights and deals with them in an open and honest manner. The CO is supportive of inmates who are experiencing difficulties in adjusting to the institution or who are having personal problems.

Orthogonality of Factors

Pearson product moment correlation coefficients were obtained to determine the orthogonality of the factors. As can be seen from Table 4, the relationship between factor A and factor B was significantly

negatively correlated ($r$=-.19, $p$<.01). Factor A and factor C were also significantly correlated ($r$=.31, $p$<.001). Pearson product moment inter-item and item to scale score correlation coefficients for each of the factor scales were obtained to further assess the non-orthogonality of the factors (see Appendix B).

Table 4

Correlation Coefficients Between Factor A, B, and C

| | Factor A | Factor B | Factor C |
|---|---|---|---|
| Factor A | 1.0 | -.19** | .31*** |
| Factor B | -.19** | 1.0 | -.11 |
| Factor C | .31*** | -.11 | 1.0 |

A correlation coefficient of .14 is required for $p$<.05

df = 197

** $p$<.01

*** $p$<.001

## Relative Importance of Factors Between Subject Groups and Institutions

A three by three factorial analysis of variance was performed on each factor by institution and subject group. Tukey's post-hoc test was applied to determine significance between subject groups and institution mean factor scores.

There was no significant main effect for institution on factor A $F$ (2, 190) < 1, as can be seen in Table 5. There was, however, a significant main effect for subject group $F$ (2,190) = 24.79, $p$ <.001. COs and supervisors attributed significantly more importance to factor A ($M$=49.74; 49.05; $p$<.05, than inmates ($M$= 44.16), as shown in Table 6. There was no significant two-way interaction effect for institution and subject group $F$ (4, 190)=2.32, $p$>.05

On factor B, there were no significant main effects for institution or subject group $F$ (2,190)=2.07; 1.65, $p$>.05, respectively, as seen in Table 7. A significant two-way interaction between institution and subject group was also not evident $F$ (4, 190)=2.09, $p$>.05.

There were no significant main effects for institution for factor C $F$ (2, 190) <1 as seen in Table 8. A significant main effect for subject group $F$ (2,190)=17.37, $p$<.001, was evident. Inmates attached significantly greater importance to factor C ($M$=17.08, $p$<.05) than COs and supervisors ($M$=15.08; 14.95), as can be seen in Table 9. A significant two-way interaction effect for institution and subject group was not evident $F$ (4, 190)= 5.78, $p$>.05.

Table 5

Analysis of Variance for Factor A
by Institution and Subject Group

| Source of Variation | SS | df | MS | F |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Institution | 14.73 | 2 | 7.36 | .25(NS) |
| Subject Group | 1450.52 | 2 | 725.26 | 24.79*** |
| Institution x Subject Group | 328.30 | 4 | 82.09 | 2.32 (NS) |
| Residual | 5557.46 | 190 | 29.25 | |

***$p<.001$

Table 6

Tukey's Post-hoc Test for Comparison of
Subject Group Means for Factor A

| | | COs 49.74* | Supervisors 49.05* | Inmates 44.16 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| COs | 49.74* | - | .69($d\bar{T}$=.72) | 5.59 ($d\bar{T}$=.29) |
| Supervisors | 49.05* | | - | 4.89 ($d\bar{T}$=.67) |
| Inmates | 44.16 | | | - |

*$p<.05$
$d\bar{T}$ = critical value

Table 7

Analysis of Variance for Factor B
by Institution and Subject Group

| Source of Variation | SS | df | MS | F |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Institution | 4.47 | 2 | 2.23 | 2.07 (NS) |
| Subject Group | 35.93 | 2 | 17.96 | 1.65(NS) |
| Institution x Subject Group | 90.60 | 4 | 22.65 | 2.09(NS) |
| Residual | 2059.19 | 190 | 10.83 | |

Table 8

Analysis of Variance for Factor C
by Institution and Subject Group

| Source of Variation | SS | df | MS | F |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Institution | 9.46 | 2 | 4.73 | .83(NS) |
| Subject Group | 197.07 | 2 | 98.53 | 17.37*** |
| Institution x Subject Group | 13.10 | 4 | 3.27 | .57(NS) |
| Residual | 1077.40 | 190 | 5.67 | |

***$p<.001$

Table 9

Tukey's Post-hoc Test for Comparison of
Subject Group for Means for Factor C

| | | Inmates 17.08* | COs 15.08 | Supervisors 14.95 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Inmates | 17.08* | - | 2.0($d\bar{T}$=.13) | 2.13 ($d\bar{T}$=.28) |
| COs | 15.08 | | - | .13 ($d\bar{T}$=.14) |
| Supervisors | 14.95 | | | - |

*$p<.05$
$d\bar{T}$ = critical value

## Individual Differences

Demographic variables were correlated with each factor by subject group.* Age was the only demographic variable that reached significance for the supervisors ($n$=25) which correlated negatively with factor C ($r$=-.42, $p$<.05), as shown in Table 10. In this case, the younger the supervisor, the higher the value was attributed to factor C.

Table 10

Correlations of Demographic Variables With Factors A, B, and C for Supervisors

| | Age | $V_1$ | $V_2$ | $V_3$ | $V_4$ | $V_5$ | $V_6$ |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Factor A | -.39 | -.19 | -.05 | .16 | -.34 | -.27 | -.20 |
| Factor B | .00 | -.16 | -.24 | -.10 | -.07 | .18 | .00 |
| Factor C | -.42* | .29 | -.10 | .24 | -.17 | -.14 | -.01 |

A correlation coefficient of .396 is required for $p$<.05
df=23

*$p$<.05

$V_1$ = Level of education
$V_2$ = Number of years employed as a supervisor at current institution
$V_3$ = Number of years previously employed as a supervisor at a minimum institution.
$V_4$ = Number of years previously employed as a supervisor at a medium institution.
$V_5$ = Number of years previously employed as a supervisor at a maximum institution.
$V_6$ = Total number of years previously employed as a supervisor regardless of level of security.

* Additionally, based upon the frequency distribution of some of these variables, they were divided into subgroups and an analysis of variance was performed with each factor and the subgroups for each subject group. However, no different conclusions were drawn and these tables can be seen in Appendix C.

The correlations of demographic variables with factors A, B, and C did not reach significance for the COs ($n$=84), as can be seen from Table 11.

Table 11

Correlations of Demographic Variables

With Factors A, B and C for Correctional Officers

| | Age | $V_1$ | $V_2$ | $V_3$ | $V_4$ | $V_5$ | $V_6$ |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Factor A | .09 | -.08 | -.20 | .02 | -.08 | .06 | -.03 |
| Factor B | .02 | .00 | -.01 | .03 | -.09 | -.05 | -.05 |
| Factor C | -.14 | .05 | -.19 | -.04 | -.09 | .02 | -.06 |

A correlation coefficient of .22 is required for $p<.05$

df=82

$V_1$ = Level of education
$V_2$ = Number of years employed as a correctional officer at current institution

$V_3$ = Number of years previously employed as a correctional officer at minimum institution.

$V_4$ = Number of years previously employed as a correctional officer at a medium institution.

$V_5$ = Number of years previously employed as a correctional officer at a maximum institution.

$V_6$ = Total number of years previously employed as a correctional officer regardless of level of security.

Age was significantly negatively correlated with factor A for the inmate group ($n$=90), ($r$=.23, $p$<.05), as seen in Table 12. The younger the inmate, the more emphasis was given to the importance of an effective CO.

The number of times previously incarcerated in a maximum institution was significantly negatively correlated with factor A ($r$=-.27, $p$<.01). The total number of times previously incarcerated regardless of level of security was also significantly negatively correlated with factor A ($r$=-.33, $p$<.01). The less number of times previously incarcerated, the more importance was given to an effective CO.

The previous length of time incarcerated in a medium or maximum institution and the total previous length of time incarcerated was significantly negatively correlated with factor A ($r$=-.32, $p$<.01; $r$=-.24, $p$<.05; $r$=-.40, $p$<.001, respectively). The less amount of time previously incarcerated, the inmate attributed more importance to an effective CO.

Percentage of the sentence served was the only demographic variable that was significantly negatively correlated with factor B ($r$=-.26, $p$<.05). The smaller the percentage of the sentence served, the more emphasis was attributed towards a poorly functioning CO.

Length of time previously incarcerated in a maximum institution was the only demographic variable significantly negatively correlated with factor C ($r$=-.23, $p$<.05). The shorter the time spent in a maximum institution, the more emphasis was placed on the CO's therapeutic skills.

Table 12

Correlations of Demographic Variables

With Factors A, B, and C for Inmates.

| Factor | Age | $V_1$ | $V_2$ | $V_3$ | $V_4$ | $V_5$ | $V_6$ | $V_7$ | $V_8$ | $V_9$ | $V_{10}$ | $V_{11}$ | $V_{12}$ |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Factor A | .23* | .06 | -.17 | -.08 | -.01 | -.20 | -.07 | -.27** | -.33** | -.17 | -.32** | -.24* | -.40*** |
| Factor B | -.11 | .09 | -.15 | .05 | -.26* | -.01 | .05 | .02 | .03 | .14 | .15 | .01 | .16 |
| Factor C | .08 | -.18 | .03 | .11 | -.11 | .00 | -.01 | -.10 | -.08 | .00 | -.23* | .01 | -.13 |

A correlation coefficient of .21 is required for $p<.05$.

df=88
*$p<.05$
**$p<.01$
***$p<.001$

$V_1$ = Level of education
$V_2$ = Length of time served at current institution at time of questionnaire administration
$V_3$ = Length of sentence in months
$V_4$ = Percentage of sentence served at the time of questionnaire administration
$V_5$ = Number of times previously incarcerated in a minimum institution
$V_6$ = Number of times previously incarcerated in a medium institution
$V_7$ = Number of times previously incarcerated in a maximum institution
$V_8$ = Total number of times previously incarcerated regardless of level of security.
$V_9$ = Length of time previously incarcerated in a minimum institution
$V_{10}$ = Length of time previously incarcerated in a medium institution
$V_{11}$ = Length of time previously incarcerated in a maximum institution
$V_{12}$ = Total length of time previously incarcerated regardless of level of security.

Thematic Interpretation of Open-Ended Question on CPRS

The final item on the questionnaire allowed subjects to add behavioral qualities of an effective CO that were not included in the original item pool. The response rate to this question was 21.1% for

the total inmate group, with 26.6%, 13.3%, and 23.3% at Brockville/ Perth Jails, Rideau Correctional Centre, and Ottawa-Carleton Detention Centre, respectively. Additional qualities of an effective CO were viewed by the inmates as an ability to understand their personal problems, to be available to them and demonstrate an empathic and caring attitude towards their personal situation. The capacity to respect the inmates' feelings and a willingness to help was seen as of prime importance.

The overall response rate for this question was 17.8% for the COs, with 20%, 20% and 12.5% at Brockville/Perth Jails, Rideau Correctional Centre and Ottawa-Carleton Detention Centre, respectively. The ability to follow and obey orders as well as the capacity to work independently and make decisions was valued. The importance of maintaining custody and security while being fair and sensitive to the needs of the inmates was highlighted.

The supervisors overall response rate to this question was 20%, with 20%, 22.2% and 16.6% at Brockville/Perth Jails, Rideau Correctional Centre, and Ottawa-Carleton Detention Centre, respectively. Loyalty and the ability to interact positively with supervisors was seen as important. Fairness with inmates was also pinpointed.

## Internal Reliability of CPRS

Cronbach's alpha was computed to determine the internal reliability of the CPRS. The internal reliability was performed on the original 69 item pool, whereby $r$=.84. When the factor analysis was performed, 11 items were dropped from the original item pool, resulting in a total of 58 items. The internal reliability for the shortened version was also $r$=.84.

Spearman-Brown split-half reliability was also computed for the original 69 item pool, whereby, $r$=.77. The internal reliability for the shortened version was also $r$=.77.

## DISCUSSION

To the author's knowledge, the Correctional Personnel Rating Scale (CPRS) is the first such measure reported in the corrections literature that purports to assess a set of CO behavior skills.

### CPRS

The CPRS was refined in this study by providing a factor analysis of the test. Three factors and the items that contributed to each of these factors were identified. Eleven items of the CPRS were discarded as contributing little to the underlying factor structure of the scale.

The factors appeared to have face validity. Factor A was labelled Responsibility/Leadership skills. The CO must be able to perform and communicate the routine aspects of the job that are integral to the daily functioning of the institution to correctional staff and inmates. Behavior Skill Deficits typified Factor B. The CO lacks investment in his role and performance with reference to administrative duties, and interpersonal relationships with staff and inmates is perceived as being inadequate. Factor C was labelled Inmate-Relationship Skills. The CO engages in a therapeutic role, whereby support and counselling is provided to inmates experiencing personal difficulties. This factor supports Homant's (1979) previously noted findings which depicted an effective CO as being understanding and empathic towards the inmates.

It is important to recognize that the behaviors that constituted the factors in this study were conceptually related to some of the subscales provided by the original authors of the CPRS. For example the subscales, Routine Job Tasks, Leadership, and Staff Relations include similar behaviors that constitute the factor labelled Responsibility/Leadership Skills. As well, the Resident Relations subscale is closely related to the Inmate-Relationship Skills factor.

Data was added to the psychometric properties of the CPRS. The internal reliability using Cronbach's alpha was high ($r$=.84) and appeared to be the result of the inter-item and item to factor scale correlations. The inter-item correlations within each scale were not all significantly correlated, mean inter-item correlations were not potent, and some of the items within each factor scale were also significantly correlated with some of the items in the other factor scales. This certainly raises questions as to the internal consistency of the factor scales. The relationship between the items may indicate that the scales are perhaps not unitary constructs. Further examination of the item to factor scale score correlations revealed that items of a particular scale significantly correlated, as well, with other factor scale scores. This may explain the lack of orthogonality between factors that was previously noted. Perhaps the subjects perceived the items within the different factor scales as being conceptually related e.g., item no. 64 - "praises an inmate for appropriate behavior" was significantly correlated with both factor scale scores for factors A and C. It is also worth noting,

that the original authors of the CPRS provided 5 subscales, which may have gone beyond the capacity of this instrument. Only 3 subscales were obtained after a factor analysis, and even so, as mentioned these factors may not represent entirely unitary constructs.

## Perceptions of Effective COs

The present study was the first in the corrections literature to systematically compare the COs', supervisors' and offenders' perceptions of the CO's tasks. As well, their observations were compared across three different types of correctional settings. A number of important results emanated from these comparisons. These factors, whether perceived from the view of supervisors, COs or inmates, were consistently valued across the three different institutional settings. Perhaps there is a conception of an all-purpose CO, whereby training would not necessarily be geared to a specific type of institution.

Perceptions between subject groups differed on the Responsibility/ Leadership dimension, as COs and supervisors attributed more importance to these skills than the inmates. These routine job skills which aid in the maintenance of security may be perceived as their primary task, whereas inmates, are obviously less concerned with many aspects of the administrative functioning of the institution.

Inmates attributed more weight to the Inmate-Relationship Skills dimension, not unexpectedly, as they are involved with the day-to-day

relationships with line staff. If one were to have an institutional setting where inmate-staff relationships had the highest priority from a counselling and programming framework, then skills tapped by this dimension would be a vital evaluative and training tool for COs.

No other studies in the corrections personnel evaluation literature have examined the influence, if any, of individual differences on the perceptions of the CO's role. Given the limitations of the individual differences assessed in this study, it may not be surprising that the correlations of these individual differences with the factors identified were not potent. The significant correlations that were reported, nevertheless, supported common sense notions. Younger supervisors attributed more importance to the counselling skills of the CO. Likely, many of the older supervisors had come up through the corrections system that reflected the traditional values of past years.

Several individual difference relationships were significant from the inmates' perspective. Age and experience an offender had with previous incarcerations, time served on the current sentence, and maximum security settings were negatively related to their ratings on factors A, B, and C, respectively. Inmates who had considerable experience with prisons appeared to be less concerned with the skills constituting an effective CO, possibly because they have developed, through experience, more appropriate coping skills to aid in their adjustment to the environment.

There are however, some limitations applied to the above results. These will be discussed in order of a) non-compliance;, b) representativeness; c) behavioral specificity.

a) Non-compliance

One of the serious limitations was the lower (<50%) response rate from COs at Ottawa-Carleton Detention Centre (OCDC). Of the institutions sampled in the present study, OCDC is well known for its checkered history from the point of view of institutional stability. On a proportional basis, in contrast to the other settings surveyed, OCDC has had much more inmate unrest, management changeover, militant unionism and grievances from line staff. Not surprisingly, some of this history may well have been reflected in the refusal of many COs to co-operate with the project (see subject section, p.16). It is tempting to assume that the non-responders may have possessed different perceptions of the qualities of an effective CO. Of course this is an assumption; possibly, if these staff were to ever respond, they still may have produced perceptions similar to their counterparts in the other settings. Unless staff were exceptionally radical, it would be stretching the point to argue that they would disagree with factors A and B. The only speculation possible at this time comes from the studies by Wilkins (1975) and Williams and Soutar (1984) who found that COs employed in maximum settings had, as expected, a more custodial view and negative stereotyping of inmates. It is not known, however, whether the settings surveyed in these studies had histories similar to OCDC.

This limitation raises another intriguing question for personnel selection research in corrections. Given the adversarial relationships that exist in some prisons, it may be possible to produce data only relevant to settings that have a reasonable degree of stability. One may never know the true situation that exists for our most problematic prisons, unless social scientists are able to measure COs' behavior unobtrusively. The logistics of such a study are not easy to imagine. As it stands now, objective data on CO evaluation processes from any of our prisons may be difficult to obtain in the future. As a case in point, the Public Service Union in Ontario has insisted that COs refuse to co-operate with research unless it is carried out by researchers of their own choice on problems defined solely of interest to the unions concerns (OPSEU, Note 1). Somehow, future researchers must attempt some reapproachment with the unions and still attempt to conduct objective CO evaluation studies that will serve the purpose of all concerned.

b) Representativeness

It is recognized that the three different types of institutional environments sampled in this study are not characteristic of the entire range of institutions found across North America. The roles of the COs in different institutions, such as federal penitentiaries may be discrepant to those sampled in this study. In addition, the offenders sampled do not include those with extensive nor particularly

violent criminal histories. It would be imperative to extend this research to other types of correctional facilities and offenders to determine the generalizability of the perceptions assessed in this study.

c) Behavioral Specificity

Throughout the CO evaluation literature, it is implicit that there does not exist a clearly defined notion of the ideal functioning CO. Probably no such ideal creature exists; it depends on one's viewpoint. The viewpoint chosen here is from a behaviorally based perspective and the development of the appropriate skills in this regard is dependent upon the judgement of those closest to the job. Some would argue that this approach is the necessary one with reference to CO selection (Ross and McKay, 1981). It appears to be a far more specific task-oriented approach than the use of psychological personality assessments that were criticized earlier for producing global trait qualities. The results from this study are a mixed blessing in this regard. Some of the factor items were indeed specific e.g., "praises an inmate for appropriate behaviour, i.e. tells him when he has done his work correctly and well; tells him his performance on trips outside the institution was good." Others, in the author's opinion, were not concrete enough e.g., "the behavior of the CO is consistent with the aims of this institution". Factor C, for example, was composed of some items that, on the surface, appeared to tap a trait like empathy.

Generating specific tasks, however, is not all that easily accomplished. In an exhaustive study, Segal and Jackson (1975) obtained a random sample of 500 personnel from correction institutions both at the federal and provincial level. COs, probation/parole officers, and management were administered questionnaires to identify the various tasks that constituted their respective jobs. From these questionnaires a task bank was developed which consisted of 228 task descriptions grouped into 16 activities, rather than by occupation. Many of these task descriptions were also global and the specific behavioral skills required to perform these tasks were not readily identified, e.g., "Report Writing - fills out reports on any incidents occurred during the shift; Disciplining - initiates charge against inmate according to security regulations when violations have occurred in order to trigger mechanism for disciplinary action" (p.145).

Obviously, a behavioral skills approach is no panacea. The further development of a behavioral skills approach using the CPRS or any other similar measure must allow for a more concrete definition of discreet behaviors. Future research should define some of the items by conducting observational studies of COs. For example, how "the CO shows interest in what an inmate is saying" (item no. 1), may be assessed by observing such behaviors as eye contact, voice tonality, body posture, etc. Alternative studies, should involve situational role-playing procedures where definitions of appropriate behaviors could be refined. This approach is being considered more and more among corrections agencies (Behrens, 1985). At the very least, some

of the items generated from the CPRS in this study, can identify behaviors that should be focussed on in pre-job training exercises.

Finally, although not specifically a limitation of the present investigation, the police evaluation literature deserves some comment, as it reflects the opportunity for significant advances in the CO field. While a behavioral skills approach is new to CO evaluation, one assumes significant advances have been made in police officer evaluation practices. This research should be relevant and offer valuable leads. As recently as 1980, Cordner noted that, "To date, no review of police job analyses has been published. One important reason for this gap in the literature is that reports of job analysis studies do not get published or receive wide circulation. They are produced for a particular agency and are not readily available in libraries or journals" (p.359). McGuiness (Note 2) stated that "all the published literature on police officer evaluation reviews the use of psychological personality instruments. For example, there are probably over 200 studies reporting the use of the MMPI. It is true that there probably are behavioral skills analyses being conducted, however, the police are not typically authors and therefore this research is not being published." Wycoff (Note 3) remarked that "all published reports in our library on police officer selection do not focus on a behavioral skill or task approach but rather on psychological tests as screening devices." Either there is little quality research on this topic or it is being classified. As such, the police literature resembles the "fugitive" literature found in other areas of criminal justice research. That is, a number of reports and unpublished papers are difficult to obtain and are of

varying methodological quality. (Sechrest, White, and Brown, 1979, pp.104-105).

## Summary

In summary, the selection, training, and evaluation of COs should be intimately linked to the necessary skills that are required for the performance of an effective CO. This process, however, cannot be accomplished without the identification of these skills. To date the research in the area of CO selection is limited and has not joined the mainstream of personnel selection research in the field of industrial/organizational psychology. Efforts must be directed towards the objective assessment of the behavioral skills that are pertinent to the CO's job. Obviously, other behavioral measures may prove to be more worthwhile than the CPRS, but the results that it has generated to date, appear to have some credibility warranting further research on the measure itself. In particular, much more normative data needs to be collected. The stability of the factor loadings should be investigated by a replication of this study with a larger sample size. Additionally, similar factors may not be obtained with a sample and institutions that are different from the one in this study. The internal consistency of the CPRS must also be further investigated. Additional data must be generated to develop internally consistent and orthogonal factor scales. Predictive and concurrent validity must also be obtained.

Finally, there is a need for further attempts at a more specific identification of CO behavior skills. Once this goal is attained, the process of CO evaluation will advance beyond its present stage.

## REFERENCE NOTES

1. Ontario Public Service Employees Union (OPSEU) memo, June 29, 1984.

2. McGuiness, J. Canadian Police College, Ottawa. Personal communication, March, 1985.

3. Wycoff, M. Police Executive Research Foundation, Washington, D.C. Personal communication, March 1985.

## REFERENCES

American Correctional Association (1970). Causes, preventative measures and methods of controlling riots and disturbances in correctional institutions.

Behrens, G. (1985). Psychological screening trends in the selection of police and corrections personnel. Criminal Justice Digest, 4, 6-8.

Bray, D., & Campbell, R. (1968). Selection of salesmen by means of an assessment center. Journal of Applied Psychology, 52, 36-41.

Cleff, S. (1980). A strategy for hiring sales representatives. Personnel, 57, 58-68.

Cordner, G. (1980). Job analysis and the police: Benefits and limitations. Journal of Police Science and Administration, 8, 355-362.

Cressey, D.R. (1959). Contradictory directives in complex organizations: The case of the prison. Administrative Science Quarterly, 4, 1-19.

Downey, R.W., & Signori, E.L. (1958). The selection of prison guards. Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology and Police Science, 49, 234-236.

Ghorpade, J., & Atchinson, T.J. (1980). The concept of job analysis: A review and some suggestions. Public Personnel Management Journal, 9, 134-144.

Glaser, D. (1964). The effectiveness of a prison and parole system. Indianapolis, IN: Bobbs-Merrill.

Goldstein, B. (1975). Screening for emotional and psychological fitness in correctional officer hiring. Washington: American Bar Association Resource Centre on Correctional Law and Legal Services.

Hammer, M. (1968). Differentiating good and bad officers in a progressive Women's reformatory. Corrective Psychiatry, 14, 114-118.

Homant, R.J. (1979). Correlates of satisfactory relations between correctional officers and prisoners. Journal of Offender Counselling, Services and Rehabilitation, 4, 53-62.

Lombardo, L.X. (1981). Guards imprisoned: Correctional officers at work. New York: Elsevier North Holland Inc.

Lundberg, D.E. (1947). Methods of selecting prison personnel. Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology, 38, 14-39.

MacGuigan, M. (1977). Report to parliament by the sub-committee on the penitentiary system in Canada. Ontario: Ministry of Supply and Services.

May, E. (1976). Prison guards in America: The inside story. Corrections Magazine, 11, 36-48.

McGregor, D. (1957). An uneasy look at performance appraisal. Havard Business Review, 35. 89-94.

O'Leary, L. (1976). Objectivity and job-relatedness. Can we have our cake and eat it too? Public Personnel Management, 43, 423-433.

Olson, H., Fine, S., Myers, D., & Jennings, M. (1981). The use of functional job analysis in establishing performance standards for heavy equipment operators. Personnel Psychology, 34, 351-364.

Paterson, A., Sir. (1951). In S.K. Ruch (Ed.), Paterson on Prisons: Being the collected papers of Sir Alexander Paterson. London: Frederick Muller, Ltd.

Perdue, W.C. (1964). The screening of applicants for custodial work by means of a temperament test. American Journal of Corrections, 26, 14-19.

Perdue, W.C. (1966). The temperaments of custodial workers. American Journal of Corrections, 28, 16-19.

Ross, R.R., & McKay, H.B. (1981). The correctional officer: Selection through training. In R.R. Ross (Ed.), Prison guard/Correctional officer: The use and abuse of the human resources of prisons. Toronto: Butterworths, Canada.

Schrag, C. (1961). Some foundations for a theory of correction. In D.R. Cressey (Ed.), The prison: Studies in institutional organization and change. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Schuerger, J.M., Kochevar, K.F., & Reinwald, J.E. (1982). Male and female correction officers: Personality and rated performance. Psychological Reports, 51, 223-228.

Sechrest, L.; White, S.O.; & Brown, E.D. (Eds.)(1979). The rehabilitation of criminal offenders: Problems and prospects. Washington: National Academy of Sciences.

Segal, B. & Jackson, J. (1975). Correctional manpower planning: Training and development project: Task bank. Ontario: National Advisory Network on Correctional Manpower Training and Development.

Shusman, E.J., Inwald, R.E., & Landa, B. (1984). Correctional officer job performance as predicted by the IPI and MMPI: A validation and cross-validation study. Criminal Justice and Behavior, 11, 309-329.

Siegal, A., & Bergman, B. (1975). A job learning approach to performance evaluation. Personnel Psychology, 28, 325-339.

Szilagyi, A.D., & Wallace, M.J. (1980). Organizational behaviour and performance. California: Goodyear Publishing Company.

Teske, R.H., & Williamson, H.E. (1979). Correctional officers' attitudes toward selected treatment programs. Criminal Justice and Behavior, 6, 59-66.

Toch, H. (1981). Is a "correctional officer", by any other name a "screw"? Criminal Justice Review, 3 (2), 19-35.

Wicks, R.J. (1980). Guard! Society's professional prisoner. Texas: Gulf Publishing Company.

Wilkins, M.L. (1975). Correctional officers: Roles, attitudes and problems. Ontario: Ministry of Correctional Services.

Willet, T. (1973). Becoming a correctional officer in the Canadian Penitentiary Service: An account of the induction process. Canada: Canadian Penitentiary Service.

Williams, T.A., & Soutar, G.N. (1984). Levels of custody and attitude differences among prison officers: A comparative study. Australian and New Zealand Journal of Criminology, 17, 87-94.

Willis, J., Jessup, B., Savage, P., Cooper, G., & Slesser, R. (1979). Preliminary data on the correctional personnel rating scale. Canadian Journal of Criminology, 21, 71-80 (a).

Willis, J., Savage, P., & Jessup, B. (1979). The correctional personnel rating scale. Corrective and Social Psychiatry and Journal of Behavior Technology Methods and Therapy, 25, 6-14 (b).

# APPENDIX A

Ministry of Correctional Services
Ontario

Memorandum

Date: September 11, 1984

To: Correctional Staff
Name/Title/Branch
Address/City/Postal Code

From: M. A. Sial, Deputy Superintendent
Name/Title/Branch/Phone
Address/City/Postal Code

Subject: RESEARCH ON THE QUALITIES OF AN EFFECTIVE CORRECTIONAL OFFICER

Ms. C. Wahler is a doctoral student from the University of Ottawa who is interested in the views of correctional staff on what makes an ideal correctional officer. She is asking staff to complete a brief questionnaire that will form the basis for her research. This research has been approved by the Ministry. The questionnaires are confidential and staff need not identify themselves. The results of the study will be reported in her dissertation and it will be available to staff when completed. Your co-operation in this project would be much appreciated.

M. A. Sial

M. A. Sial,
Deputy Superintendent.

JB:lb

Ministry of Correctional Services
Ontario

Memorandum

Date: October 1, 1984

To: CORRECTIONAL STAFF, O.C.D.C.
Name/Title/Branch
Address/City/Postal Code

From: Cindy Wahler, Doctoral Candidate, University of Ottawa
Name/Title/Branch/Phone
Address/City/Postal Code

Subject: RESEARCH ON THE QUALITIES OF AN EFFECTIVE CORRECTIONAL OFFICER

I am currently conducting research to determine the qualities of an ideal correctional officer. Correctional staff and other individuals working within this field have often asked what qualities constitute an ideal correctional officer. This is considered an important piece of research as you, the staff, are being consulted and given the opportunity to offer your input. This research is also being conducted at other correctional institutions within the Ministry and it appears that the return rate of these questionnaires at O.C.D.C. is not as high as originally expected. Your input in this study is considered to be of major importance. I would like to ask you once more that if you have not yet completed a questionnaire could you please consider doing so. The questionnaire is anonymous and you may find copies of the questionnaire in the staff duty offices. Your co-operation in this project would be much appreciated.

Cindy Wahler

Cindy Wahler,
University of Ottawa.

CW:lb

Ministry of Correctional Services
Ontario

Memorandum

Date: October 31, 1984

To: All Correctional Officers and Sergeants, Perth Jail
Name/Title/Branch
Address/City/Postal Code

From: Mr. C. R. Stewart, Superintendent
Name/Title/Branch/Phone
Address/City/Postal Code

Subject: RESEARCH ON THE QUALITIES OF AN IDEAL CORRECTIONAL OFFICER

Ms. C. Wahler is a student from the University of Ottawa who is interested in the views of correctional staff on what makes an ideal correctional officer. She is asking staff to complete a brief questionnaire that will form the basis for her research. This research has been approved by the Ministry and the following institutions, Ottawa-Carleton Detention Centre, Rideau Correctional Centre and Brockville Jail, have already participated in this research, and most of the questionnaires have been completed and returned. The questionnaires are confidentential and staff need not identify themselves. The results of the study will be reported in her thesis and it will be available to staff when completed. Your cooperation in this project would be much appreciated.

for C. R. Stewart,
Superintendent

CRS/jm

RIDEAU CORRECTIONAL CENTRE

October 3, 1984.

To: Correctional Staff

Fm: Cindy Wahler, University of Ottawa

Re: Research on the Qualities of an Effective Correctional Officer

I am currently doing research to obtain views of correctional staff on what makes an ideal correctional officer. In order to gather the information I require, I am asking you to take a few minutes of your time to complete the attached questionnaire. Please let me assure you that since this questionnaire is totally anonymous, your identity will not be revealed. Once you have completed the questionnaire, please return it to Mr. Cowie, Assistant Superintendent, as soon as possible.

Thank you very much for your cooperation.

Cindy Wahler

Cindy Wahler,
University of Ottawa.

To: Supervisors

From: Cindy Wahler

Re: Research on the Qualities of an Effective Correctional Officer

---

I am currently working on a study to determine the qualities that pertain to an ideal correctional officer. This study is unique in that correctional officers and inmates as well as supervisors are being asked to identify those qualities. It is important to get the perspectives of all three groups to understand how the correctional officer views himself and is viewed by others within the correctional system.

In order to gather the information I require, I am asking you to take a few minutes of your time to complete the attached questionnaire. Please let me assure you that since this questionnaire is totally anonymous, your identity will not be revealed.

Thank you very much for your cooperation.

Sincerely yours,

Cindy Wahler

Cindy Wahler
University of Ottawa

To: Correctional Officers

From: Cindy Wahler

Re: Research on the Qualities of an Effective Correctional Officer

---

I am currently working on a study to determine the qualities that pertain to an ideal correctional officer. This study is unique in that correctional officers themselves are being asked to identify those qualities. It is important that we have the opportunity to obtain your point of view. This will help me to understand how the correctional officer views himself and his job.

In order to gather this information I am seeking, I am asking you to take a few minutes of your time to fill out the attached questionnaire. Please let me assure you that since this questionnaire is totally anonymous, your identity will not be revealed.

Thank you very much for your cooperation.

Sincerely yours,

Cindy Wahler

Cindy Wahler
University of Ottawa

To: Inmates

From: Cindy Wahler

Re: Research on the Qualities of an Effective Correctional Officer

---

I am currently working on a study to determine the qualities of a good correctional officer. This study is different because it asks inmates what makes an ideal correctional officer. Inmates spend more time with correctional officers than with any other staff in the prison. This will help me to understand how inmates see correctional officers.

To get the information I am asking you to take a few minutes of your time to fill out the attached questionnaire. The questionnaire is totally anonymous, therefore, your identity will not be revealed.

Thank you very much for your cooperation.

Sincerely yours,

Cindy Wahler

Cindy Wahler
University of Ottawa

BACKGROUND INFORMATION SHEET - SUPERVISORS

Age _____

Level of Education: high school diploma _____

some university _____

Bachelor's degree _____

Bachelor's degree plus graduate school _____

Master's degree _____

How long have you been employed as a supervisor at this institution? Number of years _____

Previous experience at other institutions as a Supervisor

| Level of Security | Number of Years |
|---|---|
| MINIMUM | _____ |
| MEDIUM | _____ |
| MAXIMUM | _____ |

BACKGROUND INFORMATION SHEET - CORRECTIONAL OFFICERS

Age_____ Male_____ Full-time_____ Bargaining Unit_____
Female_____ Part-time_____ Management_____

Level of Education: some high school_____
high school diploma_____
some university_____
Bachelor's degree_____
Bachelor's degree plus graduate school_____
Master's degree_____

How long have you been employed as a correctional officer at this institution? Number of years _____.

Previous experience at other institutions as a Correctional Officer

| Level of Security | Number of Years |
|---|---|
| MINIMUM | _____ |
| MEDIUM | _____ |
| MAXIMUM | _____ |

BACKGROUND INFORMATION SHEET - INMATES

Age _____

Level of Education: some high school _____

high school diploma _____

some university _____

Bachelor's degree _____

How long have you been incarcerated at this institution?
Number of months _____ or number of years _____.

Number of Previous Incarcerations

| | Level of Security | | | Length of Time | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | MINIMUM | MEDIUM | MAXIMUM | MONTHS | or | YEARS |
| 1. | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | | _____ |
| 2. | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | | _____ |
| 3. | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | | _____ |
| 4. | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | | _____ |
| 5. | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | | _____ |
| 6. | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | | _____ |

Ontario Ministry of Correctional Services

Ministère des Services correctionnels

CORRECTIONAL OFFICER RESEARCH PROJECT

This is to note that the Correctional Officer Research Project has been explained to me. I understand that I will be asked to complete some confidential research forms and I agree to these conditions. I also recognize that participating in the research is not a condition of my sentence and that my participation in the research project is in addition to the requirements of the Ministry's rules and regulations.

_____

Signature of Inmate

_____

Signature of Research Staff

Date:_____

## Instructions

This rating scale contains a series of statements which define different types of behaviour. Please rate these items on the basis of what you consider to be the desirable behaviours of an ideal correctional officer. In completing the scale, use, as a basis for your judgement, your own experiences working with correctional officers in this particular institution. Place your rating number in the space beside each item.

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
|---|---|---|---|
| A Poor C.O. | A Mediocre C.O. | A Good C.O. | An Excellent C.O. |

---

Examples: If you answered "a mediocre C.O." to the question below, a two (2) should be placed in the space beside it.

2 A. Gives up quickly when in an argument with other staff.

If you answered "an excellent C.O." to the question below, a four (4) should be placed in the space beside it.

4 B. Spends time listening to inmate's complaints.

| 1<br>A Poor<br>C.O. | 2<br>A Mediocre<br>C.O. | 3<br>A Good<br>C.O. | 4<br>An Excellent<br>C.O. |
|---|---|---|---|

1. Shows interest in what an inmate is saying.
2. Deals with the actual feelings and behaviours of inmates.
3. Avoids making decisions on his own.
4. Many inmates treat this C.O. as a friend (ask the C.O.'s opinion, or talk with the C.O. openly).
5. Will not talk in a group about other staff.
6. Is as honest with the inmate as the job allows.
7. Often fails to tell staff on the next shift of any problems that inmates had during the shift.
8. "Acts" appropriately during an emergency rather than waiting to be told what to do.
9. Treats inmates fairly; does not show favouritism; does not "have it on" for particular inmates.
10. Admits mistakes and tries to correct them.
11. His views of issues or problems have little influence on other staff.
12. Avoids interacting with inmates.
13. Works well with other staff.
14. Often fails to follow through with institutional rules and regulations.
15. Will confront inmate, places demands on him when he tries to avoid responsibilities or deny facts about himself.
16. Tries to anticipate a possible problem with the inmates and acts to prevent its development.
17. Does not respect confidential information from inmates.
18. Accepts instruction from other staff without resentment.
19. Is open and willing to say what he thinks provided it is to the best interest of the inmate.
20. The behaviour of this C.O. is consisteat with the aims of this institution.

| 1<br>A Poor<br>C.O. | 2<br>A Mediocre<br>C.O. | 3<br>A Good<br>C.O. | 4<br>An Excellent<br>C.O. |
|---|---|---|---|

21. Gives up quickly in an argument with supervisors.

22. Improves performance after well-grounded criticism from a supervisor.

23. Has difficulty working with groups of inmates.

24. Rarely makes suggestions for improving institution programme.

25. Is consistent in allotting privileges (is equally apt to give permission on any day; does not let a "bad day" make him negative toward the inmates).

26. Understands facts of a situation quickly and is quick to act.

27. When an inmate displays inappropriate behaviour, the C.O. explains clearly the appropriate behaviour which should have occurred.

28. Helps inmates explore their experiences, feelings, and behaviour in order to better understand them.

29. Inmates do not find the C.O. approachable.

30. When counselling, the C.O. places the responsibility for the inmate's life on the inmate.

31. Other staff look to the C.O. for guidance and suggestions.

32. Does not say no to inmates, instead he prefers supervisors to make the decision.

33. Does not encourage other staff to express their opinions.

34. Writes detailed reports of his shift which include details of any problems and their treatment as well as possible problems.

35. Helps inmates explore alternative methods of handling situations.

36. Instructions to inmates are often unclear or confusing.

37. The C.O.'s enthusiasm has a positive effect on those who work with him.

38. Responds to the inmates, is available to them, works with them.

39. Does not accept responsibility for the mistakes that he makes.

40. Remains calm when annoyed.

| 1<br>A Poor<br>C.O. | 2<br>A Mediocre<br>C.O. | 3<br>A Good<br>C.O. | 4<br>An Excellent<br>C.O. |
|---|---|---|---|

41. Praises or compliments the work of other staff.
42. Avoids spending time with inmates on a one-to-one basis.
43. Argues with other staff in front of inmates.
44. Is unable to give accurate information on inmates' questions (e.g. parole procedures, temporary absence programmes, institutional regulations).
45. When disagreements arise between staff the C.O. takes the lead in bringing the group to an agreement.
46. Talks with and/or helps an inmate who has received bad news.
47. Does not follow through on promises to inmates.
48. Seeks advice from supervisors or colleagues.
49. Lets personal needs interfere with helping the inmates.
50. Counsels inmates on a one-to one basis.
51. Passes on appropriate information to inmates.
52. Loses temper.
53. Takes the lead in a group of staff.
54. Makes uncomplimentary remarks to other staff.
55. Shares personal experiences and emotions with the inmates to help them understand their own.
56. Acts suddenly without considering the consequences of his actions.
57. Competes with other staff for popularity with the inmates.
58. Solutions the C.O. suggests to problems are often taken on by the staff.
59. Does not respect the inmate's personal privacy.
60. Teases or makes fun of inmates.
61. Follows the rules of the institution with regard to personal protection (i.e. does two person searches, personal and room).

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
|---|---|---|---|
| A Poor C.O. | A Mediocre C.O. | A Good C.O. | An Excellent C.O. |

_____ 62. Puts things off; work often gets behind.

_____ 63. Attempts to get inmates who are involved in a disagreement to talk about it openly,

_____ 64. Praises an inmate for appropriate behaviour, i.e. tells him when he has done his work correctly and well; tells him his performance on trips outside the institution was good, etc.

_____ 65. Persists when told by supervisors that he cannot do something (nags, demands, asks repeatedly).

_____ 66. The C.O. does not allow the inmate time to practice new behaviours and chores before giving consequences for poor performance.

_____ 67. Has to be told what to do next.

_____ 68. During the shift the C.O. knows where inmates are and what they are doing.

_____ 69. Emphasizes inmate's bad points by pointing them out to other people.

How would you make this questionnaire better? Please list other characteristics of an ideal C.O.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Revised Words from Questionnaire

| | Original | Revised |
|---|---|---|
| | resident | inmate |
| item no. 13. | harmoniously | well |
| 15. | shirk | avoid |
| 17. | confidences | confidential information |
| 19. | non-defensive | open |
| 20. | house or unit programme | institution |
| 22. | valid | well-grounded |
| 26. | grasps essentials | understands facts |
| 34. | potential | possible |
| 40. | provoked | annoyed |
| 45. | consensus or compromise | agreement |
| 46. | aids | helps |
| 56. | impulsively | suddenly |
| 58. | adopted | taken on |
| 64. | excursions | trips. |

# APPENDIX B

Table A
Items with Factor Loadings for Factors A, B, and C

| Factor A - Item Nos. | Factor A | Factor B | Factor C |
|---|---|---|---|
| 5 | .49266 | .01560 | .19892 |
| 6 | .51422 | .01360 | .19892 |
| 8 | .46595 | .05848 | .15855 |
| 9 | .55086 | .12237 | .19711 |
| 13 | .62554 | .06155 | .02256 |
| 16 | .64441 | .01764 | .06734 |
| 18 | .51588 | .03999 | .03580 |
| 20 | .68199 | .00060 | .16456 |
| 22 | .66718 | .01399 | .04746 |
| 26 | .67458 | .20326 | .13262 |
| 27 | .46592 | .10186 | .05036 |
| 30 | .40908 | .17605 | .15252 |
| 31 | .57460 | .17766 | .17453 |
| 34 | .45060 | .11615 | .13827 |
| 37 | .71332 | .03151 | .06314 |
| 40 | .52294 | .28982 | .11664 |
| 41 | .68323 | .06671 | .02102 |
| 45 | .61644 | .10053 | .05002 |
| 48 | .54825 | .01726 | .00821 |
| 50 | .42436 | .05974 | .25645 |
| 53 | .55030 | .07822 | .20558 |
| 58 | .46552 | .19974 | .00284 |
| 61 | .59164 | .06816 | .30855 |
| 63 | .42373 | .01915 | .15401 |
| 64 | .46543 | .05552 | .34704 |
| 68 | .65046 | .15505 | .13325 |
| **Factor B - Item Nos.** | | | |
| 7 | .21095 | .43728 | .10134 |
| 11 | .18418 | .41321 | .07857 |
| 21 | .12978 | .44979 | .22403 |
| 23 | .04009 | .58957 | .00434 |
| 24 | .10208 | .49196 | .04150 |
| 29 | .03148 | .55362 | .10946 |
| 33 | .32090 | .37044 | .32612 |
| 39 | .08976 | .50088 | .02016 |
| 43 | .29304 | .49189 | .20892 |
| 44 | .03973 | .45461 | .09277 |
| 47 | .03315 | .47219 | .01469 |
| 49 | .00346 | .47206 | .15821 |
| 52 | .09732 | .07822 | .20558 |
| 54 | .22066 | .44857 | .24008 |
| 56 | .36169 | .40155 | .10916 |
| 59 | .12034 | .46379 | .21021 |
| 60 | .20064 | .44293 | .10285 |
| 62 | .13963 | .66122 | .04689 |
| 66 | .20360 | .45241 | .32961 |
| 67 | .09987 | .54177 | .13165 |
| 69 | .15259 | .49250 | .31957 |
| **Factor C - Item Nos.** | | | |
| 1 | .27583 | .09013 | .53976 |
| 2 | .24317 | .05491 | .55959 |
| 4 | .00518 | .07917 | .49044 |
| 19 | .07522 | .05769 | .56775 |
| 28 | .28003 | .08616 | .66671 |
| 35 | .28545 | .21472 | .60649 |
| 38 | .29897 | .16508 | .64608 |
| 46 | .31701 | .15705 | .49989 |
| 55 | .03461 | .14122 | .66560 |
| 57 | .25063 | .17778 | .45124 |
| **Eliminated Items** | | | |
| 3 | .12390 | .33942 | .25331 |
| 12 | .07421 | .26247 | .25770 |
| 14 | .26685 | .28771 | .21326 |
| 15 | .25489 | .24855 | .06225 |
| 17 | .09351 | .28565 | .12141 |
| 25 | .27509 | .20836 | .31658 |
| 32 | .32090 | .37044 | .32612 |
| 36 | .14961 | .21314 | .06314 |
| 42 | .08976 | .26995 | .16466 |
| 51 | .32661 | .05974 | .25645 |
| 65 | .10635 | .25984 | .32177 |

Table B
Inter-Item Correlations for Factor A

| Item No. | 5 | 6 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 13 | 16 | 18 | 20 | 22 | 26 | 27 | 30 | 31 | 34 | 37 | 40 | 41 | 45 | 48 | 50 | 53 | 58 | 61 | 63 | 64 | 68 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 5 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6 | .22*** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | .14* | .18** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 9 | .33*** | .32*** | .26*** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 10 | .30*** | .36*** | .22** | .56*** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 13 | .26*** | .20** | .28*** | .34*** | .34*** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 16 | .16* | .38*** | .25*** | .39*** | .35*** | .36*** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 18 | .40*** | .20** | .15* | .24*** | .28*** | .45*** | .32*** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 20 | .21** | .20** | .17* | .29*** | .28*** | .47*** | .37*** | .30*** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 22 | .22** | .33*** | .34*** | .42*** | .42*** | .56*** | .35*** | .27** | .40*** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 26 | .16* | .34*** | .43*** | .44*** | .43*** | .43*** | .54*** | .19** | .37*** | .52*** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 27 | .08 | .17* | .17* | .21** | .22** | .21** | .30*** | .09 | .25*** | .31*** | .38*** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 30 | .14* | .15* | .08 | .05 | .14* | .00 | .18** | .13 | .17* | .08 | .10 | .17* | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 31 | .28*** | .05 | .17* | .35*** | .25*** | .34*** | .25*** | .31*** | .42*** | .22*** | .34*** | .31*** | .06 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 34 | .10 | .14* | .23*** | .23*** | .21** | .31*** | .22** | .20** | .24*** | .36*** | .37*** | .29*** | .11 | .30*** | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 37 | .36*** | .31*** | .26*** | .27*** | .32*** | .42*** | .42*** | .32*** | .40*** | .45*** | .50*** | .33*** | .18** | .47*** | .43*** | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 40 | .20** | .25*** | .17* | .37*** | .40*** | .26*** | .36*** | .18** | .28*** | .30*** | .49*** | .32*** | .17* | .31*** | .36*** | .40*** | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 41 | .25*** | .20** | .16* | .26*** | .32*** | .43*** | .39*** | .38*** | .46*** | .30*** | .40*** | .26*** | .27*** | .43*** | .26*** | .51*** | .37*** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 45 | .32*** | .16* | .15* | .27*** | .27*** | .23** | .32*** | .26*** | .39*** | .29*** | .27*** | .29*** | .12 | .44*** | .27*** | .30*** | .34*** | .32*** | | | | | | | | | |
| 48 | .36*** | .33*** | .15* | .14* | .28*** | .30*** | .24*** | .28*** | .30*** | .26*** | .25*** | .28*** | .13 | .35*** | .18** | .45*** | .20** | .46*** | .33*** | | | | | | | | |
| 50 | .19** | .23*** | .08 | .26*** | .24*** | .17* | .21** | .11 | .14* | .13 | .21** | .17* | .20** | .25*** | .10 | .24*** | .36*** | .38*** | .27*** | .27*** | | | | | | | |
| 53 | .36*** | .09 | .12 | .25*** | .11 | .27*** | .21** | .27** | .31*** | .26*** | .15* | .13 | .24*** | .32*** | .25*** | .34*** | .15* | .28*** | .41*** | .27*** | .25*** | | | | | | |
| 58 | .20** | .07 | .04 | .12 | .16* | .15* | .24*** | .06 | .26*** | .18** | .14* | .23*** | .15* | .35*** | .17* | .24*** | .21** | .30*** | .51*** | .27*** | .25*** | .46*** | | | | | |
| 61 | .21** | .17* | .18** | .21** | .14* | .36*** | .41*** | .26*** | .41*** | .37*** | .34*** | .14* | .23*** | .18** | .18** | .40*** | .21** | .40*** | .30*** | .24*** | .20** | .37*** | .32*** | | | | |
| 63 | .02 | .25*** | .02 | .05 | .08 | .15* | .31*** | .19** | .22*** | .09 | .13* | .19** | .24*** | .22*** | .11 | .17* | .27*** | .42*** | .31*** | .22*** | .31*** | .21** | .32*** | .22*** | | | |
| 64 | .09 | .45*** | .18** | .24*** | .32*** | .22*** | .30*** | .11 | .25*** | .33*** | .30*** | .13* | .12 | .09 | .24*** | .27*** | .20** | .29*** | .22*** | .26*** | .39*** | .10 | .21** | .20*** | .29** | | |
| 68 | .18* | .21** | .30*** | .33*** | .34*** | .42*** | .36*** | .27*** | .34*** | .48*** | .49*** | .36*** | .15* | .35*** | .37*** | .48*** | .45*** | .43*** | .34*** | .29*** | .31*** | .16* | .20** | .36*** | .19** | .42*** | |

*p<.05
**p<.01
***p<.001

(Item Nos.)

$\bar{X}$= .28***

Table C

Inter-Item Correlations for Factor B

| Item No. | 7 | 11 | 21 | 23 | 24 | 29 | 33 | 39 | 43 | 44 | 47 | 49 | 52 | 54 | 56 | 59 | 60 | 62 | 66 | 67 | 69 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 7 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 11 | .14* | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 21 | .05 | .18** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 23 | .08 | .19** | .29*** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 24 | .07 | .16* | .32*** | .39*** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 29 | .12 | .14* | .22*** | .24*** | .37*** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 33 | .30*** | .15* | .18** | .15* | .28*** | .25*** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 39 | .32*** | .13 | .01 | .16* | .10 | .29*** | .12 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 43 | .21** | .08 | .12 | .25*** | .21** | .25*** | .32*** | .29*** | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 44 | .14 | .20** | .07 | .21** | .22*** | .24*** | .22*** | .23*** | .18** | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 47 | .10 | .11 | .18** | .24*** | .12 | .23*** | .16* | .44*** | .19** | .25*** | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 49 | .03 | .27*** | .29*** | .24*** | .22*** | .28*** | .17* | .18** | .07 | .22*** | .26*** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 52 | .24*** | .21** | .06 | .32*** | .19** | .23*** | .18** | .23*** | .35*** | .23*** | .20** | .22*** | | | | | | | | | |
| 54 | .14* | .32*** | .14* | .20** | .20** | .29*** | .15* | .04 | .43*** | .14* | .14* | .29*** | .36*** | | | | | | | | |
| 56 | .25*** | .16* | .07 | .17* | .06 | .23*** | .16* | .31*** | .29*** | .09 | .10 | .21** | .31*** | .32*** | | | | | | | |
| 59 | .02 | .11 | .14* | .16* | .30*** | .29*** | .13* | .30*** | .10 | .15* | .20** | .26*** | .31*** | .10 | .17* | | | | | | |
| 60 | .25*** | .14* | .05 | .18** | .15* | .22*** | .15* | .24*** | .34*** | .17* | .20** | .10 | .46*** | .27*** | .27*** | .24*** | | | | | |
| 62 | .33*** | .14* | .19** | .26*** | .14* | .12 | .32*** | .32*** | .30*** | .24*** | .32*** | .24*** | .47*** | .28*** | .34*** | .23*** | .34*** | | | | |
| 66 | .18** | .24*** | .38*** | .14* | .17* | .22*** | .11 | .16* | .04 | .13 | .15* | .39*** | .21** | .12 | .16* | .26*** | .15* | .22*** | | | |
| 67 | .18** | .13 | .22*** | .28*** | .19** | .21** | .11 | .30*** | .19** | .32*** | .28*** | .23*** | .37*** | .16* | .20** | .29*** | .16* | .43*** | .29*** | | |
| 69 | .07 | .11 | .22*** | .24*** | .15* | .19** | .09 | .22*** | .05 | .20** | .12 | .28*** | .26*** | .13 | .12 | .52*** | .15* | .28*** | .29*** | .36*** | |

* p≤.05
** p≤.01
*** p≤.001

(Item Nos.)

$\bar{X}$=.21

Table D

Inter-Item Correlations for Factor C

| Item No. | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | .41*** | | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | .26*** | .23*** | | | | | | | | |
| 19 | .24*** | .29*** | .21** | | | | | | | |
| 28 | .40*** | .46*** | .27*** | .27*** | | | | | | |
| 35 | .29*** | .33*** | .19** | .20** | .47*** | | | | | |
| 38 | .37*** | .35*** | .30*** | .37*** | .43*** | .60*** | | | | |
| 46 | .26*** | .30*** | .25*** | .12 | .43*** | .44*** | .37*** | | | |
| 55 | .32*** | .29*** | .29*** | .24*** | .33*** | .28*** | .31*** | .33*** | | |
| 57 | .06 | .12 | .12 | .17* | .15* | .06 | .09 | .11 | .25*** | |
| | 1 | 2 | 4 | 19 | 28 | 35 | 38 | 46 | 55 | 57 |

*p<.05
**p<.01
***p<.001

(Item Nos.)

$\bar{X}$=.28***

Table E
Inter-Item Correlations for Factors A and B

Factor A
Item Nos.

| | 7 | 11 | 21 | 23 | 24 | 29 | 33 | 39 | 43 | 44 | 47 | 49 | 52 | 54 | 56 | 59 | 60 | 62 | 66 | 67 | 69 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 5 | -.14* | -.14* | .05 | -.06 | -.06 | -.01 | -.07 | -.10 | -.13 | .06 | .06 | .06 | .00 | -.14* | -.18** | .05 | -.12 | .01 | .14* | .03 | .04 |
| 6 | .00 | .06 | .00 | .08 | -.11 | -.16* | -.05 | -.10 | -.10 | -.03 | .01 | -.02 | -.03 | -.01 | -.25*** | -.10 | -.10 | -.06 | .09 | -.09 | .00 |
| 8 | -.04 | -.07 | -.02 | -.05 | -.03 | .13 | -.09 | .06 | -.01 | -.03 | -.01 | -.07 | -.01 | -.08 | -.14* | .06 | .00 | -.04 | .10 | .10 | .02 |
| 9 | -.10 | -.06 | -.11 | -.12 | -.15* | -.03 | -.19** | .11 | -.13 | -.02 | -.17* | -.03 | -.13 | -.08 | .18** | -.08 | -.14* | -.12 | .00 | -.09 | -.12 |
| 10 | -.09 | -.03 | -.08 | -.07 | -.20** | -.05 | -.14* | -.04 | .00 | -.02 | -.14* | -.04 | -.04 | -.01 | -.21** | -.06 | -.13 | -.08 | .02 | -.14* | -.07 |
| 13 | -.18** | .02 | .08 | -.03 | .05 | .08 | -.10 | .05 | -.15* | -.03 | .03 | .00 | -.06 | -.21** | -.15* | .09 | -.17* | -.17* | .17* | .07 | .02 |
| 16 | -.05 | -.05 | -.02 | -.03 | .04 | -.13 | -.15* | -.15* | -.15* | -.11 | -.05 | -.10 | -.14* | -.14* | -.34*** | .08 | -.14* | -.14* | .12 | -.02 | .01 |
| 18 | -.19** | -.21** | .03 | .03 | .03 | .06 | -.17* | -.05 | -.09 | -.03 | .02 | -.02 | .00 | -.02 | -.09 | .06 | -.06 | -.07 | .08 | .08 | .03 |
| 20 | -.16* | -.08 | .15* | .09 | .23*** | .07 | -.12 | -.01 | -.18** | .00 | -.05 | -.02 | -.13 | -.13 | -.28*** | .05 | -.09 | -.24*** | .10 | .07 | .02 |
| 22 | -.08 | -.17* | .02 | -.01 | -.09 | -.02 | -.14* | .01 | -.15* | .00 | -.02 | -.14* | -.15* | -.25*** | .21** | .05 | -.13 | -.12 | -.05 | -.03 | .05 |
| 26 | -.13 | -.13 | .03 | -.11 | -.02 | -.02 | -.11 | -.15* | -.25*** | -.06 | -.13 | -.13 | -.18** | -.24*** | -.28*** | .00 | -.29*** | -.27*** | .05 | -.13 | -.05 |
| 27 | -.06 | -.13 | .08 | -.11 | .02 | -.02 | -.15* | -.10 | -.20** | .03 | .00 | -.01 | -.05 | -.19** | -.28*** | .06 | -.16* | -.10 | -.06 | .02 | .06 |
| 30 | .09 | -.10 | .17* | .10 | .16* | .09 | .02 | -.01 | -.11 | .09 | .06 | .16* | .06 | -.02 | -.21** | .11 | -.02 | .07 | .20** | .04 | .21** |
| 31 | .23*** | -.09 | .09 | .01 | .13 | .00 | -.15* | -.22*** | -.11 | .01 | -.11 | .06 | -.03 | -.04 | -.08 | -.01 | -.08 | -.16* | -.03 | .01 | -.07 |
| 34 | -.14* | -.17* | .04 | -.08 | .00 | -.07 | -.18** | -.10 | -.20** | -.14* | .00 | -.01 | -.16* | -.20** | -.16* | -.10 | -.24*** | -.10 | -.01 | -.07 | -.15* |
| 37 | -.23*** | -.16* | .18** | .06 | .18** | -.04 | -.21** | -.08 | -.07 | -.02 | -.04 | .05 | -.09 | -.15* | -.24*** | -.02 | .19** | -.16 | .11 | .00 | .01 |
| 40 | -.10 | -.13 | -.05 | -.16* | -.16* | -.05 | -.30*** | -.20** | -.25*** | -.16* | -.22*** | -.07 | -.15* | -.11 | -.23*** | -.08 | -.18** | -.25*** | -.01 | -.20** | -.07 |
| 41 | -.08 | -.14 | .08 | .05 | .11 | .00 | -.25*** | -.13 | -.23*** | -.01 | -.11 | -.06 | -.09 | -.07 | -.19** | -.02 | -.11 | -.25*** | .00 | .02 | .04 |
| 45 | -.12 | -.13 | .03 | -.13 | .01 | .03 | -.10 | .00 | -.22** | -.10 | .02 | -.01 | -.06 | -.05 | -.17* | .01 | -.02 | -.03 | .06 | .11 | .02 |
| 48 | -.14* | -.07 | .09 | .06 | .03 | .06 | -.15* | .00 | -.15* | .00 | .09 | .03 | -.01 | -.11 | -.25*** | .05 | -.15* | -.17* | .01 | .01 | .05 |
| 50 | .00 | .05 | .07 | .00 | .00 | -.01 | -.12 | -.06 | -.12 | .00 | -.09 | .02 | -.13 | -.13 | -.18** | -.07 | -.08 | -.05 | .02 | -.07 | -.04 |
| 53 | -.01 | -.13 | .18** | .08 | .09 | .00 | -.05 | .01 | -.15* | .07 | .04 | .14* | -.09 | -.12 | -.13 | .12 | -.15 | .03 | .17* | .23*** | .18** |
| 58 | -.15* | -.21** | .03 | -.12 | .00 | -.16* | -.13* | -.07 | .20** | -.04 | -.07 | -.01 | -.05 | -.11 | -.17* | .09 | -.09 | -.01 | -.04 | .14* | .02 |
| 61 | -.13 | -.14* | -.17* | -.03 | .07 | -.07 | -.08 | -.15* | -.27** | .01 | -.22*** | .00 | -.06 | -.20** | -.29*** | .12 | -.11 | -.10 | .15* | .09 | .14* |
| 63 | -.08 | .00 | .06 | -.03 | .07 | -.03 | -.15* | -.06 | -.12 | -.10 | -.04 | .05 | -.01 | .05 | -.01 | .05 | .05 | -.11 | .08 | .01 | .11 |
| 64 | -.06 | -.01 | -.03 | .04 | .07 | -.10 | -.01 | -.05 | -.09 | -.06 | -.01 | -.08 | -.07 | -.04 | -.23*** | -.05 | -.12 | -.06 | -.08 | -.12 | -.06 |
| 68 | -.16* | -.12 | .00 | -.08 | .04 | -.03 | -.15* | -.18** | -.25*** | .02 | -.12 | -.10 | -.07 | -.11 | -.24*** | -.05 | -.15* | -.16* | -.06 | -.05 | -.10 |

* p<.05
** p<.01
*** p<.001

Factor B
(Item Nos.)

$\bar{X}$= -.04

Table F

Inter-Item Correlations for Factors A and C

| Factor A Item No. | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 5 | .13 | .11 | -.01 | .03 | .03 | .03 | .04 | .00 | .10 | -.22** |
| 6 | .32*** | .20** | .06 | .08 | .09 | .23*** | .31*** | .14* | .03 | -.11 |
| 8 | .03 | .04 | .12 | .05 | -.01 | .12 | .11 | .19** | .07 | -.06 |
| 9 | .26*** | .18** | .10 | .09 | .18** | .31*** | .24*** | .23*** | .00 | -.13 |
| 10 | .27*** | .30*** | .01 | .19** | .16* | .28*** | .30*** | .18** | -.01 | -.04 |
| 13 | .12 | .12 | .05 | .15* | .10 | .15* | .22*** | .08 | .00 | -.07 |
| 16 | .18** | .20** | -.02 | .09 | .20** | .25*** | .31*** | .18** | -.09 | -.02 |
| 18 | .10 | .20** | -.03 | .07 | .14* | .13 | .19** | .00 | -.03 | -.08 |
| 20 | .15 | .06 | -.05 | -.03 | .17* | .08 | .07 | .10 | -.04 | -.22*** |
| 22 | .13 | .04 | .10 | .15* | -.01 | .19** | .21** | .15* | .04 | -.10 |
| 26 | .17* | .16* | .02 | .17* | .12 | .33*** | .32*** | .25*** | -.02 | .14* |
| 27 | .19** | .06 | .06 | .12 | .23*** | .13 | .26*** | .06 | .00 | -.08 |
| 30 | -.01 | -.02 | -.01 | .05 | .09 | -.02 | -.05 | .06 | -.09 | -.20** |
| 31 | .26*** | .35*** | .10 | .09 | .37*** | .24*** | .25*** | .27*** | .13 | -.08 |
| 34 | .17* | .11 | .17* | .22*** | .16* | .27*** | .35*** | .26*** | .00 | -.11 |
| 37 | .12 | .18** | .01 | -.01 | .16* | .23*** | .25*** | .28*** | .03 | .17* |
| 40 | .17* | .21** | .01 | .00 | .23*** | .27*** | .26*** | .28*** | .00 | -.12 |
| 41 | .20** | .20** | -.05 | -.09 | .26*** | .22*** | .18** | .24*** | -.01 | -.16* |
| 45 | .28*** | .37*** | .03 | .15* | .34*** | .14* | .13 | .23*** | .05 | -.04 |
| 48 | .24*** | .21*** | -.07 | .05 | .20** | .13 | .20** | .15* | .01 | -.06 |
| 50 | .15* | .33*** | .14* | .08 | .35*** | .21** | .20** | .36*** | .18** | -.12 |
| 53 | .04 | .13 | -.08 | -.01 | .20** | .06 | .04 | .20** | -.04 | -.14* |
| 58 | .15* | .27*** | .11 | .04 | .30*** | .14* | .15* | .27*** | .04 | .01 |
| 61 | .00 | -.02 | -.04 | -.11 | .06 | .04 | -.04 | .14* | -.16* | -.19** |
| 63 | .30*** | .31*** | .06 | .02 | .41*** | .18** | .10 | .22*** | .16* | .00 |
| 64 | .28*** | .12 | .15* | .02 | .23*** | .37*** | .35*** | .33*** | .20** | .03 |
| 68 | .18** | .11 | .01 | .02 | .16* | .25*** | .30*** | .44*** | .07 | -.19** |
| | 1 | 2 | 4 | 19 | 28 | 35 | 38 | 46 | 55 | 57 |

*$p<.05$
**$p<.01$
***$p<.001$

Factor C
(Item Nos.)

$\bar{X}$=.22***

Table G

Inter-Item Correlations for Factors B and C

| Factor B Item No. | 1 | 2 | 4 | 19 | 28 | 35 | 38 | 46 | 55 | 57 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 7 | -.07 | -.04 | .01 | .06 | -.01 | -.17* | -.16* | -.09 | .15* | .13 |
| 11 | .00 | .04 | .03 | .09 | -.03 | -.09 | -.01 | -.03 | .10 | .05 |
| 21 | -.12 | -.04 | -.08 | -.06 | .08 | -.14* | -.11 | .03 | -.03 | .00 |
| 23 | -.05 | -.01 | -.17* | -.05 | -.03 | -.02 | .01 | -.07 | -.08 | .01 |
| 24 | -.06 | -.12 | -.03 | -.06 | .02 | -.12 | .02 | -.01 | .07 | .06 |
| 29 | -.18** | -.12 | -.23*** | .05 | -.08 | -.12 | -.10 | -.13 | -.00 | -.06 |
| 33 | .04 | -.08 | -.08 | .07 | .03 | -.02 | -.04 | .00 | .18** | .22*** |
| 39 | -.14* | .00 | -.06 | .08 | -.10 | -.11 | -.18** | -.21** | .10 | .17* |
| 43 | .02 | .14* | .10 | .09 | .02 | .01 | .02 | .00 | .25*** | .38*** |
| 44 | -.10 | -.14* | -.14* | -.10 | -.18** | -.07 | -.06 | -.20** | -.03 | -.08 |
| 47 | -.11 | -.04 | .00 | .11 | .00 | -.06 | -.02 | -.14* | .02 | .09 |
| 49 | -.11 | .00 | -.08 | -.04 | .00 | -.18** | -.15* | -.07 | -.05 | .08 |
| 52 | .05 | .04 | -.05 | -.11 | -.08 | -.15* | -.13 | -.13 | .03 | .02 |
| 54 | .02 | .07 | .00 | .00 | .05 | -.11 | .00 | -.01 | .14* | .32*** |
| 56 | -.06 | .02 | -.05 | -.06 | -.02 | -.06 | -.25*** | -.14* | .17* | .26*** |
| 59 | -.22*** | .00 | -.08 | -.02 | -.02 | -.11 | -.05 | -.20** | -.08 | .05 |
| 60 | -.09 | .03 | -.01 | -.09 | -.03 | -.07 | -.12 | -.10 | .04 | .20** |
| 62 | -.11 | .02 | -.03 | .02 | -.06 | -.10 | -.08 | -.09 | .07 | .15* |
| 66 | -.20** | -.08 | -.09 | -.09 | -.10 | -.31*** | -.27*** | -.08 | -.20** | -.02 |
| 67 | -.10 | .01 | -.04 | -.10 | -.02 | -.16* | -.21** | -.01 | -.05 | .07 |
| 69 | -.17* | -.10 | -.12 | -.04 | -.11 | -.27*** | -.21** | -.19** | -.06 | -.03 |

*p<.05
**p<.01
***p<.001

Factor C (Item Nos.)

$\bar{X}$= -.03

Table H
Correlations of Items to Factor Scale Scores for Factors A, B, and C

| Factor A - Item Nos. | Factor A | Factor B | Factor C |
|---|---|---|---|
| 5 | .48*** | -.06 | .00 |
| 6 | .47*** | -.09 | .21** |
| 8 | .38*** | -.02 | .11 |
| 9 | .54*** | -.21** | .23*** |
| 10 | .55*** | -.15* | .25*** |
| 13 | .59*** | -.05 | .15 |
| 16 | .62*** | -.16* | .19** |
| 18 | .50*** | -.06 | .10 |
| 20 | .61*** | -.06 | .03 |
| 22 | .61*** | .14* | .15* |
| 26 | .64*** | -.25*** | .21** |
| 27 | .47*** | -.14* | .17* |
| 30 | .36*** | .10 | -.03 |
| 31 | .58*** | -.11 | .32*** |
| 34 | .49*** | -.21 | .26*** |
| 37 | .70*** | -.10 | .15* |
| 40 | .58*** | -.30*** | .20** |
| 41 | .68*** | -.14* | .14* |
| 45 | .60*** | -.08 | .27*** |
| 48 | .56*** | -.08 | .16* |
| 50 | .48*** | -.08 | .31*** |
| 53 | .52*** | .04 | .05 |
| 58 | .48*** | -.14* | .24*** |
| 61 | .56*** | -.10 | -.06 |
| 63 | .43*** | -.03 | .29*** |
| 64 | .48*** | -.12 | .34*** |
| 68 | .64*** | -.20** | .21** |
| | $\bar{X}$=.54*** | $\bar{X}$=-.10 | $\bar{X}$=.17* |
| **Factor B - Item Nos.** | | | |
| 7 | -.19** | .42*** | .01 |
| 11 | -.18** | .43*** | .03 |
| 21 | .09 | .45*** | -.08 |
| 23 | -.03 | .51*** | -.04 |
| 24 | .04 | .49*** | -.03 |
| 29 | .05 | .55*** | -.13 |
| 33 | .24*** | .48*** | .06 |
| 39 | -.14* | .50*** | -.05 |
| 43 | -.28*** | .51*** | -.19** |
| 44 | -.04 | .47*** | .17* |
| 47 | -.08 | .45*** | -.01 |
| 49 | -.01 | .51*** | -.09 |
| 52 | -.13 | .59*** | -.08 |
| 54 | .20** | .50*** | .08 |
| 56 | -.37*** | .47 | -.02 |
| 59 | .03 | .49*** | -.12 |
| 60 | -.21** | .48*** | -.03 |
| 62 | -.19** | .61*** | .02 |
| 66 | .11 | .48*** | -.24*** |
| 67 | .01 | .55*** | -.10 |
| 69 | .03 | .49*** | -.21** |
| | $\bar{X}$=-.07 | $\bar{X}$=.50*** | $\bar{X}$=-.06 |
| **Factor C - Item Nos.** | | | |
| 1 | .31*** | -.16* | .58*** |
| 2 | .31*** | -.04 | .62*** |
| 4 | .06 | -.12 | .54*** |
| 19 | .11 | -.01 | .55*** |
| 28 | .34*** | -.06 | .70*** |
| 35 | .32*** | -.24*** | .62*** |
| 38 | .34*** | -.20** | .69*** |
| 46 | .36*** | -.17* | .59*** |
| 55 | .01 | .10 | .65*** |
| 57 | -.20** | .21** | .36*** |
| | $\bar{X}$=.19* | $\bar{X}$=-.06 | $\bar{X}$=.59*** |

* $p < .05$
** $p < .01$
*** $p < .001$

# APPENDIX C

Table I

Analysis of Variance for Factors A, B, and C by Demographic Subgroup Variable Age for Supervisors

| | Source | df | SS | MS | F |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Factor A by Age | Between | 1 | 15.88 | 15.88 | 1.09 (NS) |
| | Within | 23 | 332.72 | 14.46 | |
| Factor B by Age | Between | 1 | .49 | .49 | .75 (NS) |
| | Within | 23 | 124.34 | 5.40 | |
| Factor C by Age | Between | 1 | 6.28 | 6.28 | 1.23 (NS) |
| | Within | 23 | 116.67 | 5.07 | |

Age = 1) 30-43 years; 2) 44-63 years.

Table J

Analysis of Variance for Factors A, B, and C for Demographic Subgroup Variable $V_1$ for Supervisors

| | Source | df | SS | MS | F |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Factor A by $V_1$ | Between | 1 | .05 | .05 | .00 (NS) |
| | Within | 23 | 348.55 | 15.15 | |
| Factor B by $V_1$ | Between | 1 | 11.35 | 11.35 | 2.30 (NS) |
| | Within | 23 | 113.47 | 4.93 | |
| Factor C by $V_1$ | Between | 1 | 10.22 | 10.22 | 2.08 (NS) |
| | Within | 23 | 112.73 | 4.90 | |

$V_1$ = Level of education = 1) Grade 9-13; 2) post-secondary

Table K

Analysis of Variance for Factors A, B, and C for Demographic Subgroup Variable $V_2$ for Supervisors

| | Source | df | SS | MS | F |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Factor A by $V_2$ | Between | 1 | .15 | .15 | .01 (NS) |
| | Within | 23 | 348.44 | 15.15 | |
| Factor B by $V_2$ | Between | 1 | 8.70 | 8.70 | 1.72 (NS) |
| | Within | 23 | 116.12 | 5.04 | |
| Factor C by $V_2$ | Between | 1 | .11 | .11 | .00 (NS) |
| | Within | 23 | 122.84 | 5.34 | |

$V_2$ = Number of months employed as a supervisor at current institution= 1) 2-91 months 2) 117-351 months

Table L

Analysis of Variance for Factors A, B, and C for Demographic Subgroup Variable $V_5$ for Supervisors

| | Source | df | SS | MS | F |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Factor A by $V_5$ | Between | 1 | 4.14 | 4.14 | .27 (NS) |
| | Within | 23 | 344.45 | 14.97 | |
| Factor B by $V_5$ | Between | 1 | 2.39 | 2.39 | .44 (NS) |
| | Within | 23 | 122.44 | 5.32 | |
| Factor C by $V_5$ | Between | 1 | 5.41 | 5.41 | 1.05 (NS) |
| | Within | 23 | 117.54 | 5.11 | |

$V_5$ = Number of years previously employed as a supervisor in a maximum institution= 1) 0-1 year 2) 2-12 years.

Table M

Analysis of Variance for Factors A, B, and C for Demographic Subgroup Variable $V_6$ for Supervisors

| | Source | df | SS | MS | F |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Factor A by $V_6$ | Between | 1 | .06 | .06 | .00 (NS) |
| | Within | 23 | 348.53 | 15.15 | |
| Factor B by $V_6$ | Between | 1 | 5.92 | 5.92 | 1.14 (NS) |
| | Within | 23 | 118.91 | 5.17 | |
| Factor C by $V_6$ | Between | 1 | 8.78 | 8.78 | 1.77 (NS) |
| | Within | 23 | 114.17 | 4.96 | |

$V_6$ = Total number of years previously employed as a supervisor at an institution regardless of level of security.
1) 2-4 years 2) 5-36 years.

Table N

Analysis of Variance for Factors A, B, and C for Demographic Subgroup Variable Age for Correctional Officers

| | Source | df | SS | MS | F |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Factor A by Age | Between | 2 | 44.57 | 22.29 | .76 (NS) |
| | Within | 81 | 2361.95 | 29.16 | |
| Factor B by Age | Between | 2 | 6.49 | 3.24 | .36 (NS) |
| | Within | 81 | 727.71 | 8.98 | |
| Factor C by Age | Between | 2 | 33.84 | 16.92 | 2.53 (NS) |
| | Within | 81 | 540.49 | 6.67 | |

Age = 1) 0-30 years; 2) 31-38 years; 3) 39-57 years.

Table O

Analysis of Variance for Factors A, B, and C for Demographic Subgroup Variable $V_1$ for Correctional Officers

| | Source | df | SS | MS | F |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Factor A by $V_1$ | Between | 1 | 105.19 | 105.19 | 3.74 (NS) |
| | Within | 82 | 2301.32 | 28.06 | |
| Factor B by $V_1$ | Between | 1 | 5.11 | 5.11 | .57 (NS) |
| | Within | 82 | 729.09 | 8.89 | |
| Factor C by $V_1$ | Between | 1 | 2.57 | 2.57 | 3.69 (NS) |
| | Within | 82 | 571.77 | 6.97 | |

$V_1$ = Level of education = 1) Grade 9-13; 2) Post-secondary

Table P

Analysis of Variance for Factors A, B, and C for Demographic Subgroup Variable Age for Inmates

| | Source | df | SS | MS | F |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Factor A by Age | Between | 1 | 23.31 | 23.31 | .41 (NS) |
| | Within | 88 | 3122.33 | 35.48 | |
| Factor B by Age | Between | 1 | .90 | .90 | .06 (NS) |
| | Within | 88 | 1294.33 | 14.70 | |
| Factor C by Age | Between | 1 | 6.51 | 6.51 | 1.44 (NS) |
| | Within | 88 | 396.12 | 4.50 | |

Age = 1) 16-21 years; 2) 22-53 years.

Table Q

Analysis of Variance for Factors A, B, and C for Demographic Subgroup Variable $V_1$ for Inmates

| | Source | df | SS | MS | F |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Factor A by $V_1$ | Between | 1 | 3.72 | 3.72 | .10 (NS) |
| | Within | 88 | 3141.89 | 35.70 | |
| Factor B by $V_1$ | Between | 1 | 11.76 | 11.76 | .80 (NS) |
| | Within | 88 | 1283.46 | 14.58 | |
| Factor C by $V_1$ | Between | 1 | 6.51 | 6.51 | 1.44 (NS) |
| | Within | 88 | 396.12 | 4.50 | |

$V_1$ = Level of education = 1) grade 2-9; 2) grade 10-13

Table R

Analysis of Variance for Factors A, B, and C for Demographic Subgroup Variable $V_2$ for Inmates

| | Source | df | SS | MS | F |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Factor A by $V_2$ | Between | 2 | 79.03 | 39.51 | 1.12 (NS) |
| | Within | 87 | 3066.65 | 35.24 | |
| Factor B by $V_2$ | Between | 2 | 41.54 | 20.77 | 1.44 (NS) |
| | Within | 87 | 1253.68 | 14.41 | |
| Factor C by $V_2$ | Between | 2 | .03 | .01 | .00 (NS) |
| | Within | 87 | 402.60 | 4.627 | |

$V_2$ = Length of time served at current institution at time of questionnaire administration = 1) 2-5 weeks; 2) 6-10 weeks; 3) 12-44 weeks.

Table S

Analysis of Variance for Factors A, B, and C for Demographic Subgroup Variable $V_3$ for Inmates

| | Source | df | SS | MS | F |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Factor A by $V_3$ | Between | 2 | 19.48 | 9.74 | .27 (NS) |
| | Within | 87 | 3126.19 | 35.93 | |
| Factor B by $V_3$ | Between | 2 | 30.76 | 15.38 | 1.05 (NS) |
| | Within | 87 | 1264.46 | 14.53 | |
| Factor C by $V_3$ | Between | 2 | 6.22 | 3.11 | .68 (NS) |
| | Within | 87 | 396.42 | 4.55 | |

$V_3$ = Length of sentence = 1) 3-14 weeks; 2) 16-24 weeks; 3) 25-62 weeks

Table T

Analysis of Variance for Factors A, B, and C for Demographic Subgroup Variable $V_4$ for Inmates

| | Source | df | SS | MS | F |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Factor A by $V_4$ | Between | 2 | 1.86 | .93 | .02 (NS) |
| | Within | 87 | 3143.78 | 36.13 | |
| Factor B by $V_4$ | Between | 2 | 106.53 | 53.26 | 3.89* |
| | Within | 87 | 1188.69 | 13.66 | |
| Factor C by $V_4$ | Between | 2 | 7.83 | 3.91 | .86 (NS) |
| | Within | 87 | 394.81 | 4.53 | |

* $p<.05$

$V_4$ = Percentage of sentence served = 1) 10-35%; 2) 36-59%; 3) 60-99%.

Table U

Tukey's Post-hoc Test for Comparison of Means for Factor B for Inmates by $V_4$

| Percentage | Means | 16.20* | 14.99 | 14.52 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 10-35 | 16.20* | - | 1.21 ($\overline{dT}$=.57) | 2.68 ($\overline{dT}$=.57) |
| 36-59 | 14.99 | | - | .47 ($\overline{dT}$=.58) |
| 60-99 | 14.52 | | | - |

*$p<.05$

$\overline{dT}$= critical value

Table V

Analysis of Variance for Factors A, B, and C for Demographic Subgroup Variable $V_{12}$ for Inmates

| | Source | df | SS | MS | F |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Factor A by $V_{12}$ | Between | 2 | 859.89 | 429.94 | 16.36*** |
| | Within | 87 | 2285.77 | 26.27 | |
| Factor B by $V_{12}$ | Between | 2 | 10.47 | 5.23 | .35 (NS) |
| | Within | 87 | 1284.76 | 14.76 | |
| Factor C by $V_{12}$ | Between | 2 | 12.79 | 6.39 | 1.42 (NS) |
| | Within | 87 | 389.84 | 4.480 | |

** $p<.01$

$V_{12}$= Total length of time previously incarcerated at an institution regardless of level of security = 1) 0-1 month; 2) 2-22 months; 3) 23-130 months.

Table W

Tukey's Post-hoc Test for Comparison of Means for Factor A for Inmates by $V_{12}$

| Months | Means | 48.32* | 41.80 | 41.93 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 0-1 | 48.32* | - | 6.52 ($\overline{dT}$=1.23) | 6.39 ($\overline{dT}$=.92) |
| 2-22 | 41.80 | | - | .13 ($\overline{dT}$=1.21) |
| 23-130 | 41.93 | | | - |

*$p<.05$
$\overline{dT}$= critical value